

The Sufficiency of The Scriptures

by
James D. Bales

Published by
Church of Christ
C-22 South Extension 2
New Delhi 49, INDIA

PREFACE

In this booklet we shall study some of the evidences which show that the Bible is the only revealed will of God which we have, and that, therefore, it constitutes our sole rule of faith and practice. Since it is the only revealed word of God it is our only guide from earth to heaven. It and not some other authority, furnishes us completely unto every good work.

In showing the sufficiency of the Scriptures it will be necessary for us to examine some of the "authorities" which people accept in addition to the Bible, as their guide. Those who hold to authorities other than the Bible will be misled, therefore it is necessary for us to show them that they have the wrong authority, and that they ought to accept just the Bible. In addition to this, it will not be possible to answer Christ's prayer for the unity of believers unless we can agree as to what is the word of God, and the final authority in religion (John 17:20-21).

Christians should conduct a study of this type, as well as all other studies, with the desire to know the truth and to be guided by the truth. They should long to help people who are entangled with false authorities, and to speak the truth to them in love.

CONTENTS

Lesson	Page
Preface	
1—The Question of Authority Is Fundamental ...	1
2—The Bible Is Our Only Rule of Faith ...	8
3—The Right of Private Judgment ...	16
4—The Authority of Christ, The Apostles, and the Prophets	24
5—Was Peter Pope ?	30
6—Is Conscience the Authority in Religion ...	39
7—Feeling As the Authority	49
8—Christian Science	58
9—Christian Science and Its Cures	70
10—Seventh Day Adventists	80
11—The “Jehovah’s Witnesses”	87
12—The Latter Day Saints	98
13—The Completeness of Scriptures	109

The theme of this series of lessons is The Sufficiency of the Bible. In these studies are presented some of the evidences which show that the Bible is the only revealed will of God which we have, and therefore, it constitutes the sole rule of faith and practice for men who will follow the Lord.

LESSON ONE

The Question of Authority is Fundamental

If we are to know what we ought to believe and do, we must know what rule of faith, what standard is to be followed. There are differences in the religious world as to what one must do to be saved; how one must work and worship; how the church is to be organised; etc. None of these questions can be settled satisfactorily unless we know by what authority they are to be settled.

(1) *The Meaning of "Rule of Faith"*

"We here take the phrase, '*Rule of Faith*,' it will be observed, as referring only to 'the faith as once delivered to the saints,' (Jude 3), the truths of Christianity, the Christian religion ... the 'faith' ... is ... fully contained in the Scripture, and ... that Scripture is our only divine informant respecting it." (William Goode, *The Divine Rule of Faith* London : J. Harchard and Son, 1842 p. 3)

"The *rule of faith*, then may be briefly described as that which God has delivered respecting religion; and if we inquire as to the extent and limits of that rule *to us*, we have simply to determine the extent and limits of that which we have sufficient grounds for believing to be divine revelation on the subject. For the doctrines of religion, excepting those which are made manifest by the works of God (Rom. 1:19-21), can be known only by divine revela-

tion: none but God has a right to be heard in this matter. Faith in them, therefore, must have what it believes to be testimony that has a divine source and authority as a foundation to rest upon." (Ibid., p. 3)

(2) *Why the Question of Authority is Fundamental*

The fundamental issue is the question of authority. If you reason from the basis of one authority, and the other person reasons from another authority, you cannot prove anything to one another. Why is this true?

This can be illustrated with many examples. Why it is foolish to quote Acts 2:38 to prove to an unbeliever that he ought to be baptized? Does he accept the authority of Christ and the apostles? What truth, stated in Acts 2:36, must he accept before he will realize that Acts 2:38 is binding?

To point to a contradiction between the doctrines of the Latter Day Saints and the Bible does not upset a Latter Day Saint. He appeals to the authority of Joseph Smith, and of the succession of officers in the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints. Since he does not accept the Bible as his sole or final authority he does not think that he has to go to it for his beliefs. Instead, he accepts as final that which the prophets of his church teach. The fundamental issue, in any discussion with Latter Day Saints, is: Was Joseph Smith, Jr., a prophet of God? If he was, we should accept whatever he taught as authority. If he was not, we should reject everything which he taught which is not in the Bible, or which is not discoverable by human reason.

George Salmon's statements concerning the centrality of the question of the infallibility of the Pope in controversy with the Catholics well illustrates the need of dealing with the question of authority. "The truth is, that the issue of the controversy mainly turns on one great question... the question of the Infallibility of the Church. If that be decided against us, our whole case is gone ... In fact, suppose we make what seems to ourselves a quite convincing proof that some doctrine of the Roman Church is not contained in Scripture, what does that avail if we are forced to own that their Church has access to other sources of information besides Scriptures as to the doctrine taught by our Lord and his Apostles? Suppose we even consider that we have proved a Roman doctrine to be contrary to Scripture, what does that avail if we are compelled to acknowledge that we are quite incompetent to decide what is Scripture or what is the meaning of it, and if it belongs to the Church of Rome alone to give us the book and to teach us its true interpretation? In like manner, if our study of history should lead us to the conclusion that the teaching of the present Church is at variance with the teaching of the Church of former days, we are forced to surrender this ill-grounded suspicion of ours if we are made to believe that the Church cannot err, and, as a necessary consequence, that her teaching must be at all times, the same."

"One can scarcely open any book that attempts to deal with controversy by such a Roman Catholic as, for instance, Cardinal Manning, without being forced to observe that his faith in the infallibility of the present Church makes him impenetrable to all arguments. Suppose,

for example, the question in dispute is the Pope's personal infallibility, and that you object to him the case of Honorius: he replies, At most you could make that it was *doubtful* whether Honorius was orthodox; but it is *certain* that a Pope could not be a heretic. Well, you reply, at least the case of Honorius shows that the Church of the time supposed that a Pope could be a heretic. Not so, he answers, for the Church now holds that a Pope speaking *ex cathedra* cannot err, and the Church *could* not have taught differently at any other time."

"Thus, as long as anyone really believes in the infallibility of his Church, he has proof against any argument you can ply him with. Conversely, when faith in this principle is shaken, belief in some other Roman Catholic doctrine is sure also to be disturbed; for there are some of these doctrines in respect to which nothing but a very strong belief that the Roman Church cannot decide wrongly, will prevent a candid inquirer from coming to the conclusion that he has decided wrongly. This simplification then, of the controversy realizes for us the wish of the Roman Tyrant that all his enemies had but one neck. If we can but strike one blow, the whole battle is won."

(3) *When the Bible is Not Recognized As Final Authority*

What happens when the Bible is not allowed to have the final word can be illustrated from numerous things which are taught by the Roman Catholic Church. Roman Catholic scholars will admit what the Bible teaches, and then attempt to override it by the authority of their Church. They will admit that the Bible teaches one thing, and

that they do something else. They claim, however, that their Church cannot err in matters of faith, and that the Bible is not the final authority. So the differences between them and what the Bible teaches does not bother them.

(1) *Teaching concerning marriage.* Catholics say that they cannot "repeal or change" "the Divine law of marriage." However, they claim that their church has the right to determine when marriage is valid, and that they can change these laws. A marriage is invalid when: (a) one party has "a solemn vow of chastity." (b) When "one party is a Catholic and the other is unbaptized. Unless by dispensation, such a marriage is null." (c) It is not a marriage unless the parish priest performs it in his own parish, "or by a bishop in his own diocese, or by a delegate of either, in the presence of at least two witnesses. If those subject to the Church's law go elsewhere to be married, there is no marriage at all." (John F. Sullivan, *The Externals of the Catholic Church*, pp. 338-342), (d) Marriage is made void, it is annulable, when those contracting the marriage agree "not to have more than one or two children, or not to have any children at all, until, in the judgment of the contracting parties, circumstances shall enable them to be provided for..." (The Catholic Encyclopedia, IX:702).

Is there any indication of such laws in the New Testament? Does the New Testament teach that the Church has the right to make such laws? How do these laws show that the Roman Catholic Church is not as strict concerning marriage and divorce as she claims? How do these laws help her make the claim that she does not grant divorces to these people? How does one of her laws contradict I Cor. 7:12-14?

(2) Roman Catholic Festivals. "...in the Christian Church festival days are not of divine institution. They were all established by the Church herself, being begun 'at different times and in different parts of the world.'" (John F. Sullivan, *The Externals of the Catholic Church*, p. 126). The Roman Catholic Church requires fasting and abstinence from certain things during some festivals (p. 133). Has she bound on people what Christ has not bound? Does Col. 2:16-21 apply here?

(3) In a footnote to I Tim. 3:2, the Catholic Revision of the Challoner-Rheims Version of the New Testament says: "priestly celibacy as a law is of later ecclesiastical institution." Do they forbid what Paul commanded?

(4) Baptism: "to wash or to immerse," "immersion" (*Catholic Encyclopedia*, II:269, 261-262). What substitution have they made?

(5) Instrumental music. It is admitted that the church did not use it in the first centuries (*Catholic Encyclopedia*, X:648, 651).

(6) Killing heretics. It is admitted that the New Testament does not teach it, and that the church of the first few centuries did not practice it; and yet, they claim the right to put heretics to death (*Catholic Encyclopedia*, VIII:26-38; XI:703; VII:323, 260-261; XII:266). Why don't they do it today?

Can you think of other illustrations which prove that sometimes we do not make headway in talking with people because they justify their practices by some authority other than the Bible?

(4) *Is it Scriptural to Examine These "Authorities" ?*

There are some individuals who think that it is wrong to examine and to refute the authorities which are held to by other people. They think that it shows discourtesy and intolerance. The answer to a few questions will help us to see that they are mistaken.

(1) If a man comes to your home and asks to search your house, is it wrong and discourteous to ask him for his legal authority to do it ?

(2) Is it right to want to be certain of our grounds in business matters, but wrong to try to be certain in religious matters ? Should we be careful about what we base our hope on in this life, but careless as to what we base our hope on concerning the life which is to come ?

(3) Is a scientist intolerant because he opposes a falsehood and stands for a truth ?

(4) Isn't a public proclamation of a message an invitation to examine it ? If a person does not want his claims examined should he present them ?

(5) If you worked in a bank, and a stranger wanted to cash a 1,000 dollar check, would it be discourteous and intolerant for you to ask for identification ?

(6) False teachers can lead a person astray (2 Tim. 3:13) Is it wrong for us to be careful lest we be led astray ? Is it wrong to warn others ? (I John 4:1).

(7) How do the following Scriptures show that it is our right and duty to test those who profess to have a message from God ? (Acts 17:11-12; I John 4:1-3; Rev. 2:2; Matt. 7:15-23; Matt 24:24; II Thess. 2:1-12)

LESSON TWO

The Bible is our only Rule of Faith

What is the standard by which our beliefs and our conduct ought to be measured? What rule should be our guide? *God's will constitutes the only safe rule of faith and life.* Even those religious people who rely on things other than the Bible claim that these things are the will of God. So they recognize that God's will should constitute the standard. Thus the question is: Where has the revelation of God's will been deposited? Where can we find it?

It can be shown that the Bible is all of God's word to man that is available for us today. All that he wants us to have has been recorded and is in the Bible. The so-called "proofs" that there are revelations by inspired men, other than those in the Bible, will not stand close examination.

Why do some people want some standard in addition to the Bible?

(1) *The Bible Is All We Have*

The Scriptures constitute our rule of faith and practice *because besides them there is no other rule.* Since there is no other rule of faith, this one must be complete for it is the only one. It alone is the revelation of the truth for

we do not have direct revelation today. What we have in the Bible is all that we have. For centuries it has been considered the complete word of God, and men cannot prove that it is not. They cannot show wherein it is incomplete.

(2) *Is the Spirit the Rule ?*

It has been objected that the Bible is not the rule of faith but that God or the Holy Spirit constitutes the rule of faith. This cannot be. The Spirit, considered apart from his revelation, is not the rule for we know nothing of the Spirit except what He has seen fit to reveal. The Spirit may reveal the rule of faith, but he is not the rule of faith. The law and the lawgiver are not the same thing. The Lord, the ruler, has given up the rule through men who were inspired by the Spirit.

(3) *Was Inspiration the Rule ?*

When this question is considered we shall see that we have the same rule that the apostles had. Inspiration itself was not the rule, but only the means through which the rule was delivered. We have the same rule they had for we have the one which they received by inspiration. Their rule was the word which they received from the Spirit. Direct revelation was simply the means of getting the rule to them and through them to us. We receive the same thing from them which they received from the Spirit. As Bennet expressed it :

“That which God did immediately reveal, not only was the rule of faith to the apostles and other inspired persons, in the primitive times (as well as to those to whom they taught it), but is also the rule of faith to us. Because the same things are revealed to us, tho’ not

immediately (directly). Nor were they the rule to them, *because* they were revealed *immediately*, but *because* they were revealed. For what is revealed, whether *mediately*, or *immediately*, is the rule of faith. And therefore we who have a *mediate* revelation of what they knew by *immediate* revelation, have the same rule of faith with them, tho' it was not delivered to us after the same manner as to them. For to them the revelation was *immediate* : to us it is *mediate* : but what God has revealed is the rule, and the self same rule, to both."

If God said one thing to me by phone and the same thing to you by letter, would it be a different thing just because it was transmitted in a different way to each of us? Just so the rule of faith which was delivered directly to a few persons by the Spirit is the same rule they delivered to others. Paul received the gospel from Christ (Gal. 1:12); and many others received it from Paul (1Cor. 15:1-5). It was the same gospel in both instances.

(4) *How Was the Church Guided Before the Bible Was Written?*

The answer to this point settles the issue which some raise in saying that the Scriptures were not the rule of faith of the church from the beginning since the New Testament was not written during the first *few* years of the existence of the Church. But these things were revealed, thus they were divine revelations. What the inspired men revealed when they *uttered* words did not differ from what they revealed when they *wrote* words. The word of God is the word of God whether spoken or written. Those things which were revealed were the rule both then

and now. And we do not account the Scriptures the rule of faith for any other reason, but only because "they are divine revelations." And since they are "all the divine revelations which we now enjoy, therefore they are to us the only rule of faith." The only way we can receive the word from the inspired men of the first century, who are now dead, is through their written word.

(5) *Do the Scriptures Claim to Be the Rule*

There are some who object that the Scriptures do not claim to be the rule of faith. These very people often accept it as a rule of faith! Does it say that it is a rule of faith? When we study the characteristics of the written word we see it really claims to be the standard of faith for it contains the revelation of the faith. What are some of its characteristics? Those who say that the Bible does not claim to be the rule of faith forget that it claims to be the word of God. And to say that the word of God does not claim to be the rule of faith is to say that what God has revealed is not the rule of faith. The fact that it is God speaking is ample reason for man to accept it and obey it. Why do those who profess to believe the Bible ignore the fact that when they say anything against the Bible they are saying that thing against the *word of God*? Their very attitude toward the Bible reveals that there is deep seated antagonism between their doctrines and the doctrine of the Bible. It is sufficient for us that it is his word; yea, when He speaks it is earth's responsibility to hear (Isa. 1:2) Since it is the standard by which we shall be judged (John 12 : 48), since it is the only word of Jesus that we have, it must be the standard by which we are to *live* (Matt. 7 : 21, 24-27). If anyone denies that in John

12 : 48 Jesus is speaking about the written word delivered by the apostles we ask them : Do you deny that the New Testament is his word? Even John 12:48 itself is written.

How do we get Christ's word ? He received it from the Father, and gave it to the apostles (John 17:8, 14). The Spirit was to bring it to their remembrance, and to guide them into all truth (John 14:25-26; 16:12-13). Others were to believe because of their word (John 17:20). Today they teach us through the written word, for it is the only word we have from them. They are not here in person to speak to us. So their written word leads us to faith (John 20:30), and instructs us in the way of Christ (Eph. 3:4). The word which they wrote was the same word which they spoke (II Thess. 2:15; 3:6).

(6) *Who Is the Judge of Controversies ?*

But someone may say, who is the infallible judge of controversies and doctrines if the Bible is the standard? God, Christ and the Holy Spirit are the infallible Judge. Man is not. Man cannot know anything about it except as it is revealed to man. But when it is revealed we can know, regardless of whether or not the revelation is received mediately or immediately. There is no immediate revelation today, therefore the written revelation must have the final word in all controversies. The Scriptures are not the Judge of controversies, but they are the "sentence of the Judge concerning controversies". Man, to whom God has revealed his judgment, does not constitute the judge. Man should simply give assent and obedience to the sentence of God, the Judge. And to do so one must study his will. If it be objected that, that makes human

reason the judge we reply. *First*, one must use reason to discover the rule and apply the rule regardless of whether it be in football or religion. But the reason you use is not the rule, it simply enables us to see and apply the rule. The telescope is not the eye just because the eye looks through the telescope, nor is the telescope the star at which we look.

Second, even those groups which claim to have a human being who delivers infallible judgments concerning controversies must still use their reason. The so-called infallible judge must use his reason to be sure that what he claims is an infallible decision from God is not just a whim or idle dream of his own. Furthermore, those who accept this infallible human judge must use their reason to determine whether or not God has ordained that that person be such a judge. For they must accept him as such for some reason or for no reason at all. And if they accept him for no reason at all, they have no assurance that they have not been imposed upon—and certainly with several churches who claim to have inspired infallible judges today someone is being imposed upon. But if they accept him for some reason then they must use their reason to determine whether or not there is sufficient reason or evidence on which to accept that person. Furthermore, when one receives a decision from this infallible judge he must use his reason to hear it, to read, and to understand it. If God must send us an inspired interpreter to interpret the revelation which He gave through inspired men, why would He not have to give us an interpreter to interpret the inspired interpretation? The only solution would be *either* that God has given us the power of intellect with which to

study and understand his revelation or that He must inspire each of us to understand the Word *after* it has been revealed. But there was no need to reveal it through others to us if we could not understand it without direct revelation.

(7) *Study Questions*

(a) When we maintain that the Bible is the rule of faith for the church, the Roman Catholic asks: What did the church go by before the New Testament was written? All know that the New Testament was not written on the day of Pentecost when the church started. In fact, the first books which were written were not written until some time after the establishment of the church, and the book of Revelation was not written until almost the close of the first century. How do you answer their question?

(b) Somewhat related to the above point, is the contention of Roman Catholicism that the church gave us the Bible and therefore it is the church and not the Bible which constitutes the authority. Did the church give us the Bible? How do you answer their argument?

(c) Did Christ ever tell the Jews to go to some infallible interpreter among the Jews so that they could understand the Old Testament? Did he expect them as individuals to understand what was written? Did those individuals who accepted traditions oppose or accept Christ?

(d) How can the following Scriptures be used to show that the Bible is our only guide? (II Tim. 3 : 16-17; John 16 : 13; Jude 3; Matt. 28 : 20; Heb. 2 : 3). Can the Catholic say that these statements were written before the New Testament was completed, and that therefore it does

not prove that the New Testament is complete and final today ?

(e) To what was Israel to appeal ? (Isa. 8 : 20).

(f) Why did Jesus say that the Sadducees erred ? (Mk. 12 : 24)

(g) Roman Catholics maintain that II Thess. 2 : 15 shows that what the apostles taught orally was as binding as that which they taught in writing. Therefore, traditions handed down orally from the days of the apostles are as binding on us as what is found in the Bible. How do you answer their argument ?

(h) Did Jesus ever appeal to "tradition" in order to prove something or did He always appeal to the written word, the Old Testament, and to his own authority as the Son of God ?

LESSON THREE

The Right of Private Judgment

The Roman Catholic Church, and a few other religious groups, maintain that the common people cannot understand the Bible unless they have an infallible interpreter to tell them what it means. If this is true can the Bible be said to be a revelation of God's will to them? James Cardinal Gibbons, a very high ranking Catholic, wrote: "If your church is not infallible it is liable to err, for there is no medium between infallibility and liability to error. If your church and her ministers are fallible in their doctrinal teachings, as they admit, they may be preaching falsehood to you, instead of truth. If so, you are in doubt whether you are listening to truth or falsehood. If you are in doubt, you can have no faith, for faith, excludes doubt, and in that state you displease God, for 'without faith it is impossible to please God.' (Read the rest of the passage, Heb. 11 : 6, J.D.B.) Faith and infallibility must go hand in hand. The one cannot exist without the other. There can be no faith in the hearer unless there is unerring authority in the speaker—an authority founded upon such certain knowledge as precludes the possibility of falling into error on his part, and including such unquestioned veracity as to prevent his deceiving him who accepts his word." (*Faith of Our Fathers*, 110th Edition. Baltimore : John Murphy Co., 1917 pp. 70-71).

Can you point out some of the errors in this quotation? The answer to the following questions will help you to discern his fallacies: Do Catholics claim that their priests

and teachers are infallible? No. Thus one can turn the argument against them. Has the Pope given an infallible interpretation of every passage in the Bible? No. Is not this the reason that we want all human teachers to *show* our source of authority, the Bible, infallible? Is not this the reason that we want all human teachers to show *us what the Bible says* about a matter? Do we accept the teaching just because the teacher said so, or because he shows us where the Bible teaches it? Unless each hearer is infallible is it not possible for him to err? How would this show that Gibbons, in order to be consistent, would have to teach that each hearer was infallible, so that he could be infallibly certain that he had understood the infallible teacher? Does Gibbons' statement assume that the hearer has no mind of his own with which to weigh what the teacher says? If the hearer cannot weigh and pass judgment on the teaching which he hears, how is he to learn that the Roman Catholic Church is infallible? Since Romanism does not teach that each priest is infallible, but only the Pope, how does the first part of Gibbons' last sentence force him to the position that Catholics cannot have faith and therefore cannot please God?

(1) *The Meaning of Private Judgment*

When we deny that God has furnished us with an infallible interpreter of the Bible, and when we affirm that each man has the right and duty to weigh the word which is brought by a teacher, we do not mean: (a) That the individual has the right to make the Bible mean anything that he wants it to mean. (b) That a teacher of the Bible is useless. The right of private judgment means that each individual ought to be fully persuaded in his own mind. He ought not to accept a thing *just because* some

preacher or priest says that it is so. He ought not to accept a teaching until he becomes convinced that it is in God's word. A teacher should endeavor to show the pupil the reasons and Scriptures which lead him to take certain positions. He should ask the student to weigh these things, and on the basis of the evidence receive the truth. Thus he does not see this truth just because the teacher sees it, but because he himself sees it. The teacher can help furnish him with the facts and Scriptures which show that such and such is true, but he must see it for himself and not just because the teacher says that he (the teacher) sees it. In other words, each must make his own decision. Another cannot make our decisions for us.

Does another person answer for us? (Rom. 14 : 12; I Thess. 5 : 21; I John 2 : 2-4). What happens to those who blindly put their trust in human guides? (Matt. 15 : 9, 14). How do these things show that we ought not to leave to some priesthood our decisions as to what God requires of us?

(2) *The Necessity of Private Judgment*

Gibbons presented what he called the earmarks or characteristics of the New Testament church, and then tried to show that these earmarks are found in the Catholic Church, but are not found in other churches. Was not this an appeal to our private judgment? Is not every sermon, paper, or conversation, which has as its object the instruction and conversion of non-Catholics, an appeal to the judgment of the individual? Do they appeal to him to accept it just because the Pope and the Roman Catholic Church say that these things are true? Do they ask us to accept their infallible authority for some

reason or for no reason at all ? It would be absurd to say that we ought to accept their claims for no reason at all. If we are to accept them for some reasons, do we not have to use our reason and make a judgment as to whether or not they are right ? And do we not make this judgment on the basis of our own understanding and interpretation of what is said, and without doing it on the basis of the authority of the Roman Catholic Church ?

As William Chillingworth wrote : "But if there be no certainty in reason, how shall I be assured of the certainty of those which you allege for this purpose ? Either I may judge of them, or not, if not why do you propose them ? If I may, why do you say I may not, and make it such a monstrous absurdity, that men in the choice of their religion should make use of their reason ? which yet, without all question, none but unreasonable men can deny to have been the chief reason why reason was given them." (*The Religion of Protestants*, P. 136).

As George Salmon wrote: "That submission to the Church of Rome rests ultimately on an act of private judgment is unmistakably evident, when a Romanist tries...to make a convert of you...What does he then ask you to do but to decide that the religion of your fathers is wrong; that the teachers and instructors of your childhood were all wrong...(that you have not understood the Bible your-self; that it is wrong to say that the Bible is the only rule of faith J. D. B.)...is not that...exercise of private judgment ? But suppose you come to the opposite conclusion, and decide on staying where you were, would not a Romanist have a right to laugh at you, if you said that you were not using your private judgment *then* that to *change* one's

religion indeed is an act of private judgment, but that one who continues in his father's religion is subject to none of the risks to which every exercise of private judgment is liable? Well, it is absurd to imagine that logic has one rule for Roman Catholics and another for us, that it would be an exercise of private judgment in them to change their religion, but none if they continue in what their religious teachers have told them. An act of our judgment must be the ultimate foundation of all our beliefs." (*The Infallibility of the Church*. Published by James D. Bales, Searcy, Arkansas. pp. 48-49).

What if you inherited a million dollars, and someone said that it would be unsafe for you to use your reason in handling this money, and that therefore you ought to turn it over to him to handle for you? Would that avoid the use of your judgment with reference to the money? Would this keep you from making any mistake with reference to the money?

Do you see why Salmon says that we not only have the right of private judgment, but that every individual must use his judgment in matters of religion, even when he decides to let others do, or continue to do, his thinking for him?

(3) *The Right of Private Judgment*

(1) Did Jesus tell the Jews that their trouble was that they had not listened to some infallible interpreter? Were the Jews led astray because they were depending on their leaders for their doctrines instead of going by the word of God? (Mk. 7:1-10; Matt. 15:7-8, 14).

(2) In appealing to the Jews did Christ appeal to their minds by presenting the truth to them and calling on *them* to understand and accept it ?

(3) Was the New Testament written to some special priesthood in the church who, in turn, were to interpret it to the common people ? See the introductory statements, for example, to some of Paul's epistles.

(4) Did Peter appeal to the private judgment of his audience (Acts 2:36) ? If Peter's spoken word did not need an infallible interpreter, does his written word ?

(5) Does the Pope render an account for us in the judgment ? Since each one of us must give an account, (Rom. 14:12) should we depend on what the Bible says or what the Pope says ?

(6) What bearing do the following passages have on this question ? (John 12:48; I Thess. 5:21, 27; I John 4:1-3; III John 9; Rom. 15:4; I Cor. 10 : 11; 14 : 37; I Pet. 2:2; Col. 3 : 16; I Tim. 2:15; 4:13; II Tim. 3:14-17).

(4) *Roman Catholic Arguments*

How can you answer the following arguments which are made by Roman Catholics ?

(1) Would it not be better to have an infallible interpreter ? In thinking about this point ask yourself the following question : Is the Bible the infallible interpreter of God's will to us ? If we need an infallible interpreter to interpret the Bible, wouldn't we need an infallible interpreter to interpret the infallible interpreter ? Is it right to depend on a so-called infallible interpreter when we know he (the Pope) is not infallible ? Is the question to be settled

by what we might like, or by what God has actually provided for us? Should we demand that God should fix things like we might want them, or should we be grateful for what He has done for us? If the question is to be settled on the basis of what we might think is better, would we not be allowed to conclude that it is better that everyone be an infallible interpreter and that therefore everyone is?

(2) Is an infallible interpreter necessary in order to expose new departure from the word of God? We do not need an infallible interpreter in order to know that Romanism is a departure from God's word! Since a false teaching is simply a teaching which is repugnant to the teaching of the Bible, all we need to do is to study the Bible to expose false teaching.

(3) Is an infallible interpreter necessary for unity. The Lord did not provide an infallible interpreter of the Bible, so such must not be necessary in order to have unity. Besides, the Roman Catholics are not united on a good many points. One cannot read very long on some things in *The Catholic Encyclopedia* without noticing that they differ on a good many things.

(4) Does II Pet. 3 : 16-18 teach the need for an infallible interpreter? Ask yourself the following questions: Was this epistle written to a special priesthood or the Pope or to the church? Is all hard to understand? Did Peter say that it was impossible to understand it? Do all wrest the Scriptures? Do those who wrest the Scriptures wrest only the hard passages? Did Peter say that we must listen to the Pope to keep from being deceived? What safeguard does he provide for us in verses 17-18?

(5) Acts 8 : 31. Is the Eunuch simply saying that he is puzzled and needs help, or is he saying that he must have the Pope to interpret it to him ? Are we in the same position the Eunuch was in ? Did he have the written New Testament as we do, that he might be able to read and so learn of whom the prophet was speaking ?

(6) II Pet. 1 : 19-21 is sometimes used to show that the common person has no right to study the Bible for himself. Isn't it strange that the Pope claims the "private right" to do that ! When they use this verse to try to prove their point are they appealing to our private judgment ? This passage does not refer to the understanding of a prophecy after it has been delivered. Instead it refers, as the American Standard Version brings out, to the origin of prophecy. Prophecy did not originate in man's private judgment concerning the future. How did it originate ? In the mind of God, and it was revealed by the Spirit. The New Roman Catholic translation renders it : "No prophecy of Scripture is made by private interpretation." *A Commentary on the New Testament*, prepared by The Catholic Biblical Association, 1942, p. 630, says : "Prophecy comes *not by will of man*, i. e., by some natural medium where by man can know the future."

LESSON FOUR

The Authority of Christ, the Apostles, and the Prophets

What is the foundation of the church ? (Eph. 2:19-22) How do we know that reference is made, in this context, to New Testament apostles and *prophets*, and not to Old Testament prophets ? (Eph. 3 : 4-5 ; 4 : 11). Does the church have more than one foundation ? Does Christ constitute one ? the apostles another ? the prophets another ? Does the foundation refer to their doctrine or teaching ? Has this foundation ever been destroyed ? Can this foundation be replaced ? Do apostles and prophets have to be on earth in person today for us to have the foundation ? Does Christ ? Can we put in new apostles and prophets in the foundation every generation ? Can we put in another Christ each generation ? Are the apostles and prophets in the foundation or in the sides or roof of the building, which is here called the temple ? What position do we occupy ? (I Pet. 2 : 5, 9). Why is the temple said to be a growing temple ? How were people builded into that temple ? Gentiles, Paul said were built into the temple (Eph. 2 : 22). This is simply another way of saying that they had heard and obeyed the gospel. Or, as Paul said in Eph. 2 : 13 "But now, in Christ Jesus, ye who sometime were far off are made nigh by the blood of Christ." How did they obey the gospel then ? (Rom. 6:2-4, 17-18). Into whom were they baptized ? (Gal. 3:27) How do we get into the temple today ? Is it true that whenever and wherever anyone obeys the gospel that God places

him in this building ? Does this passage (Eph. 2:19-22), show that we should not accept any teaching which has not come from Christ, the apostles, or the prophets ? Can anything be in the foundation which they did not place there ?

This long series of questions now leads us to two more questions: How do we know what Christ, the apostles, and the prophets taught ? Why should we accept the authority of the apostles and prophets ?

(1) *The Authority of Jesus Christ*

Who sent Christ ? (John 12:49). Where did He get his word ? (John 12:49-50; 12:24, 17:8). How authoritative is He and his word ? (John 12:48; 14:6; Acts 17:31.)

(2) *The Authority of the Apostles*

In John chapters 13 through 17, Christ was speaking to the apostles at the time of the institution of the Lord's supper (John 13:2-3; Matt. 26:20). Who sent the apostles? (John 17:18; 15:16). What word did they receive ? (John 17:6-8) Does it make any difference how we treat their word? (John 13:20). What if we refuse to keep their word? (John 14:23) How were the apostles to remember what Jesus had taught them ? (John 14:26). If this promise applies to anyone today would he have to study the four Gospels ? Were any truths, other than those which Jesus had taught in his personal ministry, to be taught by the apostles ? (John 16:12-13). Were they to teach only a part of the truth ? (John 16:13). If all truth, the complete revelation of Christianity, was not revealed in the first century to these apostles did Christ's promise fail ? Did this promise fail ? Does this show that the truth was fully

revealed in the first century? Since we do not have any word from the apostles, other than that which is in the Bible, is it not our sole rule? Is it not sufficient, complete? Is not "all truth"; the sufficient guide?

When were they to begin their work of witnessing for Christ? (John 15:26-27; 16:12-13; Luke 24:48-49; Acts 1:5-8; 2:1-4,33).

Did Jesus indicate how other people were to be led to believe on Him? (John 17:20; compare Rom. 10:14,17). Since these apostles are not now here, how can they lead us to believe? (John 20:30-31). How can they instruct us in the word of God? (John 20:30-31, Eph. 3:4). Do we "have" the apostles, in any sense, today? (Eph. 2:20 compare Luke 16:29-31). How can we hear them? (compare Acts 13:27. "Voice"; 2 Thess. 2:14).

(3) *Who Were the Prophets?*

The apostles could prophesy and teach, and a prophet was one who prophesied and taught. However, as will be shown, an apostle was more than a prophet. In Eph. 2:20 the prophets are distinguished from the apostles. Evidently the term is here used to cover the other inspired men of the first century. Other inspired men, as well as some of the apostles, helped write the New Testament. Who were some of them? All of the teaching, whether by an apostle or a prophet, came from God, Christ, and the Spirit. On the foundation of the truth which they delivered the church is built. Whatever goes beyond that is teaching something which does not belong in the foundation of the church, and thus it should not be received by the church.

(4) *Qualifications of Apostles*

Since there are some individuals who claim to be apostles of Christ, such as the Latter Day Saints apostles, it is necessary to measure them by the characteristics which the Bible shows that an apostle had to have. Does the Lord commend people for trying those who profess to be apostles? (Rev. 2:2).

The term apostle simply means one set forth, one sent, a messenger. Christ is called an apostle because He was sent forth by God (Heb. 3:1). "Messenger" in Phil. 2:25 is from the Greek word which means apostle. A church can send someone today, and he is their messenger or apostle. But he is not an apostle of Christ, for an apostle of Christ had to be sent and qualified by Christ. They, and they alone, possessed all the following characteristics: (1) Eye and ear witnesses to the work of Christ. They had to have seen Christ after His resurrection (I John 4:1-4; Acts 1:21,22; 10:39; 41:42; 22:14,15; 23:11; I Cor. 9:1; 15:8-9).

(2) Called and chosen by Christ personally and not by the church (Luke 6:13; Acts 1:2; 9:6; 24:16-18; Gal.1:1) Even in the case of Matthias, who was numbered with the eleven apostles (Acts 1:26; 2:14; 6:2), the appeal was to God to show the one whom He had chosen (Acts 1:24). This was not a case of an apostle being selected to be a successor to a departed apostle after the establishment of the church. It was: (a) before the establishment of the church; (b) the fulfillment of prophecy (1:20), and (c) he had to be an eye witness (1:21-22). A ministry of eye

witnesses cannot have successors throughout the age, for eye witnesses do not live that long.

(3) Apostles were taught the gospel by Christ and by direct revelation (Gal 1:12; John 14:26; 16:12-13). They were inspired.

(4) They had power to work miracles. So did some other people, but the apostles seem to have been able to work all sorts of miracles, speaking in tongues, etc., while in at least most cases individuals did not have several gifts (1 Cor. 12:8).

(5) The apostles had power to confer miraculous power through the laying on of their hands (Acts 19:1-6; Rom. 1:11; 2 Tim. 1:6).

(6) They are in the foundation of the church (Eph.2:20). Christ did not promise them that they would remain on earth, but that their fruit would remain (John 15:16). The work which they started still continues, and all who do gospel work are furnished with gospel truth by their word. The word they delivered is still our guide.

There are people today who claim to be apostles of Christ, but it can be shown that:(a) They are not inspired. (b) That they teach false doctrines. (c) That they have made false prophecies. (d) That they cannot do the miracles which the apostles did. (e) That they have not really seen the Lord. To Paul, last of all, Christ appeared to make him an apostle (I Cor. 15:8-9). He has not appeared to anyone else to make him an apostle. The foundation of the church (Eph. 2:20) has been laid once for all. It is impossible, as well as un-necessary, that it be laid again.

Instead of seeking for new apostles, who can be false apostles only, we should seek to know the will which the inspired men of the first century delivered. When men do not teach that which is found in the faith once for all delivered to the saints (Jude 3, American Standard Version) their teaching should be rejected. Whatever teaching is not built on the foundation of Eph. 2:20 is from man and not from God. The standard by which all teaching must be tested is: Did the apostles of Christ teach it? The only source of information which we have as to what they taught is the Bible. It is our only standard because it is the only record of their teaching which man has today. When they were here in person man learned the truth from their lips as well as from their pens. Today the truth can be learned only from their pens, from what they wrote, for their lips have been sealed by death. He who does not study the Bible shuts himself off from the only message, which God has for his people, concerning his will for them. He who rejects them and their teaching rejects God.

(5) *Study Problem*

The Latter Day Saints teach that apostasy totally destroyed the Lord's church, and that the church had to be re-established directly from heaven. It vanished from the face of the earth, they say, and had to be established on earth by new revelations, miracles, etc. How does Eph. 2:2 and other Scriptures which have been studied in this lesson, prove that apostasy could not destroy the church in the sense in which they say that apostasy destroyed it? What is necessary for the church to be established in any community and any century? Does Luke 8:11 give us any help here?

Was Peter Pope ?

(1) *The Position of the Roman Catholic Church*

(1) The Roman Catholic Church teaches that Peter was the first Pope; that the Popes of Rome are his spiritual successors ; and that to be a faithful Christian one must accept the Pope. To establish these positions they must prove that : (a) Peter was Pope; (b) Peter was to have a successor ; (c) the Bishops of Rome were to be his successors ; and that (d) the present Pope teaches the doctrine that was taught in Peter's day. If the Papacy is not Scriptural, the Roman Catholic Church is not the church of Christ.

(2) The Roman Catholic Church teaches that the Pope is infallible. What do they mean by this?

(3) The issue is not : was Peter prominent ? The issues are : Was Peter Pope ? Does he have faithful successors in the Roman Church ? The Pope appeals to the Bible in this matter and so shall we.

(2) *The Rock Upon Which the Church is Built*

(Matt 16 : 18)

What is the Catholic claim on this passage ? Let us examine it.

(1) If the church was built on Peter it does not help the Catholics since he did not leave a successor ; and they contradict Peter's teaching as well as that of the other inspired men who wrote the Bible.

(2) Peter's confession "is this Rock doctrinally" for he confessed the truth that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God. The church could have been built without Peter, if

Christ had not called him to be an apostle, but it could not have been built without the truth that Jesus is the Christ. Peter preached this truth but as a person he was not essential to the truth that Jesus is the Christ.

(3) When men are spoken of as in the foundation, the other apostles are in it equally with Peter (Eph. 2 : 20; Rev. 21 : 14, 19)

(4) If Peter has a successor, so do all of the apostles. We no more need apostles, other than the original ones, each generation than we need another Christ on earth in each generation. "As in a building it is incongruous that foundations should succeed foundations, so it may be in the church, that any other apostles should succeed the first." (W. Chillingworth. *The Religion of Protestants*, (Bohn Edition), p. 376). What about Matthais?

(5) One was the master of the apostles. Who? (Matt. 23 : 8, 10).

(6) In the Greek the term for Peter is "Petros" (masculine gender), a stone; the term for the rock is "Petra" (feminine gender). The Roman Catholics try to avoid the force of this by maintaining that Jesus spoke in the Syro-Chaldaic and that "in this tongue there is no change of gender." Regardless of the language in which Jesus spoke, and it is not positively known that Jesus spoke in Syro-Chaldaic, Matthew, who was there made the distinction.

(7) The other apostles did not understand, either before or after Pentecost, that Christ here made Peter supreme (Lk. 22 : 24, 25 ; Gal. 2:6-9). There would have been no argument as to who was to be the greatest,

if Christ had made Peter supreme. Did Christ end the argument by stating that Peter was to be the greatest? (Matt. 20 : 21; 25 : 25).

(8) "Keys were an ancient emblem of authority" and power (Matt. 16:19; Rev. 3:7, 8). The power of "binding and loosing" must be taken as exegetical of the power of the Keys. These expressions are manifestly Jewish, and may therefore be satisfactorily explained by reference to this mode of speaking. With the Jews to bind and loose was a usual phrase for declaring what was lawful; what was binding on men's consciences; and that from the obligation of which they were loosed or free." (Richard Watson, *Commentary on Matthew*, p. 236). The other apostles were also given such power (John 20:20-23; John 16:12- 19). What each bound on earth was what had already been bound in heaven and which was made known to them through the Spirit (John 14 : 26 ; 16:7; Lk. 24:49; Acts 1:8; 2:1). God did not allow them to bind their own ideas, instead they declared to the people what God had bound.

James Cardinal Gibbons, a prominent Catholic, also pointed out that the keys were simply symbols of authority. The symbol itself is nothing, "it is the thing symbolized that is effective," and authority—the thing symbolized—was certainly given to the other apostles. (John 20:20-23 grants authority without using the symbol of "key." (Fradyssa).

If there is any successor to Peter or any other apostle, that successor to be a real successor would have to be qualified to make, bind and confirm, new revelations. The

Popes do not claim to make new revelations, thus they are not like Peter.

(9) There is no unanimous agreement of the "church fathers" of the early centuries on this passage. Giorgio Bartoli, once a Jesuit, who left them of his own accord, said : "At the time of the Vatican Council a book was published under the title *Quoestio*, which examined very carefully the opinions of the Fathers of the Church upon our subject, and it found that eight Fathers interpreted the word 'rock' as all the apostles collectively taken sixteen took it as meaning Christ Himself, seventeen applied it to St. Peter, and forty-four interpreted it as the faith which Peter confessed :'" (*The Primitive Church and the Primacy of Rome*, p. 49).

This word (rock, JDB), to them, is a mere adjective which they bestow on Peter, just as our Lord did. The same Fathers and writers, however, whenever they happen to inquire into the meaning of the word 'rock', as applied to Peter uphold either (a) that the true rock is Christ ; or (b) that St. Peter was called Rock because he was intrusted with the foundation of the Church, i.e. because he, first of all, opened the gates of the Church to the Jews and the Gentiles: or (c) because, from the first Church founded by him at Jerusalem, all other Churches are derived ; or (d) finally, because the Church is founded upon the profession of faith by him uttered, on which faith, as upon a solid rock, the Church was forever founded." (*Ibid*, p. 50). It is well to notice that the other apostles had a part in the establishment of the Church on Pentecost (Acts 2:1-4, 37).

(3) *Confirm Thy Brethren* (Lk. 22 : 32)

The Roman Catholic Church maintains that Christ prayed particularly for Peter because he "was to be the foundation stone of the Church." He also prayed for the others (John 17 : 9, 15). In Lk. 22:32 Christ prayed for Peter not because he was the foundation-stone but because "Satan hath desired to have you, that he may sift you as wheat." (22:31). Jesus knew that Peter stood in particular need of prayer. The prayer was with reference to Peter's subsequent trial and denial and not to any supremacy.

To confirm brethren does not mean: (a) that Peter was to rule other apostles : or (b) to have a successor. Spiritual brethren are to restore erring ones, but that does not make them supreme in authority (Gal. 6:1). Paul, for instance, confirmed brethren, but was Paul Pope ? (Acts 14 : 22).

(4) *Peter the Chief Shepherd ?* (John 21:15-47)

The three questions which Peter considered as a re-proof, are regarded by the Roman Catholics as a grant of universal supremacy in the church. Did Christ call Peter the chief shepherd ? (Compare John 10:14; 1 Pet. 5:4).

Peter's three professions of love are connected with his three denials. Peter had once sat in judgment on the other disciples and had pronounced himself as the one who would never deny Christ (Matt. 26:34; Lk. 22:33). Peter boasted of his power but Christ foretold his denial (Lk. 22:34; Matt. 26:33,35). After the denial (Matt. 26:74), impulsive Peter was addressed by Christ. He who had publicly denied Christ three times was now asked to affirm publicly his love three times. Peter could not know whe-

ther or not he loved Christ more than did the others. He had thought in times past that he had more loyalty than they. In this instance he simply affirmed his own love and made no attempt to compare it with the love of the others. This furnishes us with the reason why Peter, instead of the others, was thus questioned. He had taken the lead in boasting (Matt. 26:33-35), he had denied Christ three times, so as Augustine said, this now revealed that Peter's tongue was no less accessible "to love, than it had been to fear" (C.H. Collette, *Milner Refuted*. London : 1856, p. 131).

There was an implied rebuke in this passage for Jesus did not refer to him as Peter but as "Simon, son of John."

The Roman Catholic position that "sheep" refers to Bishops, and "lambs" to the "laity" is wrong. The distinction is not in the New Testament. The faithful in general are his sheep (John 10:16). Christ may mean that Peter should so conduct himself, in the future, so as to discourage neither the old nor the new followers of Christ.

The "church fathers" did not understand that Christ here made Peter the chief shepherd. Cyprian, "Bishop of Carthage, writing to Stephen, Bishop of Rome, said : 'We being many shepherds, do feed one flock, and all the sheep of Christ' (Epist. 68, ad P.Steph. p. 188, ed. Lipsiae, 1838). 'What is said to Peter (according to St. Augustine), is said to all, Feed my sheep.' (Aug de Agone Christ. 30, tom. vi. p. 439. Paris, 1837)." (Collette, *op cit.*, 131).

Christ loved the other apostles and they loved Him

(John 16:27; 15:9) Nothing was here ascribed to Peter from which the others were excluded.

(5) *Peter Never Claimed That He Was Pope*

(1) Peter did not claim to be Pope. First, he referred to himself as an apostle but never as the head of the apostles (1 Pet. 1:1). He did not hide his apostleship, if he had a higher position why did he fail to mention it? Second, did he tell elders that he was the chief elder (1 Pet. 5:1)? Third, whom did he call the "chief shepherd" (1 Pet 5:4)?

(2) No dispute was settled by a reference to Peter's supremacy. No decision was bound on that basis. How could he have been Pope, in a time when disputes existed in the church, without exercising "one act of jurisdiction or authority" over any other apostles? Striking indications that Peter held no such office may be found in the fact that in the instances where a statement of such authority should have been made, if he held such, there was no reference to it (Acts 1:23; 2:1; 10:26; 11:1; 15:1; Gal 1:17; 2:6). The word from Peter, which would have established such an office, is absent. He was prominent but never supreme.

(6) *The Other Apostles Gave No Hint of Peter's Supremacy*

(1) If Peter were Pope they should have indicated it by their actions and teaching. No such reference was made to Peter or such word written about him.

(2) The inspired men were under an obligation to reveal the truth (John 14:26; 16:7-13). Peter never mention-

ed it when he said that all things pertaining to life and godliness had been revealed (II Pet. 4:3). Paul did not teach it although he taught God's whole counsel (Acts 20:27,26). An apostasy was foretold (Acts 20:29, 30; Matt. 7:15; 24:5, 11, 24; I Tim. 4:1; II Tim 3:13; 4:3; II Pet. 2:1, 2). Since the Roman Catholics claim that the Papacy is a safeguard against heresy, why didn't the Bible direct us to it as a safeguard against apostasy? We are appointed a safeguard but it is contained in the apostles doctrine (I Tim. 3:14; 6:3; II Tim. 3:10; 14-17; II Pet. 1:12-15). Surely no Roman Catholic writer would have failed to direct Christians to the Papacy as the safeguard. This indicates that the New Testament writers either knew of no such safeguard or that they manifested criminal neglect for failing to point us to that safeguard.

(7) *Questions*

Did Peter have anything to do with Paul's authority? (Gal. 1:1, 12,16, 17; Acts 22:14; 26:16). Who, besides Paul were the outstanding apostles? (Gal. 2:9). Was Paul inferior to them? (II Cor. 11:5; 12:11-12). When referring to temporary or to permanent officers in the church did Paul ever refer to the Papacy? (I Cor. 12:28; Eph. 4:11). If Peter had written II Cor. 11:28 what would Catholicism use it to prove? If there is any Pope, who would be pope over the Gentiles? (Gal. 2:7-8). Was Peter married? (Lk 4:38; I Cor. 9:5; compare I Tim. 4:1-3). Was Peter first to confess faith in Christ? (John 1:49; 11:27; Lk. 8:28). Did Peter perform the first miracles? (Acts 2:43). Was Peter the only one called to be a fisher of men? (Matt. 4:19; Mk. 1:17). How do Acts 8:14, John 13:16 show that Peter was not supreme? Was any superior authority of Peter appeal-

ed to in Acts 15:7, 13, 19-22-29? Was it Peter's verdict ? (Acts 15:23,25), Would Peter accept the homage of man in a way that the Pope does? (Acts 10:25-26 cp. Rev. 22:8-9). Did Peter tell Christians that there would be a successor to him, the Pope ? Is it not significant that the only intimation of a supreme rule on earth, which is given in the New Testament, is in connection with an apostasy (II Thess. 2:1-12). Peter was an elder, as well as an apostle (1 Pet. 5:1). If someone succeeded him in point of time, as an elder, would that prove that Peter as an apostle had a successor ? John lived until about the close of the first century. He survived Peter. If someone succeeded Peter—as head of the church—would that not have placed John under someone who was not even an apostle ? Did Peter celebrate "Mass," hear "Confessions," use beads, pray to Mary or the "Saints," use "holy water," relics, command abstinence from meat on Friday or during Lent ; teach celibacy, establish nunneries, present his ring to be kissed ?

LESSON SIX

Is Conscience the Authority in Religion ?

What expression indicates that some people think that just so you follow your conscience you are all right ? Can conscience be *a* guide as to one's motives without being *the* guide to right and wrong ?

(1) *Definitions of Conscience*

What do you think of each of the following definitions ? Bear in mind that sometimes it is difficult to define something exactly ; for example, "life," "electricity."

(1) Harvey W. Everest : "Conscience is the judgement pronouncing on questions of right and wrong, together with the feelings consequent on these judgements." (Harvey W. Everest, *Science and Pedagogy of Ethics*. St. Louis Christian Publishing Co., 1899, pp. 29, 30) Everest explains that conscience implies a moral agent who recognizes that there is such a thing as right or wrong and that one ought to do the right and shun the wrong. The feelings connected with conscience may "arise *before* the act is performed, urging to the right and restraining from the wrong ; or they come *after* the act is performed and are aroused by self-approval or self-condemnation ; we call them feelings of complacency, regret or remorse," or satisfaction and approval (pp. 30, 31). Conscience approves when we do that which we believe is right and thus we feel good over it. Conscience disapproves or

rebukes when we do that which we believe is wrong and we feel badly about it.

(2) It has been defined as : "the instinctive, infallible judge of right and wrong." What is wrong with this definition ?

(3) P. W. Stonestreet writes : ...it is difficult to arrive at an adequate definition in concrete form. Like love, perhaps we can come nearer telling what conscience is by observing what it does. *It is an urge to do right.* While its possessor is often misinformed as to what is right, there is certainly nothing wrong with that mere and noble urge, however faulty one's knowledge may be. Hence, let us attack unrelentingly the fundamentals of religious error, but stay off that noble urge to do right. While a good conscience always reflects the degree of knowledge of the teaching of the Scriptures that its possessor has, yet there is an important distinction to be made between conscience and one's knowledge of good and evil, for the former can be revised only by the revision of the latter, but not the other way around." (P. W. Stonestreet, "The Functions of Conscience," *Gospel Pilot*, May 1946, pp. 3,8).

(4) "By conscience is meant that faculty or power of the human soul by which it perceives the difference between right and wrong, approving the one and condemning the other." (*Southern Presbyterian Review*. April, 1853, VI: 454). Man "judges of right and wrong, approving one and condemning the other." The remainder of the author's article shows that he did not mean that man instinctively knows what is right and what is wrong, but

that man knows that there is right and that there is wrong. Conscience implies the realization that there is a difference between right and wrong, and that man ought to do the right and avoid the wrong.

How important is conscience? What would a man be like if he had no conscience? How can you answer the person who says that man really does not have a conscience since people differ as to what is right and what is wrong? Does this prove that there is no conscience, or that conscience can be educated or taught? Is there a difference between man's awareness of, his sensitivity to, the idea of wrong and right, and man's knowledge of what is right and what is wrong?

(5) Conscience is "faculty of duty." (H. Langhorne Orchard). It tells us that we ought to do right, but it cannot tell us what is right unless enlightened by God's word. Paul said: "I verily *thought within myself*, that I *ought* to do many things contrary to the name of Jesus of Nazareth." (Acts 26:9). What were some of these things? (26:10-11). Paul thought that he was doing his duty. He had "thought within" himself that he *ought* to persecute Christians, but his thinking was wrong. It was based on misinformation and traditions of men.

(6) "...conscience is the emotional reaction of the heart to a moral duty the mind has recognized." (E.W.A. Koehler, *Conscience*, p. 13).

(2) *Questions for Discussion*

(1) How do the following Scriptures show that a person is not right just because he follows his conscience? (Acts 23:1 compared with Acts 22:4; Titus 1:15-16; Heb. 9:14; 10:22; 1 Cor. 8:12; 1 Tim. 4:2).

Does Rom. 14:22-23 refer to the faith once for all delivered to the saints, or is faith here used in the sense of conscience? (Compare 14:5)

(3) How can conscience bear witness? (Rom. 2:15;9:1). If it is defiled can it be a good witness?

(4) What is meant by a pure conscience (II Tim.1:3)?

(5) What was the law unable to do? (Heb. 9:9; 10:2)?

(6) What happens when one thrusts aside a good conscience? (I Tim. 1:19-20.) What were they to hold?

(7) Can a conscience be "good" in the sense of sincerity but not in the sense of being right?

(8) How can we keep from searing our consciences?

(9) When a person says that his conscience does not bother him he usually implies that he thinks he is right. But this does not prove that he is correct. It shows that he is either sincere or ignorant in what he has done; or that his conscience is seared concerning that matter. Offer proof for this last statement.

(10) Is a man really conscientious when he follows the prompting of his own conscience without making any real effort to instruct his conscience by the word of God? Is it not our duty to use what means we have to educate our consciences as to what is right and what is wrong? Is one living conscientiously when he fails to take life seriously enough to educate his conscience? Can he, under such circumstances, excuse himself by saying that he thought such and such was right? "That which inculcates a very large portion of mankind in obeying, as they allege, the dictates of conscience, is not that they yield to honest convictions, honestly formed, but that 'loving

darkness rather than light,' they give themselves up to their evil prejudices and practices, without the use of those means of information that might easily rectify their conduct. It is in this way that the great body of papists and of heathen idolaters continue in sin. The one class refuse to employ the light of nature for the correction of idolatry (Rom. 1:18-21) ; and the other class, with equal pertinacity, reject the Scriptures, in order to preserve their traditions. Such persons are guilty, not only for their corrupt practices : but for their perverted consciences. What, then, is their duty ? To obey a misguiding conscience, and continue in idolatry ? Evidently not. Their first and chief obligation is to come to the light, and to test their creed by whatever means God, in his providence, may have afforded them. But such persons, it is alleged, believe that they are already in the light, and that all others are in darkness. We admit this ; but deny still that they are morally bound by either their faith or consciences. In *their own view*, they are so bound ; but such a view is erroneous, and might easily be corrected were they disposed to use the proper and obvious means for such correction..." (I.C. Morgan. *Southern Presbyterian Review*, Vol. 6., Columbia, S.C., April, 1853, p. 470)

"We will close these remarks by a brief consideration of the case of the Apostle Paul. Saul of Tarsus having been educated 'after the most strictest sect' of the Jewish religion and at 'the feet of Gamaliel', was of course a bigotted Pharisee. So far then, as education and position are concerned, he was ill-situated to appreciate the facts and evidences of Christianity. Still, the moral phenomena that had taken place in Jerusalem for several years

previously were very remarkable, and such as should have called forth from him a candid examination. Instead, however, of giving to the subject such attention, he became exceedingly indignant, and continually 'breathed out slaughter and threatening' against the church. The remarkable testimony and triumphant death of Stephen, which he witnessed, made no impression on him whatever. In fact, it seems to have quickened his false zeal, and to have made him but the more active in 'binding and delivering into prison both men and women'. Now, upon this conduct of his, the Apostle afterwards both pronounces a reprobation and enters an apology. He declares that 'he is less than the least of all saints, and not worthy to be called an Apostle, because he persecuted the church of God.' In another place, he designates himself, on the same ground, as 'the chief of sinners, a blasphemer a persecutor and injurious.' Now, it is evident that Paul's conversion had no effect whatever in changing the moral character of the persecutions that took place before that event. It changed his *views* of those persecutions, taking them from a false, and placing them in a true light. But the moral character of these acts were the same, both before and after the Apostle's conversion. His conduct, then, as a persecutor, was in truth criminal, in a very high degree. Was he, then, *bound* to pursue such a course? What bound him? Not truth and righteousness, for these were on the other side of the question. Not the Scriptures, for these predicted the coming of the Messiah. Not any command from God, for he was persecuting and destroying his church. What bound him? Hear his own testimony—'For I verily thought within myself that I ought

to do many things contrary to the name of Jesus of Nazareth.' It is here stated, that his erroneous convictions led him to persecute the church. This is the *best* certainly that can be said of the case; for it is certain from the narrative, that along with such false views of duty there existed great violence of passion and prejudice. The amount of this explanation is, that the Apostle, at the time, *believed* that he ought to persecute the church; *therefore*, it was his duty to do. But this conclusion requires another condition to make the justification complete. *His belief must (should J.D.B.) have resulted from a careful and candid investigation of the whole subject.* But he never instituted such an investigation. He arrived at his conclusions from ideas already existing in his mind, and took no pains to inform himself on the subject of Christianity. Hence his ignorance was criminal, and could be no justification of his conduct. Still, however as such ignorance did exist as to fact, and his persecutions were not in the higher sense *wilful*, he mentions it, not as an apology for his crimes, but as somewhat mitigating their heinousness:—'But I obtained mercy, because I did it ignorantly in unbelief.' His actual, though criminal ignorance, somewhat abated the malignity of his crimes, and 'he obtained mercy.' Will any one say then, with these facts before him, that Saul of Tarsus was morally bound to persecute the church? That he believed himself bound, he asserts. But was it so? Were not his views entirely erroneous? And can *error* bind? We believe firmly, that man has a conscience, and that there are innumerable cases in which he is morally bound to obey that conscience; but we cannot persuade ourselves that the

same obligation exists where the conscience prompts to act of immorality and sin. An enlightened and sound conscience never does this ; and it is only to *such a conscience* that we consider a man morally bound to submit. When a man is perfectly sure—(and this is not always easy to be ascertained,)—but when a man is perfectly sure, that he has used all possible methods with absolute candour, to ascertain his duty, then his convictions are legitimate, and although his intellect may be in error, his conscience is sound, and its promptings are to be regarded. But there is an infinite difference between this case, and that of one who suffers his conscience to be perverted through inattention, false education, prejudice or passion.” (I. C. Morgan *Southern Presbyterian Review*, Vol. 6. Columbia, S.D., April, 1853, pp. 470, 471, 472).

(9) “The importance of Conscience we recognize continually in affairs of daily life. If we meet any one who appears to be conscienceless, we generally give him more or less a wide berth. Quite rightly, for such a person is unreliable.” (H. Langhorne Orchard). Why is he apt to be unreliable? Can you think of some example which shows how hardened such individuals become?

(10) Can you think of any illustrations where, for conscience sake, men in the Bible bore persecution? Can you think of any cases outside the Bible ?

(11) What is meant by : If you refuse to listen to the voice of your conscience, it will gradually cease to speak to particular matter or action which is under consideration?

(12) What is the significance of the fact that no

where has a race of people ever been found without conscience ?

(13) What does this mean: "being convicted by their own conscience ?" (John 8:9)

(14) Is Acts 24:16 simply another way of saying that Paul always tried to do right : that he tried to do what he thought was his duty? When this is a person's goal will he continue to study, and be open to truth, so that he will learn what is his duty ? Is a person really conscientious who refuses to try to learn the right ?

(15) Is the following right : "But conscience never changes ; it never approves what for the time being we know to be wrong, nor does it ever warn us against doing what we know to be right (perhaps the better word would be *think* to be right, J.D.B.)—Knowledge is forgotten and convictions are lost, but no man ever loses his conscience. Its urgings and warnings may be weak at times, may even cease in certain instances, yet conscience itself is never lost." (E. W. A. Koehler, *Conscience* St. Louis, Mo : Concordia Publishing House, p. 6).

(16) How is baptism connected with a good conscience ? (1 Pet. 3 : 20-21). This passage shows that baptism is not for the purpose of cleansing the body of dirt or filth but that it has a spiritual meaning. It is true that when one is immersed that the physical body is covered with water, but in the act the individual is not trying to cleanse the body. How does the act of baptism, when it is done from the heart, appeal to God through Christ's resurrection ? (Rom. 6:2-5). If a person refuses

to be baptized does it show that his conscience is not good ? Can it be said that he has not been taught rightly, or that if he has been taught correctly that he has not received the teaching in the right spirit ? The person whose conscience is rightly taught and who wants to do God's will, will respond to Him by being baptized into Christ.

Feeling as the Authority

‘I don’t care what Paul said, I know what I feel in my heart.’ “You know it when it gets you, brother.” Individuals who speak thus think that they are right because they *feel* that they are right. Do they always understand that they are setting the Bible aside? How do they know that they have the right feeling? What proof do they have that their feeling is in line with God’s will? What sort of feeling must one have in order to be sure that he is right? Unless God has said that when one feels so and so that he is saved, can we be safe in depending on our feelings? How are feelings related to one’s sincerity? to one’s conscience?

(1) *Faith and Feelings*

What is faith? Is feeling an emotional accompaniment of faith? Does one feel because he believes, or believe because he feels? Will a lie, *when believed*, have the same emotional affect on one that it would have if it were true? Jacob misinterpreted the testimony of the blood stained coat, and the statement of his boys, but did his misinterpretation mean that Joseph was dead? (Gen. 37:31-36). Was Jacob’s expectation, of verse 35, fulfilled? Did his feelings turn falsehood into truth?

Did the eunuch feel good because he was saved, or was he saved because he felt good? (Acts 8:39) What has God promised the baptized believer? (Acts 2:38; Mk. 16:16; Gal. 3:27). Was the eunuch a baptized believer? (Acts 8:37-39). Why should this make him feel good?

Do emotions have any place in Christianity ? Are they the guide or do they help furnish us with the impulse, the drive, the stimulation, the push, involved in carrying out the commandments of the guide ? It is possible for one to react so much against extreme emotionalism, that he fails to let emotions have their proper place in the Christian's life ? Does a cold, unemotional life have much attraction ? Is a life under the control of emotions attractive ?

(2) *Emotionalism*

To study the Bible and walk by it is too mundane, too prosaic, too common place, for some people. It may also be too much trouble for them. Thus they may tell the Lord that they are ignorant, and that they want Him to guide them. He has given them a mind with which to think, and the word of God to guide them, but they do not use these means of guidance. Instead, they want something mysterious. They get some feeling and they interpret that as God's means of guiding them. They trust in their own impulses instead of in God and His word. When they seek such direct, mysterious, means of guidance they believe that they will get help and guidance from God in a way *which He has not promised*. This is not Scriptural faith. Scriptural faith is the full assurance *that what God has promised* (not everything which we have promised ourselves, or someone else has promised us), He is able to perform (Rom. 4:20-21). What are some things which people promise which God has not ?

Mrs. H.W. Smith had a great deal of experience with individuals who were seeking direct, mysterious ways of guidance. She wrote : "I have come to the conclusion that the whole explanation of it lies in the fact that the

emotional nature is allowed absolute control. The subject of the emotional nature is one of the mysteries that has never yet been fully solved ; but one thing is certain : it is the most uncontrollable part of our nature, and the least to be depended upon. Everything affects our emotional nature : the state of one's health, the state of the weather, the sort of food we eat, the atmosphere we live in, the circumstances of our lives, whether pleasant or otherwise, and especially, and more than anything else, the influence of other people upon us. Emotions are more contagious than the most contagious disease in the universe." (Ray Strachey, *Religious Fanaticism*, p. 155). Can you think of any examples ? What can we learn from this that will help us to be better teachers?

Can you show how the contagion of emotions works in some of the religious meetings of the emotionalist, where fast music is played, people shout, etc. ? If the preacher says that the Holy Ghost is working on these individuals, and if a person does not know much about the Bible or about his emotional nature, is he apt to get some kind of feeling and think that it is the Spirit working on him ? Did you ever notice how contagious emotions are at a ball game ? Some people, when they see something white at night near a cemetery may reason in this manner : What is it ? I don't know. Therefore, it must be a ghost ! Just so, in some religious meetings where emotionalism is very much present, some persons are affected as they have never been before. The preacher says that the people around them, who are acting as they are beginning to feel like acting, have the Holy Spirit. So they reason : "I never felt this way before in a

religious service. It must be the Holy Spirit working on me."

As Mrs. Smith wrote : "When people are in specially religious frames of mind, their emotional nature is always specially open to impressions, and it is certainly the most natural thing in the world for them to believe that the interior impressions which come in these solemn and sacred moments must necessarily be of the Lord. I cannot tell how many fanatics, when I have tried to convince them of their errors, have said to me : 'But, Mrs. Smith, what *am* I to do ? These inward voices come to me in my most solemn and sacred moments, when I feel myself to be nearest the Lord and most abandoned to Him, and how can I believe that at such moments He would allow the delusions of the devil to deceive me?" (p. 157). God has given them sufficient protection, His word, if they will but study and follow it. He has warned against following anything but His revealed will as our guide. But if we abandon it, or subordinate it to our feelings, we should expect to be deceived by the devil. If we do not use the means which God has given us to guard against deception (II Tim. 3:13-17), we should not expect Him to keep us from being deceived.

Emotionalists fail to understand their own emotional nature. "Embryo fanatics know nothing of this, and believe that they are most faithful and obedient when they follow every impression that they receive. Naturally the impressions, being encouraged in this way, grow in power, and as the emotional nature is thus aroused more and more, it is a very simple matter for that part of our nature which is most emotional to be in course of time aroused

also. It generally begins with physical thrills, which are in themselves a perfectly natural manifestation of the emotional nature, and which only become dangerous when they are looked upon, yielded to and encouraged as being of divine origin. All human beings know about these thrills. We are very apt to feel them at the sight of some deed of heroism, or the hearing of the story of it, or the sight of some beautiful picture, or the hearing of an eloquent speech, or the reception of some stirring piece of news ; in short, on the occasion of any circumstances, whether religious or otherwise, which is calculated to arouse the emotional nature”.

“The whole mistake lies in attributing these physical sensations to a divine origin ; they are no more divine in the religious life than they are when seeing a fine picture, or hearing fine music. I have heard many people say with regard to Wagner’s music that it went through them with thrills of delight, and yet no body attributes these thrills to God. They are not a divine touch in the case of music, and they are not a divine touch in the case of religion ; they are simply the physical responses to the spiritual frame of mind, whatever may cause it. But one can see that it would be very natural for Christians who have had this physical response in their own bodies to some wonderful spiritual truth, think too that these physical thrills are the divine touch and the token of the divine presence, and that therefore they ought to be sought after and cultivated with all possible earnestness, especially as they may never have felt them at any other time. Moreover, as they really are very delightful, it is a temptation to cultivate such delightful feelings and to give oneself up to them”.

“Sooner or later Christians, who give themselves up to follow impressions, become the slaves of their emotional natures, and end in giving to their carnal passions the place of authority they meant to give to God. I have watched my own experience in these respects very carefully, and compared them with those of a very intimate friend of mine whose nature was far more emotional than my own. We were seekers together after the deep things of God, and whenever I made what I thought was a discovery of a new truth I always at once confided it to her. And I found that, while in my own case the discovery had been only a keen intellectual delight, in her case it nearly always caused an awakening of her emotions, accompanied very frequently with wave after wave of delicious physical thrills. She always called these thrills the ‘witness of the Spirit’ to the truth we had discovered, and until I had a clear understanding of the subject, I often felt great disappointment that I seemed debarred from receiving this longed for ‘witness.’” (Mrs. Smith).

Does Rom. 8:16 say that the Spirit bears witness through our feeling that we are children of God? Does it say that it is done in some miraculous way to each individual? Paul teaches that man could not know the mind of God unless God revealed His will by means of His Spirit (1 Cor. 2:9-11). The inspired men of the first century taught the word of God which the Spirit revealed to them (2:12-13). All that we know today about what God requires of anyone in order to become a child of God, and what is necessary to being faithful to God, is found in the Bible. It is the only word of the Spirit which

we have today. Is it possible for the Spirit to bear witness through His written word? (Heb. 10 : 15-17 quotes from something which Jeremiah, directed by the Spirit, had written in Jer. 31 : 31. Read how Paul used it). The Spirit through His word has shown what is necessary to sonship and our spirit knows whether we have done these necessary things. It is in this manner that the Spirit bears witness with our spirit. Those who claim some other witness of the Spirit to their sonship sooner or later contradict what the Spirit teaches in the Bible. We know that they do not have the witness of the Spirit for if they did the Spirit would not contradict His will as revealed in the Bible.

How do the statements from Mrs. Smith show why it is that in "Holiness" meetings the *emotional* people "pray through" and "get the Holy Spirit" quite easily, but those who are not emotional may try for days and even years and not "get the Spirit?"

Is worship itself an emotional experience? If it is, can you worship without having an emotional experience? Does a feeling of awe that might come over one in a pagan temple prove that one is worshipping? There may be an emotional reaction, such as thrilling to the songs of Zion, in a worship service, but the emotional reaction is not worship itself. How do we know that it is not? Has God told us that we must have a physical thrill in worship, or has He told us what we are to do in worship?

(3) *To Depend on Emotions Is to Depend on Oneself.*

If God has revealed that man can depend upon his

feelings when he has such and such feelings, we would be relying on God when we took those feelings as evidence of pardon. But God has not revealed such. Thus to rely on our feelings is to rely on ourselves, or on the word of some other human being. Did the prophets of Baal feel deeply concerning their religion? (1 Kings 18 : 26, 28, 29). How does Jeremiah warn us? (17 : 5, 9, 10). What remedy does he give us? (17 : 7.) Is the way of man in himself? (Jer. 10:23). Do we know God's way by our feelings? (Isa. 55:8-9). How has He revealed His will to us? (1 Cor. 2:8-13; Rom. 10:17; Heb. 2:2-4). As Luther is said to have written :

Feelings come,
 And feelings go.
 And feelings are deceiving.
 My warrant is the word of God,
 Nought else is worth believing.

(4) *Questions for Discussion.*

Why do some of these "guided" emotionalists think that certain things, which have been considered sinful, are not sinful for them? Some of them have been prompted to do something absurd or something which they have long considered sinful. They have done it, however, because they said that they wanted to give the Lord the benefit of the doubt. They doubted that they should obey the impulse or impression, but since they regarded that impulse as the voice of God they did it in spirit of the doubt. How does this go contrary to Rom. 10:1-5? What should we do when in doubt as to whether a thing is right for us

to do ? Do we have the right to insist that if we are in doubt about a matter that everyone else must be in doubt, or must not do it ? What statement about service to God in Mk. 12:28-30 do people often overlook ? What must we do in order to know right and wrong ? (I Thess. 5:21; Heb. 5:11-14). Why was Israel rejected ? (Hosea 4:1,6, 12-13). Did she seek guidance other than through God's word ? Does faith come by feeling ? (Rom. 10:17). Does freedom come by feelings ? (John 8:31-32). Does John 8:31-32 show that more than knowledge is necessary ?

Why is it difficult to reason with these emotionalists ? How do some Christians sometimes go by their feelings instead of by convictions based on God's word ? Is this a common source of trouble in congregations ? If a person wants more than God's word, in such places as Mk. 16:15-16 ; Acts 2:38; 22:16, etc., as proof that he is forgiven when he obeys the gospel, is this a sign of faith or of a lack of faith ? It is not really saying : "I want more than God's word for it. I want Him to send some other witness that I am saved." Does faith accept God's word as sufficient, or does it ask for something in addition to God's word ?

How do the following cases show that feelings are not a safe guide ? (Acts 5:17 ; 5:33 ; 7 : 54, 57; 19:28,32,34).

LESSON EIGHT

Christian Science

Who founded the Church of Christ, Scientist? In what country? What century? Does the examination of someone's teaching imply that they are insincere? Is it enough for a person to be zealous? (Rom. 10:1-4). Can one commend their willingness to support with money what they believe, without commending what they believe?

Whenever a religious teacher places a message before the public it is an invitation to examine its credentials and doctrines. Christians must be careful to determine whether or not the doctrine which is taught them is the doctrine of Christ. Mrs. Mary Baker Eddy has a message before the public today. Is Christian Science God's message? If it is, all should accept it. If it is not, all including Christian Scientists, should reject it. In evaluating Christian Science, we are prompted by truth and love. We have no personal antagonism toward Christian Scientists. We do not doubt their sincerity. We commend their zeal.

(1) *The Real Key to Christian Science*

Richard L. Swain wrote in *The Real Key to Christian Science*, that one can readily understand Christian Science when he sees the meaning which they attach to three terms: (a) Principle; (b) Mortal mind; and (c) the meaning and method of Demonstration." By *Principle* is meant that nothing exists "but mind and all mind is one,

and that one mind is God." God is Good and He is All. There is nothing else. He and his ideas, which "are neither persons nor things," are all that exist. By *mortal mind* is meant "error, illusion, nothingness" Anything besides God which *seems* to exist is simply a false belief of mortal mind. It is all an illusion since mortal mind is blind belief, which is nothing. Demonstration is proving that "God is the only reality by losing the sense of everything which is not God. The Method whereby I demonstrate, is simply to affirm that God is All, and that sickness is nothing. By constantly keeping the thought in mind that God is All, the false sense should go ; and when it is gone I have demonstrated." (*The Key to Christian Science* pp. 32-37).

Christian Science may be summed up as follows : (a) God is all that is and all that is is God. (b) God is good (c) Therefore all is good for all is God and God is good. (d) Therefore, there is no sin, sickness nor death for God is all, and all is God, and God is Good; therefore all is good and thus there is no sin, sickness, and death. (e) But there seems to be sin, sickness and death. It is only *Seeming* ; an illusion of mortal mind. (f) What then is mortal mind ? It is nothing claiming to be something. (g) By demonstrating that God is all, one does away with mortal mind and its errors.

But of course, if Christian Science is right "it would be as ridiculous for God to have such a terrible spell of mortal mind as it would for him to be sick."

(2) *A Brief Refutation of Christian Science*

The following considerations when fairly faced destroy

Christian Science. If God is everything that is, then there is nothing but God. If there is nothing but God there is no room for illusions. How could there be a mortal mind which could have illusions of sin, sickness, and death, if all that is is God ? If there are any illusions then God himself must be having these illusions ; for everything that is is God, and thus nothing could take place outside of God.

In such a universe as Christian Science pictures, how could nothing (mortal mind) claim to be something ? What room would there be for nothing to make such a claim if God is all that is ? Whence does it come, whom does it deceive, and how does mortal mind generate illusions ? Would it not be an evil that there could be such illusions ? Would it not be an evil that nothing could claim to be something ? If there is no such disease as cancer, would it not still be an evil that someone can have the illusion that he does have cancer ? But if all that is is God, there is no one but God to have such an illusion of cancer.

Either God is having illusions or there is someone besides God. If God is all that is, what need is there for God to demonstrate to Himself that He is all that is, and that sin, sickness and death are illusions of mortal mind ? If God is all that is He knows it and there is no one to deny that He is all that is. On the other hand, if there is need to demonstrate that sin, sickness and death are not real, to whom is this demonstrated ? It would not need to be demonstrated to God, for if there is no sin, sickness, and death, God already knows it. So if there is a need to demonstrate that there is no sin, sickness, and death, it

must be that someone besides God exists. And Christian Science is built on the idea that it is needed in order to demonstrate that there is no sin or death.

If there is no sin, sickness, and death ; if these are simply illusions ; they are still bad illusions. The very fact that there could be such illusions would be an evil. Thus there is evil. Thus God is not all there is. There is someone else and that some one else is subject to these illusions.

Thus when Cristian Science even admits that there are illusions it makes an admission that destroys Christian Science.

A Christian Scientist said that in affirming the existence of sin, sickness, and death that I become their ally and encourage sin, sickness, and death. Answer this charge. Answer the "argument" that a dream is nothing, and that the dreamer and the dream are nothing ; thus all we need to do is to "wake up" and realize that nothing is wrong.

(3) *Christian Science Is Bad Philosophy*

It is true that one ought to keep his thinking pure. It is true that Christians ought to cast all their burdens upon the Lord and face the world with a clear mind and courageous heart. But it is also true that if one has a broken bone or a contagious disease it will not do him much good to think that there is nothing wrong with him. Philosophy has been defined as the love of wisdom, and such conduct is not dictated by wisdom.

Christian Science also denies the existence of any philosopher, except God. It declares that everything is God and thus it leaves no room for individual human beings. It leaves no room for thinking human beings for it teaches that there is but One Mind and its Ideas, and ideas neither think nor preceive for themselves. It declares that man is only a "compound idea" and that it is a falsehood which says that life or mind is manifested through brain and nerves. (*Science and Health*, Sunday School Edition, p. 502, line 28). Hereafter we shall refer to the page and line together, as in the following references which bear on the topic under discussion. (503 : 16 ; 470 : 21; 469 : 13; 468 : 23 ; 290 : 10; 281 : 18; 113 : 15). No system of rational philosophy can get rid of the individual for it takes the individual to conceive and to teach the philosophy.

(4) *Christian Science Is Unscientific*

Scientists work with matter and with human beings. Mrs. Eddy denied the existence of both matter and human beings. "According to Christian Science, the only real senses of man are spiritual, emanating from divine Mind. Thought passes from God to man, but neither sensation nor report goes from material body to mind. The inter-communication is always from God to his idea, man." (*Science and Health*, 284 : 28). "The belief that a material body is man is a false conception of man. The time has come for a finite conception of the infinite and of a material body as the seat of Mind to give place to a diviner sense of intelligence and its manifestations..."

(285 : 16). Of course, we realize that man is composed of body, soul, and spirit (I Thess. 5 : 23), and that the body is dead without the soul and spirit. (Jas. 2 : 26). But what Mrs. Eddy failed to realize is that man does have material body. No real scientists have ever thought of denying it.

She regarded matter as an illusion and as another name for mortal mind. Mortal mind is defined as nothing claiming to be something. (*Science and Health*, 591) "Hence the logical sequence, that there is in reality neither matter nor mortal mind, but that the self-testimony of the physical sense is false." (Mrs. Eddy, *Unity of Good*, 42, 46). Without the testimony of the physical senses science is impossible, therefore any system that teaches as does Christian Science cannot be scientific. If matter and mortal mind are nothing *Christian Science further shows* its unscientific character by going to so much trouble about nothing.

No scientists would deny that there is such a thing as poison. Mrs. Eddy taught that "It is a mortal belief, not divine Principle or Love, which causes a drug to be apparently either poisonous or sanative." (12 : 18) What about the person who drinks poison when he thinks it is medicine ?

(5) *Christian Science Is Unscriptural and Thus Unchristian*

(1) *Creation of man.* Mrs. Eddy claimed that man and woman have been "co-existent and eternal with God." (*Science and Health*, 516:21 ; 278:16; 279:6; 295:28 ; 470:327; 41:15; 335:8; 503). "I believe," she wrote, "in the

individual man, for I understand that man is as definite and eternal as God, and that man is co-existent with God, as being the eternally divine idea" (*Unity of Good*, 61,59). Genesis teaches that God created man, and thus there was a time when man did not exist. (*Genesis* 1:1, 26, 27).

(2) *Sin, evil, sickness or death.* "The soul that sinneth, it shall die." (*Ezekiel* 18:4. See also *I Cor.* 15:21-22; *Heb.* 9:16, 27; *John* 5:29; 5:2-5; 5:28; *Rom.* 14:9; *John* 19:20; *Rev.* 1:18; *Matt.* 27:50). It tells us to "abhor that which is evil." (*Rom.* 12:9). But it does not tell us to deny that there is evil in the world. Mrs. Eddy taught that the soul could not sin. (*Science of Health*, 468:5; 479:28). Jesus said "Plainly, Lazarus is dead." (*John* 11:14). Mrs. Eddy taught that 'Lazarus had never died.' (*Science and Health*, 75:13; 294:12).

(3) *Atonement through the blood of Christ.* One of the fundamental tests of any religious system is found in the answer to the question : what does it teach concerning Christ ? What does Christian Science teach about Christ the Redeemer and Savior ? Since it denies the fact of sin and death it must also deny the fact of the atonement as taught in the Bible. If man is not lost, there is no need for redemption. Mrs. Eddy denied that man had fallen (*Miscellaneous Writings*, 79:61). She said that there was no proof of human discord such as sickness, disease, death, or sin. (*Ibid* 65). Paul said that Christ came to save sinners. (*I Tim.* 1:15; *II Cor.* 5:20; *Mk.* 16:15-16; *John* 3:16; 3:36; *Heb.* 9:22; *Isa.* 53; *John* 1:29; *I Pet.* 2:24; *Lk* 24:46; *John* 19:20; *Rev.* 1:18; *Rom.* 3:23; 5:8-11

These passages show that He suffered and died for sinners).

Jesus said that His blood was poured out for the remission of sins. (Matt. 26: 26—). The Lord's Supper proclaims the death of Christ for our sins. (I Cor 11:26; Matt. 26: 26—). What does Mrs. Eddy say? "To mortal thought Christ *seemed* to come as a child, to grow to manhood, to suffer before Pilate and on Calvary because he could reach and teach mankind only through this conformity to mortal conditions; but Soul never saw the Saviour come and go, because He was always present." (*Unity of Good*, p 74'. She wrote that Christ came to redeem us from the illusion that we were sinners in need of a Saviour. (Ibid., 74-75. See also *Science and Health* 472: 27; 491; 470 : 21; 481 : 7-12. 21). To the flesh Jesus seemed to die, but in fact He did not. (*Unity of Good*, p, 78; *Health and Science*, 45:11; 38:23; 46:3; 46:20). Could anything be more cruel? Christ our actual Saviour who suffered agony and poured out His blood and actually died on the cross, this same Christ is said to have just seemed to suffer and die. This is sheer mockery of His sacrifice and death on the cross.

(4) *The judgment*. (Heb. 9 : 27 ; Matt. 25 : 31—). Mrs. Eddy denied that a soul can be lost, (*Science and Health*. 311 : 12; compare Matt. 16:26), and thus she denied that a final judgment awaits mortals. (291:21).

(5) *Christian Science turns the Comforter into a system*. The Bible refers to the Comforter, or Holy Spirit, as a Person. (John 14:16, 26; 16: 13, 14) Mrs. Eddy taught that what came on the first Pentecost after Christ's resur-

rection was the "influx of divine Science" (*Science and Health*, 43 : 7) and that "Divine Science," or Christian Science, is the Comforter. (*Ibid* 55: 28).

(6) *Christian Science's teaching on marriage.* Mrs. Eddy wrote that marriage "is often convenient, sometimes pleasant, and occasionally a love affair." (*Miscellaneous Writings*, 52). She was married three times. We do not see how either type of the above mentioned marriages could take place if celibacy, which she advocated *in words*, was established. "Is marriage nearer right than celibacy? Human knowledge inculcates that it is, while science indicates that it is not." (*Ibid.*, 288). A good deal of Mrs. Eddy's life was run by human knowledge, if the above quotation is correct.

"Until time matures human growth, marriage and progeny will continue unprohibited in Christian Science. We look to future generations for ability to comply with absolute Science, when marriage shall be found to be man's oneness with God,—the unity of eternal love." "To abolish marriage at this period, and maintain morality and generation, would put ingenuity to ludicrous shifts; yet this is possible in Science, although it is to-day problematic." (*Ibid*, 216). Doubtless! Furthermore, she wrote that marriage will continue "until it is learned that God is the Father of all....." (*Science and Health*, 64:26; 56:7—). But why should marriage be necessary to progeny, when she maintains that children are "the spiritual thoughts and representatives of Life, Truth, and Love?" (*Ibid.*, 582:28).

(7) *Christian Science abolishes the New Testament*

teaching on the Lord's Supper. Why don't they want to observe it? The disciples of the Lord observed the Lord's Supper on the first day of every week. (Matt. 26:26—; Acts 20:7; I Cor. 11:20; Heb. 10:25; I Cor. 16:1-2). Jesus had asked them to do it in memory of Him, and so they did it because they believed in Jesus and His death for them, as well as in His resurrection from the tomb. But “The Mother Church of Christ, Scientist, shall observe no more communion seasons.” (*Church Manual*, 1910 Edition, 61). They say that their communion, or Eucharist, is a spiritual one with God. (*Science and Health*, 35:24; 34:6). We do not deny the spiritual aspects of the Lord's supper but we also heed the Lord's example and admonition when we use the bread and the fruit of the vine as a memorial of Christ's death for us. Of the Supper which He ordained she said that “this supper closed for ever Jesus' ritualism or concessions to matter.” (*Ibid.*, 32:32—).

(8) *Christian Science discards the New Testament teaching on baptism.* The baptism of the Great Commission was preceded by faith and repentance. (Mk. 16:16; Acts 2:38). It was required of all (Matt. 28:19) and involved a burial with Christ and a resurrection to newness of life. (Acts 8:37—; Rom. 6:2—; Col. 2:12). Water was the element in which the believer was baptized. (Acts 8:36—; 10:47). Mrs. Eddy discarded water baptism and taught that their baptism was “purification by Spirit; submergence in Spirit.” (*Science and Health*, 581:23). “Our baptism is a purification from all error.” (*Ibid.*, 35:19). It is right to be purified, by obedience to the truth, (John 12:48; Acts 17:30-32; 1 Pet. 1:22) but it is wrong to

eliminate what *Christ* taught on baptism. Who will judge us? Christ or Mrs. Eddy? Christ will judge us therefore we should obey His word and not that of Mrs. Eddy which contradicts His word.

(9) *Mrs. Eddy labeled a portion of the Bible a lie.* In commenting on Genesis 2:7 she said: "Is this addition to His creation real or unreal? Is it the truth, or is it a lie concerning man and God? It must be a lie, for God presently curses the ground." (*Science and Health*, 524:24—). She, who called this a lie, knew not the truth. God did curse the ground later, but only after man had fallen and as a punishment to man. (Genesis 3:17-18).

On Genesis 2:21-22, she wrote: "Hence falsity, error, credits Truth, God, with inducing a sleep or hypnotic state in Adam in order to perform a surgical operation on him and thereby create woman. This is the first record to magnetism." (*Science and Health*, 528:15). We wonder why Mrs. Eddy did not stop to wonder how, on her theory of the universe, that there could be magnetism; or anyone to be effected by it; or anyone to record it; or anyone to label the record as error. For did she not claim that all that existed is God and His ideas? And yet here she says there is a record of magnetism.

These last two quotations are in line with the other statements of Mrs. Eddy which reveal that she did not accept the Bible. She does not believe the *first verse* of the Bible for it says that God created the heavens and the earth. If that verse is right something besides God exists (the heavens and the earth) and her system is false for more than God and His ideas exist; His creation exists

also. She does not believe the *last verse* in the Bible for it says "the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ be with you all". She does not believe that sin exists; or that sinners need to be redeemed for if there is no sin there are no sinners; and thus she does not believe in the Bible doctrine of grace which teaches that man in sin needs God's grace and mercy to be redeemed. And yet the system which rejects every distinctive Bible doctrine calls itself *Christian Science*.

(10) *Assignments and Questions.* Look into an encyclopedia and get a few facts about Mrs. Eddy's life and the Church of Christ, Scientist.

If you can get Mrs. Eddy's book, *Science and Health* bring it to class and read a passage or so to the class. Of course, there is some truth in the book.

Is Christian Science the philosophy of mind over matter or that mind is superior to matter?

Is Christian Science simply the Bible plus the idea that the church can work miracles of healing today?

Do Christian Scientists demonstrate that food and money do not exist?

In view of the violent antagonism of Christian Science doctrines to the Bible and to common sense, can you think of some reasons why some people become Christian Scientists?

Is there any reason—from the viewpoint of Christian Science—that they should think that we are wrong in opposing Christian Science?

LESSON NINE

Christian Science and Its Cures

In this lesson we shall examine the claim of Christian Scientists that their healings prove that Christian Science is true and that *Science and Health with Key to the Scriptures*, is of God. In showing that such is not the case with reference to Christian Science, it will also be shown that no "healing" group can claim today to be the Lord's church just because it has some cures. Of course, the other "healing" groups do not accept the peculiar ideas of the Christian Scientists, but no group does what the inspired men in the New Testament did. And no group outdoes any other group in their working of "wonders". So their "wonders" cannot prove one of them to be of God any more than it can prove that all of them are of God. Name some of the groups which claim to perform wonders.

(1) *Christian Science Denies the Fact of Disease*

Disease is mentioned in the Bible. (Matt. 11:5; Lk. 8:2, 4—). Facts testify to its presence. Christian Science labels "supposed suffering" (*Science and Health*, 421:18—) and says that "there is no disease" (421:18). Mrs. Eddy wrote that when the Science of life was understood, and certainly she claimed to understand it, that a human limb which had been lost would be replaced as readily as the lobster's claw. It would be replaced with a genuine limb and not with an artificial one. (499-2). With many limbless people in hospitals today Christian Science should go into the hospitals and show these poor crippled people

how to re-grow lost limbs. But not a Christian Scientist will try it though their text book, *Science and Health*, is supposed to set forth the Science of life.

We cannot agree with any principle which is *distinctive* to Christian Science. However, we do commend the zeal and cheerfulness of many Christian Scientists. They are willing to put forth money and effort to influence people to their way of thinking. Their zeal and efforts are worthy of a better cause.

The real purpose of this lesson, however, is not to commend but to examine. The examination will show that Christian Science is not the teaching of the Bible plus the idea that Christ still heals. Does it teach one distinctive teaching of Christ, or does it deny every fundamental principle which Jesus taught? Our previous lesson answered this question. Although Christian Science teaches that God is, they do not teach the same God who is set forth in the Bible.

(2) *The "Cures"*

(1) The records of some of their cures read like some patent medicine "testimonies".

(2) It is a fact that many cases of illness are healed by nature if given time. This is admitted by one Christian Science lecturer. He said that "Seventy-five or eighty per cent of the different ailments, if left alone, would disappear if nothing were done. The ability of any curative system to cope with incorrigible sickness attests its real value, and the healing of hundreds of thousands of cases of hopeless diseases constitute the proof of Christian

Science Mind-healing". (Edward A. Kimball, *Answers to Questions Concerning Christian Science*, p 27). From this statement it is evident that in seventy-five per cent of the cases the Christian Scientist has nothing to fear, in the way of failure, for they will get well anyhow. And these cases can furnish them with a lot of "testimonies" which they can publish to show how valuable Christian Science is in healing folks. However, we deny that Christian Science has been any more successful with the remaining twenty-five per cent than has any other type of healing cult or so-called "divine healers." Furthermore, it has, as we shall point out, many black cases of horrible failure.

(3) As doctors well know, most people are unable to diagnose correctly their own illness. And thus it is that some people think that they have been cured from some terrible illness when there was not very much wrong with them.

(4) It is strange that Christian Science teaches that there is no sickness and then claims to heal people of sickness.

(5) The testimony concerning illness, that an individual gives, is based on his physical senses and his mind and consciousness. Mrs. Eddy says that the five physical senses cannot be relied on. She calls the physical senses false testimony, and maintains that they cannot bear reliable testimony on the subject of health. Science denies all disease. (*Science and Health*, 117:24; 120:7-14, 16; 120:23, 20; 123:16): If this be the case there can be no cures. Furthermore, since the people are dependent on their "material senses" in trying to determine by

what ailment they are afflicted; and if these senses give false testimony; how can the Christian Scientist know that he did have a certain disease and how can he be sure, if he did have a disease, that he has been cured?

(6) Christian Science is contradictory for it claims to have healed people of ailments which she claims that they never did and that they never could have. They claim that the blood, heart, lungs, brain, etc., have nothing to do with Life, God. Every function of the real man is governed by the divine Mind." (*Ibid*, 151:18). If this is true, how could they have ailments of the blood, heart, lungs or brain? And thus how could they be cured of such ailments?

(7) Christian Scientists are afraid of their own logic for under certain conditions they recommend calling a surgeon who can give a hypodermic injection. (*Ibid*, 464; 13). What about the little children who cannot call a doctor and whose mothers Mrs. Eddy told to tell the children that they were not hurt? When a child thinks he is hurt just tell him, "Oh, never mind! You're not hurt, so don't think you are." (*Science and Health*. 154:32). We are grateful that our mother was not a Christian Scientist. How little compassion they have, if they really follow their own doctrine! We are glad that some of them are much better than their doctrine. Some of them have compassion not because of but in spite-of their doctrine.

(8) Christian Science is against doctors, in spite of the fact that they resort to them as indicated in the above. They regard books on anatomy, health, and physiology as "promoters of sickness and disease," (*Ibid*, 179:21).

(9) Christian Science is against hygiene. "The less we know or think about hygiene, the less we are predisposed to sickness." (*Ibid*, 389:5).

(10) Christian Science does not publish its failures. And yet, she has many failures as doctors know and as many of my own personal friends know who have had friends who died because they refused medical treatment and trusted in Christian Science.

Christian Science is ridiculous when it says that "man is the same after as before a bone is broken or the body guillotined;" (*Ibid*, 161:17), but it is more than ridiculous, it is absurd, unscriptural and dangerous. And to show you how dangerous one doctor thinks it is we shall quote from Dr. Humiston in *The Faith, The Falsity and The Failures of Christian Science*. Dr. Humiston, a professor of Surgery, collected cases, through medical channels, of the failures of Christian Science. He wrote :

"Christian Science, in the field of treatment of human ailments, is a menace to society. The untreated surgical condition, the unrecognized or concealed communicable disease, the resistance to measures of sanitation, the total disregard of disease prevention are as much to be regarded as enemies to human health and life as are scourge and pestilence, and as much to be opposed by their profession which is consecrated to the health and happiness of mankind...in the field of medicine, Christian Science is a rank imposter. Does the normal individual recoil from the heart-rending picture of a little child in the final stage of untreated diphtheria progressively and surely choking to

death, every breath a struggle, bulging eyes staring from out of a livid countenance, arms out-stretched in helpless appeal to mother, to father, and these natural protectors, of their own offspring with vacuous stare and unsympathetic mind merely mumbling the senseless jargon of *Science and Health*? Diphtheria can certainly be prevented. It can, almost certainly, be cured. Is it not manslaughter to withhold certain cure? Whoever is opposed to manslaughter is stupidly inconsistent if he be not likewise opposed to the Christian Science treatment of diphtheria." (Humiston, *op. cit.*, pp. 303-304).

"When Christian Science says: "The blood, heart, lungs, brain, have nothing to do with life, it, at once, comes into conflict with medical science. If the statement were made that the brain had nothing to do with Christian Science, here might be less ground for controversy. Viewed medically Christian Science is a mental disorder with a high mortality. It is the confederate of contagion and the ally of disease, the antithesis of reason and common sense in everything pertaining to the health and well-being of the human body." (*Ibid.* p. 304).

"The harm of Christian Science lies in its profoundly obtuse inability to discriminate between real and imaginary disease. (*Ibid.*, p. 305).

"The trail of this modern sorcery is marked by the slaughter of innocents. Here and there a touch of comedy appears; but, for the most part, these cases are tragedy-useless, cruel waste of human life." (*Ibid.*, pp. 340-341).

"Christian Science shorn of its mask of religion, stalks forth the arch-demon of the medical underworld.

"Christian Science is an assassin of humanity.

"Highwaymen demand : 'Your money or your life' Christian Science, beguiling with siren smile, deluding with false promise, takes—your money and your life!" (*Ibid.*, pp. 403, 404).

Stephen Page wrote that "I have found, by patient inquiry among doctors and other friends, the appalling and monstrous list of some of her victims. She has killed thousands, not by any mistake in diagnosis, for she never examines a case; not by any mistake in treatment, for she does nothing that you can call treatment; her feet are red with the blood of those whom she kills by sheer deliberate ignorance, by wilful blindness, by deliberate refusal to raise a finger for them. She puts them to death; and then when they are dead she says hat they died of want of faith " (Stephen Paget. *The Case Against Christian Science.*, p, 27).

(11) God is not the God of confusion and contradictions. And yet, if the course of Christian Science prove that it is of God, the cures of Roman Catholicism (which can match Christian Science cure for cure) prove that it is of God. And yet, both cannot be of God for each teaches doctrines which contradict the other group. Would God send out messengers with contradictory messages? If Christian Science was of God its healings would so far outdistance the other "healing groups" that it would be clear who was on God's side. For example, Moses so outdid the magicians that even Pharoah knew who was on God's side. But as it is they all do the same type of thing. One is no better than the other. And none of them match the various types of miracles which are recorded in the Bible.

(12) Psychologists, psychiatrists, others who have operated on the principle of mental suggestion have had the same type of cures that the healing groups have. Dr. Dunbar, in *Emotions and Bodily Changes*, has given many such cases. They include people who were paralyzed; certain types of heart trouble; blindness—which is sometimes due to hysterical conditions; hearing restored; lame have walked; etc. There are many ills which can be traced to emotional and mental disturbance, for our condition of mind has an impact on the body. Thus, unless various complications have arisen and progressed too far, when the person is led to adopt a sane attitude toward life, he may recover from his bad health. How should the sane attitude toward life, which Christ teaches us to have, help our mental and physical health?

(13) These healing groups do not perform the range of miracles which are recorded in the Bible. They only attempt, as a general rule, to heal sickness. Notice some of the miracles in the Bible. (Ex. 3:20; 7-; Lk. 18:41; Matt. 8:2-; II Kings 13:21; Matt. 14:35; Acts 19:11, 12; Deut. 8:4; Neh. 9:21; Dan. 6:16-27; John 1:17; Num. 12:10; II Kings 5:10-; I King 13:4; Acts 28:3-6; II Kings 2:1, 11-; Acts 8:39, 40; John 11:43-; Acts 9:40-; Ex. 16:4-; I Kings 17:14-; Mk. 6:37-44; Ex. 14:15-; 17:6-; Matt. 14:25; Ex. 14:24-; Mk. 4:39-; Dan. 3:20-.)

(14) Contrast the characteristics of the miracles in the Bible with those of the modern "healers." Give examples of New Testament miracles. Can you add any to the following list? Instantaneous. Complete, not partial healings. No relapses. Preachers did not

become rich due to their work as "healers." They were not used to start a denomination. The miracles were performed in connection with the work of men which confirmed the truth that was being revealed. Healers today do not all claim to be inspired, and those who do claim it can be shown to be uninspired. In the Bible, miracles were used to confirm truth, but teachers of error today try to confirm their erroneous teachings with their healings. Apostles didn't preach healing more than they did Christ. In fact, healing was not emphasized by them as much as it is emphasized by some in some groups today. They did not have special healing services. They did not refuse to take hard cases.

(15) Miracles were always used by the Lord to start things. The first man and woman were created by miracles, but the human race is perpetuated by natural laws. The church was established, and the gospel revealed and confirmed, by miracles, but it is perpetuated by spiritual laws through the word of God which is the seed of the kingdom. Those who revealed the will of God, confirmed it with miracles (Heb. 2:2-4). We have no new revelations today. There are no revealers now, so there are no confirmers now. Although we do not have space to examine thoroughly this question of miracles, it is sufficient to see that God has actually taken away from the church the power to work miracles. And the claims of "divine healers" today do not stand up under investigation.

(16) Men should be tested by their teaching as well as by their claims (Matt. 7:21-22, 4:24; Deut.

13:1-5; II Thess. 2:9).

(3) *Questions and Assignments*

Do you know of any one who has died under Christian Science "treatment?"

What if the Christian Scientist replies that people have died under treatment by doctors?

Did miracles give the Christians in the first century any advantage over us, with reference to having a firm basis for faith in Christ? If not, what additional evidence do we have that some of them did not have?

How do the following passages show that we must check what a person teaches, even if he does seem to work wonders? (Deut. 13:1-; Matt. 7:22; 24:24; II Thess. 2:3, 9).

How would you answer the statement that some of the miracles of Jesus were gradual just like some of their "healings" today and that this is proved by John 4:49-54? God would not back with miracles different Churches who teach different doctrines. Neither would He uphold any Church whose teaching goes contrary to the New Testament. What are some of the teachings of some of the "healing" Churches which show that they are not upheld by the Lord?

How would you answer the following statements : God has changed if He does not give us power to work miracles; God has played favorites if He does not give us power to work miracles; You cut out part of the Bible if you do not believe we can work miracles?

Seventh Day Adventist

Why are they called Seventh Day Adventists? What religious movement of the nineteenth century furnished the background out of which they came? Who was their founder? Can you give a brief sketch of their origin? doctrines? size? and the effort which they are putting forth for world evangelism? Did you know that the Voice of Prophecy is a Seventh Day Adventist program? This radio program offers a free correspondence Bible course, but it does not tell you over the radio, and in the first part of the course, just who they are.

(1) *The Inspiration of Mrs. White*

The Seventh Day Adventists are most widely known for their belief that the Sabbath (Saturday) should be kept today. Some of their views on the nature of man, and on prophecy, are also fairly well known. However to accept their views about the Sabbath is not enough to make one a Seventh Day Adventist. One can believe that and join the Seventh Day Baptist, or the Seventh Day Church of God. To be a real Seventh Day Adventist one must accept the authority of Mrs. Ellen G. White. There are a lot of people who do not know this because the Seventh Day Adventist does not approach others with the message that Mrs. White was inspired. Instead, they usually approach people with the Bible and only after they have taught some of their peculiar misinterpretations of the Bible do they begin to bring the inspiration of Mrs. White to the prospective convert's attention.

To prove that they so view Mrs. White, the following quotations are taken from *The Ellen G. White Books. The story of the writing and Publication of The 'Conflict of the Ages Series' and the 'Testimonies for the Church.'* By W. C. White, D. E. Robinson, and A. L. White. (Issued by The Trustees of the Ellen G. White Publications. General Conference, Takoma Park, D. C. Reprinted from *The Ministry*, 2nd Edition, 1942) "The revelations given to Ellen G. Harmon (later White) began in December, 1844. Her first written delineations of these visions were in letters addressed to individuals, and a few of these were published by the recipients." (p.3). While thus speaking, she was taken off in vision, and for two hours, during which time the congregation remained in the building, the Lord through divine revelation opened up to her many matters of importance to the church." (p. 3). She was a woman preacher. "The first sentence in this little work declares, '*The Lord has shown me that Satan was once an honoured angel in heaven.*' The words 'I saw' or their equivalent appear in this little work on an average of more than once for each page of the book. It is clear to the reader that at times the scenes passed before her in great panoramic views:" (p. 4) "...she had been favored with revelations..." (p. 4) "...she penned the solemn message from heaven to a perishing world" (p. 5) She once said, concerning some of her books, "Sister White is not the originator of these books. They contain the instruction that during her lifework God has been giving her." (p. 9).

(2) *Mrs. White a False Prophetess*

(1) *She made false prophecies.* Her teaching concerning the Sabbath is sufficient to show that she is a false prophetess. Those who are interested in seeing some of her false predictions, and other false teachings see D. M. Canright, *Seventh Day Adventism Renounced*, pp. 129-165.

(2) *She taught false doctrine.* Even if an individual gave a successful sign, if he led people away from God and his word he was to be rejected (Deut. 13: 1; Matt. 24: 14; Rev. 2: 2). The false teaching of Mrs. White is sufficient to show that the same spirit who guided the writers of the Bible did not guide Mrs. White. We shall examine only one of their false doctrines.

(3) *Sabbath Keeping Is Not Bound on Christians.*

(1) If the Sabbath is in force there must be some regulations which show us how to keep the Sabbath. The only regulations for Sabbath keeping are those found in the Old Testament. If the Sabbath is still in force the laws which governed it are still in force. If these are not the laws which govern the Sabbath will our Seventh Day Adventist friends please show us in the New Testament what laws do govern it? The Sabbath is here with all of its regulations or it is gone, unless they can show—which they cannot—that God has legislated that it is to be kept in some other way than it was under the Old Testament. What were some of the things prohibited on the Sabbath? (Ex. 35: 3;

16 : 29, 23; 31 : 14, 15; Num. 15 : 32-36; 28 : 10; Jer-
17 : 21, 22; Lev. 24 : 5-9).

(2) Starting with Heb. 1 : 1-2, and using Col. 2 : 14-17, build an argument to prove that we are not under the Sabbath. What if an individual says that Christ was the one who delivered the Sabbath to Israel, and that therefore we should accept it?

(3) Starting with Matt. 28 : 20 build an argument against Sabbath keeping.

(4) The following argument is sufficient to destroy their position. (a) The two covenants (the old and the New) cannot exist together. That is, they cannot be in force at the same time (Rom. 7 : 1-7. Verse 7 shows that Paul has reference to the ten commandment law. Read Heb. 10 : 9, and Heb. 8:6-13 to see that by the first he meant the Old Testament, and by the second, the New Testament). (b) The Old Covenant was the ten commandment covenant (Ex. 34 : 28 ; Deut 4 : 13 ; 9 : 9-11, 15 ; 1 Kings 8 : 9, 21 compared with Jer. 31 : 32 ; Deut. 5 : 2, 3, 15 ; Heb. 8:9) (c) We are under the New Covenant today (Heb. 9 : 5-13; 10 : 9; 2 Cor. 3:6-14 ; Heb. 10 : 12-24 ; 13 : 20). Nowhere in the New Covenant is the keeping of the Sabbath commanded. Instead, it is expressly stated that it is not bound (Col. 2 : 14-16).

(5) II Cor. 3 : 6-16. A study of this passage shows that the letter which kills is the ten commandment covenant, which was the ministration of death, written and engraven in stones. It killed because it condemned the sinner, and all had sinned. What was written and engraven in stones when Moses' face shone and he put

a veil over his face when he talked with Israel? (Exodus 34 : 27-35). What has happened to it now? (II Cor. 3 : 11). What are we under, the Old or the New Testament? (II Cor. 3 : 6).

(iv) *Questions*

(1) Can we accept Moses as our authority, along with Christ? (Matt. 17 : 38-).

(2) Did God prophesy that the old covenant would be done away? (Jer. 31 : 31-34; Zechariah 11 : 10-14 : Matt. 26 : 14-15; 27 : 3-7).

(3) Was the new covenant in force before Christ's death? (Heb. 9 : 15-17). What bearing does this have on the S. D. A. argument that Christ kept the Sabbath? What else did Christ do under the Old Law, that we do not do?

(4) How do the introductory remarks to the ten commandments show that God was addressing them to Israel? (Deut. 5; Ex. 20).

(5) It cannot be proved that the Sabbath was kept before Moses' day. If it could be proved that it was, would that prove that it is bound on Christians? Did circumcision and animal sacrifices exist before Moses? Does that prove that they are now bound on Christians?

(6) S. D. A. say that the Old Testament is divided into the law of God and the law of Moses. The law of God, they say, is the moral (the ten commandments), and the law of Moses is the ceremonial law. They argue that when anything is said about the law being

done away it means the law of Moses, and not the law of God which contains the Sabbath. How do the following passages show that the law of God and of Moses are the same? It was the law of Moses because it was given through Moses (Lk. 2:22-25, 27, 39. Are these statements found in the ten commandments? See also. II Chron. 31:3; Neh. 8:1-18. Notice the different names for the law. Mk. 7:9-10, 13). The so-called ceremonial law contained moral precepts as well as rituals (Ex. 22:21, 22; 23:2; Lev. 19:2, 16, 18, 17, 14.) This is in what S. D. A. call the law of Moses, to distinguish it from the ten commandments which they regard as the moral law of God). Were the two greatest commandments in the ten commandments? (Matt. 22:36-40).

(7) The Sabbath is said to be perpetual, but that meant that it was to be perpetual throughout the generations of their dispensation (Ex. 31:16-17). What else is said to be everlasting or perpetual throughout their generations). (Gen. 17:9-14; Ex. 12:14, 17, 24; 29:42; 30:8; 20-21; Lev. 6:14-18; 23:10-14, 27-32, 34-43; Num. 15:38; Ex. 30:10). Would their argument bind the death penalty for Sabbath breaking? (Ex. 31:14-16). Forever or throughout your generations, sometimes simply means as long as that dispensation, or thing, existed. For example, the slave was to serve the master for ever (Deut. 15:17) but it was limited to his lifetime.

(8) S. D. A. maintain that we should keep the Sabbath now for it will be kept in heaven (Isa. 66:22-).

Can they prove that this refers to heaven? Compare Isa. 65:20 with Rev. 21 : 1, 4. 65: 20 with Rev. 22 : 15; 21 : 27. If S. D. A. were to maintain that it is literal prophecy of the New Testament dispensation, it would prove that Jerusalem will be restored and Israel return to it (Isa. 66 : 19, 20). Yet Mrs. White said that Israel's day as a favoured nation was at an end when Christ died (*The Great Controversy* 1911 edition, pp. 20-21), and that old Jerusalem would never be built up (Quoted by E.B. Jones, *Why You Should Not Be a S.D.A.*, 3rd Edition, pp. 32-33). If it is a literal prophecy it will prove that the priests and sacrifices will be restored (Isa. 66 : 21); also the new moon (66:23. Contrast Col. 2 : 14-16). In a previous quarterly we studied something about prophecy and its interpretation. It was shown that some prophecies were literal, some figurative, some symbolical, and some typical. If Isa. 66 refers to the New Testament, or if it refers to heaven, it simply takes some of the conditions and ceremonies of the Old Testament and uses them to typify or foreshadow service to God in the New Testament dispensation, or in heaven. One does not have to decide to which it refers in order to refute the S.D.A. argument.

LESSON ELEVEN

The "Jehovah's Witnesses"

Who are they? What are some of the names by which they have been known? Who was their founder? What about them can you commend?

The impression which one gets from their literature today is that they accept only the Bible and endeavor to go by what it teaches. This lesson will show that they originated in the teaching of a man, Charles T. Russell, for whom inspiration was claimed. It will also be shown that his false prophecies and false doctrines discredit both this claim and the entire "Jehovah's Witnesses" movement.

(1) *The Claim That Russell was Inspired*

Charles T. Russell wrote six volumes entitled *Studies in the Scriptures*. After his death, Judge Rutherford—his successor—published volume VII of the series. It contained, among other things, material which Russell had written on Revelation and Ezekiel. In the Preface to volume VII, called "The Finished Mystery," it is stated that: "Through St. John the Lord Jesus revealed the fact that the Church would be developed during seven distinct periods, or epochs; and that for each of these epochs He would have a special angel, or messenger, to serve the other members of the Body. It follows, then, that the messenger to the last, or Laodicean, epoch would declare the Presence of the Lord and the time of the Harvest of the Gospel Age. The great Master laid special

emphasis on the importance of the messenger to the seventh, or Laodicean, period of the Church, saying that such a one would be "a faithful and wise servant, whom his Lord would make ruler over all His Household, to give them meat in due season." "Those consecrated Christians who have read and fully appreciated the Truth as contained in the preceding six volumes of *Studies in the Scriptures* readily see and agree that Charles Taze Russell was the messenger of the Church of Laodicea. In the mind of every one who believes the Bible the evidence set forth in this volume will establish that fact beyond the question of the doubt" (VII:3). The meat in due season which this servant was to furnish the household of faith is the series of books called *Studies in the Scriptures* (VII. 4:5). These volumes are no longer circulated by the "Jehovah's Witnesses". Has the meat become tainted?

Paul was the special messenger of God to the church in the first age (VII:23), and Russell in the last age. This in itself is sufficient to indicate the belief that Russell was inspired like Paul. Rev. 14-6 in its reference to an angel means Volume I of the *Scripture Studies* (VII:221); 14:8 is volume II (VII:221); 14:17 is "Pastor Russell himself" (VII : 226); 14:18 is "the corporate body which Pastor Russell organized to finish his work" (VII : 227); and 14:20 is volume 7 (VII:229).

Rev. 22:18 says that God would add the plagues to those who tampered with his word. Russell commented as follows on this verse : "His penalty will be, when he comes forth from the tomb in the Times of Restitution,

that he will have to read the Seven Volumes of *Scriptures Studies*, and get the matter straightened out in his own mind" (VII :338).

"In all his warnings he claimed no originality. He said that he could never have written his books himself. It all came from God, through the enlightenment of the Holy Spirit" (VII : 387). Although Russell is now dead, he yet speaks to people through his books (VII:485).

(2) Judge Rutherford Endorsed Pastor Russell

Judge Rutherford succeeded Pastor Russell. In earlier editions of Rutherford's work, *The Harp of God*, we are told that God gave the greater light to the world, just as he had promised he would, through Russell's work (Preface of 1,962,000 Edition). In the very last page of advertisement in this book the seven volumes of *Scripture Studies* are offered for sale. This same edition calls Russell the special servant of Matt. 24:45-47 (pp. 237-239). This is of special interest in view of the fact that many "Jehovah's Witnesses" today deny that Russell was. They say that the servant is the "Jehovah's Witnesses" group as a whole. How does this discredit the work of Russell? "In 1917 the seventh volume of the series of *Studies in the Scriptures* was published, known as 'The Finished Mystery,' which has had a very wide circulation. These books are the first clear explanation of the divine plan ever published" (pp. 239). Later editions leave out these last endorsements of Russell, without saying why, or without even indicating that such a change has been

made. In *Creation* (1,395,000 edition), Rutherford again stated that God used Russell to write *Studies in the Scriptures* (pp. 120-121).

(3) *Russell Begins to be Dropped*

Russell's works, including his volume seven on Ezekiel and Revelation, were acclaimed by Rutherford as the first clear explanation of the divine plan ever given (*The Harp of God*, p. 239). After Rutherford wrote on Ezekiel and Revelation it was claimed that *his* works were the first clear explanation of the divine plan ever given (*Light*, Vol. 1:5-6, 12, 53; *Vindication*, 1:5). The 1928 edition of *The Harp of God* drops the reference to Russell as the special servant of the Lord. In *Vindication*, 1:99, in his exposition of Ezek. 9, Rutherford wrote: "Aside from the Lord Jesus Christ, God has never since committed to any one individual on earth an exclusive work to be done by that individual". And yet, in the exposition of Ezek. 9 which was printed in Vol. VII :417-418 of *Studies in the Scriptures* Russell was said to be the special servant pictured as the man with the writer's inkhorn by his side. What suspicion about Rutherford does such as this arouse? Can they drop Russell and his works and still claim that their movement is right? Is not their entire movement based on Russell and his teachings? Can they pass off Russell's mistakes, with the statement that they have received new light since then? Let us notice some of Russell's false prophecies and false teachings.

(4) *False Prophecies of Russell and Rutherford*

In some of the early editions of *Studies in the*

Scriptures, then called *Millennial Dawn*, Russell taught (1) "...this date limit—A. D. 1914—must not only witness the completion of the selection and trial and glorification of the entire body of Christ, but it must also witness the purifying of that larger company of consecrated believers..." (III:360). (2) "...the last member of the 'body' or 'bride' of Christ will have been tested and accepted and will have passed through the vail before the close of A- D. 1910" (III:359). (3) "Call to mind that the scriptures showed us that the full end of Gentile power in the world, and of the time of trouble which brings its overthrow, will be in the end of A. D. 1914, and that some time before that date the last members of the Church of Christ will have been 'changed, glorified'..." (III:357). (4) "And with the end of A. D. 1914, what God calls Babylon, and what men call Christendom, will have passed away, as already shown from prophecy." (III:153). (5) "The beginning of the earthly phase of the Kingdom in the end of A. D. 1914 will, we understand, consist wholly of the resurrected holy ones of olden times, -from John the Baptizer back to Abel..." (IV:625). (6) "...within the coming twenty-six years all present governments will be overthrown and dissolved..." (*Studies*, II:98-99. Statement first made in 1889).

When some of his prophecies did not find fulfilment, the edition of the books which were printed after the date set for the fulfilment were sometimes changed so that: "at A. D. 1914" reads "after 1914" (III : 126); "before 1914" is changed to "after 1914" (III : 228);

“before” to “near” (III:362); and “that this date limit—A. D. 1914—must” is changed to “may” (III:364).

What is the Scriptural attitude toward such a teacher? (Deut. 18:22).

Judge Rutherford taught that ancient worthies, such as Abraham, would be resurrected from the dead, and appear in human perfection on the earth in 1925. And that people then (1920) living would never die. He based his calculations on some of the same things on which Russell based his calculations (*Millions Now Living Will Never Die* pp. 97, 100, 117, 98, 89-90).

(5) *False Teachings*

(1) Russell and Rutherford taught that Jesus, while on earth, was only a human being, although a perfect one (*Studies*, 1: 179). How does this contradict John 1: 10, 14; 8: 58; 5:23; 6:31; 16:28; I Tim. 3:16; Isa. 9:6-7?

(2) Christ's body was not raised (II:129-130). How does this contradict John 2:19, 21; Lk. 24:2, 37-40; John 20:25-27? (3) “It was necessary not only that the man Christ Jesus should die, but just as necessary that the man Christ Jesus should never live again, should remain dead, should remain our ransom-price to all eternity.” (V:454). Christ, Russell taught, was just a man while on earth. He also taught that man is breath and body, and that there is no soul left when breath is separated from the body. If, as Rutherford wrote, “Jesus as a man must remain dead forever” (Government, p. 110), could there have been any resurrection? How does this contradict Acts 2:36, 3:14-15; 5:30; 17:31; Heb. 10: 12; Rev. 1:18?

(4) God "has not even attempted the world's conversion" (*Studies*, 1:95) What about II Cor. 6:2; Matt. 28:18-20; Acts 17:30-31; II Pet. 3:9? (5) The gospel is not for the Jews during the "Christian" dispensation (Rutherford, *Life*, p. 119). What about Matt. 28:18-19; Acts 10:34; Rom. 10:1-4; 11 : 23; John 3:16? (6) The earth will not be destroyed by fire (Rutherford. *Reconciliation*, p, 25) what did Peter say? (II Pet. 3:10). (7) "The commission given to the new creation ("all real Christians are members of the new creation") does not authorize any member thereof to beg or even to urge one to become a Christian (Rutherford, *Creation*. pp. 344, 345). Did the apostles know this? (Acts 2:38-41; 26:18, 29). Let us now consider their false teachings concerning man's nature, the doom of the wicked, and Christ's second coming.

(6) *The Nature of Man*

(1) "Jehovah's Witnesses," as well as Seventh Day Adventists, teach that man is but breath and body, and when we die we are dead all over, so to speak. Death is annihilation.

(2) *The Bible*. (a) Body of man formed of dust (Gen. 2:7). What is its destiny at the end of this life? (Gen. 3:19; Ps. 104:29; Eccl. 12:7. (b) The term soul in Genesis 1 and 2 includes all beings that have animal life; beings which are not lifeless like matter (1:20, 21, 24, 30). However, Genesis clearly distinguishes between man and the animals. It is not said of the animals that they were made in the image of God. Man possesses life of a physical body, and animals have a life of a physical

body. But the beasts were not made in the image of God. Beasts have a life of the body, but not spirit (Isa. 31:3). Therefore, the part of man which is in the image of God is not the mere life of the body. Is the image of God a spiritual or a physical image? (John 4 : 24). Was the image destroyed by the fall? (Gen. 9 : 6; Jas. 3 : 9). How does Rom. 1 : 23 show that a likeness of man's physical body is not a likeness of God? (Compare Acts 17 : 29). How does Phil. 2:6-8 show that the form Christ possessed as a man in the flesh was not the same as the form of God? What is in man? (1 Cor. 2:11). Who formed it? (Zech. 12:1). Of what is God the Father, with reference to man? (Heb. 12:9). This makes man what? (Acts 17:29). Does the decay of the outward man result in the decay of the inward man? (II Cor. 4:16). What happens when the outward man dies? (Eccl. 12:7; Acts 7:59). How did Paul describe man's makeup? (I Thess. 5:23). What is dead at death, according to James? Is it the body or the spirit? (Jas. 2:26). How did Jesus show that death did not end all, as the Sadducees thought? (Matt. 22:32).

(7) *The Doom of the Wicked*

(1) They teach that annihilation is the punishment of the wicked.

(2) Whether some of the statements in the Bible are figurative or literal, does not change the fact that hell is far worse than death itself (Matt. 18:6). The doom of the wicked is as long as the bliss of the righteous (Matt. 25:41-46).

"We are told 'eternity' and 'eternal' are applied elsewhere to things of limited duration, as to the hills and the land of Canaan. This, however, decides nothing; for almost every word is used in different senses and degrees. But when the inference is drawn, that, as 'eternal' elsewhere means terminable through long duration, it must have the same meaning here, we protest that it does not follow. It were as cogent to argue that because 'god' sometimes denotes a finite being, therefore it does so when applied to Jehovah; or that the 'heaven,' which Peter says saints are to inherit, means the firmament, because that is meant by the same word when the apostle speaks of 'the fowls of heaven,' or that 'life' means brute life in all cases because it has that meaning in some cases.

It has been reasonably contended that the duration signified by "eternal" corresponds to the nature of the being to which it is applied. It gives to the hills a very long period, according to their capability; and so to the land of promise, the earth, the Aaronic priesthood and ordinances. It ascribes to God, duration absolute, without beginning or end. Applied to man, it attributes duration without end. On this principle the everlasting punishment of an endless being implies an endless punishment.

*"A comparison of the places where the words 'eternal' and 'eternity' occur suffices to show that a long terminable period is the less frequent, lax and accommodated import, and unlimited duration their common and literal one." (M. Randles, *For**

Ever: An Essay on Eternal Punishment, London : Westleyan Conference Office. 2, Castle-st., City-road; 1878, pp. 28,29).

The doom of the wicked is a terrible thing to contemplate. Although we do not understand all about it now, we can rest assured that the judge of all the earth will do right. God, to be faithful to His promise to the faithful ones must keep the wicked out of heaven or they would wreck heaven just as sin wrecked the Garden of Eden. We do not know how much error in one's life God will overlook, but we need to obey Him and to teach all the people we can.

(8) *Second Coming of Christ*

The "Jehovah's Witnesses" teach that Christ's second coming has already taken place. We cannot see Him with the physical eye, for He is invisible. (1) Doesn't this fail to distinguish between his invisible presence during the gospel age (Matt. 28:20), and his visible second coming? (Rev. 1:7; Acts 1:9-11). (2) What if they reply that see means to see with the eye of understanding, and that only the righteous shall see Him? (Rev. 1:7; Matt. 25:41-46). (3) "Christ the Bridegroom and Reaper actually came" in 1874 (Studies, II:118, 240). Could Russell have known the date? (Matt. 24:36). (4) What the Scriptures teach will take place at his second coming have not yet taken place. So He has not yet come. What will take place at his coming? (Heb. 9:28; I Cor. 15:42-54; I Thess. 4:16,17; John 5:28-29; II Pet. 3:7-12; II Thess 1:6-10). (5) Christians are to be like Him when He comes (I John 3:2). If he has already come, then all

Christians are invisible like He is. Thus "Jehovah's Witnesses" are not His people for we can see them. On the other hand, if we can see God's people today Christ has not come. For if He had come, He would be visible, for they are visible.

Since "Jehovah's Witnesses" and their leaders have taught and circulated false prophecies and false doctrines, we should reject their movement, and try to instruct them more perfectly in the way of the Lord.

LESSON TWELVE

The Latter-Day Saints

Joseph Smith, Jr., was the founder of the Latter-Day Saint movement. Consult an encyclopedia, or some other books in the public library, and gather a few facts on his life. After his death the movement split, and today there are at least three groups : (a) The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-Day Saints, which has headquarters in Salt Lake City, is the largest group. (b) The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-Day Saints, with headquarters in Independence, Mo., is the next largest group. Do you know of any differences in teaching between these first two groups ? (c) The smallest group, called the "Church of Christ" has headquarters in Independence, Mo. The Reorganized Church does not like to be called "Mormons," but the first President of the Reorganized Church once called them Mormons (*The True Latter-Day Saints' Herald*, Vol. 1 : 169, 1860).

It is claimed that Joseph Smith died as a martyr for Christ. The truth is that he died because his methods of violence and dictatorship aroused some people, including former Mormons, against him. He died with a gun in his hands trying to kill his enemies: (George Q. Cannon. *Life of Joseph Smith*, pp. 42, 491 ; Reorganized Church *Journal of History*, October 1918, pp. 399-416; R. C. Evans, *Forty years in the Mormon Church and Why I Left It*, p. 123). How does this compare with the spirit of Christ (Lk. 23 : 34), and Stephen ? (Acts 7 : 60).

In the old Testament one who claimed to be a prophet was tested in such ways as : (a) His teaching (Deut. 13 : 1-5). (b) Whether his signs, prophecies, came to pass (Deut. 18 : 21-22). These same types of tests hold true today. Let us thus examine Joseph Smith Jr. If he were not a prophet of God, the entire Latter-Day Movement collapses for it is based on the faith that he was God's prophet.

(1) *Prophecies of Joseph Smith, Jr.*

He made so many guesses concerning the future that he may have occasionally guessed right. But a true prophet must not make any false prophecies. We shall consider some false prophecies concerning Christ's coming.

Smith did not escape the date-setting fever, current during his day, which led William Miller, Mrs. Ellen G. White and others astray.

"Kirtland, Feb. 14, 1835. President Smith then stated that the meeting had been called, because God had commanded it : and it was made known to him by vision and by the Holy Spirit. He then gave a relation of some of the circumstances attending us while journeying to Zion—our trials, sufferings, etc., etc.; and said God had not designed all this for nothing, but He had it in remembrance yet; and those who went to Zion, with a determination to lay down their lives, if necessary, it was the will of God that they should be ordained to the ministry, and go forth to prune the vineyard for the last time, or the coming of the Lord, which was nigh—even

fifty-six years should wind up the scene" (*Millennial Star*, Vol. 15, p. 205).

At this same meeting the following took place at the selection and blessing of the 12 apostles. *Lyman E. Johnson*. "And that he shall live *until the gathering is accomplished*, according to the Holy Prophets...and he shall see the Saviour come stand upon the earth with power and great glory" (15:206). *Heber C. Kimball*. "*That many millions may be converted by his instrumentality, and angels may waft him from place to place, and that he may stand until the coming of our Lord, and... that he be made acquainted with the day when Christ shall come (something no New Testament writer knew, Matt. 24 : 36, J. D. B.) ; and that he shall be made perfect in faith*" (15:206). *Orson Hyde*. "He shall stand on the earth and bring souls till Christ comes." "He shall have power to smite the earth with pestilence ; to divide waters, and lead through the Saints." "He shall be like one of the three *nephites*." The nephites here mentioned did not die but were transformed so that they could remain and baptize people (III Nephi 28:1-). However, according to the second edition of Andrew Jenson's *Church Chronology* Orson Hyde died no Nov. 28, 1878, at Spring City, Utah (p. ix). *William Smith* was to "be preserved, and remain on earth, until Christ shall come to take vengeance on the wicked" (15:207). *Luke Johnson*. "He shall bear testimony to the kings of the earth" (15 :207). There may be a record of his doing so, but I do not know of it *Brigham Young*. He was to do such wonders that the "heathen nations shall even call him God him-

self, if he do not rebuke them" (15 : 206). These blessings came by or through the Three Witnesses and they were just as valid as was the ordination of these men as apostles. This paragraph not only shows that they expected Christ's second advent in their lifetime, but it also incidentally records other false predictions.

On April 6, 1843 "Joseph Smith prophesied that Christ would not come until he (Joseph) was eighty-five years of age" (Jenson, *Church Chronology*, p. 22). Smith said that "I do not say whether He will make His appearance or I shall go where He is. I prophesy in the name of the Lord God, and let it be written—the Son of Man will not come in the clouds of heaven till I am eighty-five years old" (E. F. Parry, a LDS, *Joseph Smith's Teachings*, p. 86). "I believe the coming of the Son of Man will not be any sooner than that time" (*Doctrine and Covenants*, Utah Edition, 130 : 17). One Latter-Day Saint elder told me that Christ would have returned then if Smith had lived. Christ's first advent was not dependent upon the life or the death of some particular man and there is no indication in the New Testament that His second advent is so conditioned. Oliver Cowdery testified that Smith predicted that he would live until Christ came (quoted by Charles A. Shook, *The True Origin of the Book of Mormon* p. 51).

Elder Hyde, in his book written around 1852 and shortly after he left the Latter-day Saints, said that "it is one of the most prominent promises made by the Elders to those whom they bless, that they shall live to behold the winding up scene." Smith promised this to

Brigham (died August 29, 1877, JDB); he likewise publicly prophesied in April, 1843; "There are those of the rising generation who shall not taste death till Christ comes" (*Mormonism, Its Leaders and Designs* p. 175). This last statement is found on page eighty-five of *Joseph Smith's Teachings*. "There are those of the rising generation who shall not taste death till Christ comes." *W. W. Phelps*, the last time he spoke to T. B.H. Stenhouse, "was fully satisfied that the revelation of Joseph, 'that he was to live until Christ comes again,' could not fail in its fulfilment" (*Rocky Mountain Saints*, p. 42). Phelps died March 7, 1872. One Mormon preacher in a sermon said that Christ, was expected in his generation (*Times and Seasons*, Vol. 4, p. 126, a LDS publication). The second advent was near, and as W. Woodruff said. "God is beginning to make a short work in these last days" (*Millennial Star*, Vol. 1, p. 89). The Latter-day Saints expected "that the world is soon to experience great and final change" (*Millennial Star*, Vol. 1, p. 299). Over one hundred years ago *Elder Adams* said, "We further believe that the restoration of Israel and Judah and the second advent of Messiah are near at hand, and that the generation now lives who will witness the fulfilment of these great events" (*Times and Seasons*, Vol. IV, p. 142). *Apostle Orson Pratt*, remembering perhaps his blessing at the time he was ordained an apostle, said that "I have no doubt that there are others in the church that think it is a far-off event, an event that will probably take place in the days of their youngest children ; but from what is written I look upon it is as an event that is much nearer than is generally !

supposed" (*Journal of Discourses*, Vol. III, p. 17; 1855).

The son of Joseph Smith, Jr., said that on Feb. 19, 1834, "My father Joseph then laid his hands upon my head and said, Joseph, I lay my hands upon thy head and pronounce the blessings of thy progenitors upon thee, that thou mayest hold the keys of the mysteries of the Kingdom of heaven, until the coming of the Lord: amen" (Heman C. Smith, *Reorganized Church True Succession in Church Presidency*, p. 44; *Church History* (Reorganized), Vol. 1. p. 433; *Times and Seasons*, Vol. 6, pp. 994-995). (Last reference given by Heman C. Smith). Smith's son has already passed on, and Christ has not yet come.

On this one subject—the coming of Christ—Smith's own words prove that he was a false prophet. We cannot accept him and be faithful to God's test for a prophet. Thus we are unable to accept the statement of George Q. Cannon that every "prediction from his (Smith's JDB) lips, has been literally fulfilled" (*The Life of Joseph Smith the Prophet*, p. 379).

(2) *The Book of Mormon*

This book was supposedly translated by inspiration by Joseph Smith from some long lost plates. It purports to be a history of the ancient inhabitants of this country. If it is false, Joseph Smith was a false prophet for fostering it on the public. It is false because :

(1) Paul shows that to attempt to be bound to

the law and to Christ is to be in spiritual adultery (Rom. 7 : 1-6). The two covenants could not be in force at the same time (Heb. 10 : 7-20). The new covenant was not in operation before Christ's death (Heb. 9 : 15-17). But the *Book of Mormon* teaches that there were churches of Christ in America years before Christ was born. It also teaches that the people were under the law of Moses also. (Alma 4 : 4-5; Mosiah 25 : 23; Alma 46 : 14-15).

(2) It can be shown that Joseph Smith tried to deceive people. Some men once faked some plates and hid them. They were dug up and finally placed in Smith's hands. He claimed to translate a portion of them, after he found that no one else could translate them. Only a bogus prophet translates bogus plates. (*Times and Seasons*, IV : 186-187; *Millennial star*, XXI:41; Charles A. Shook, *Cumorah Revisited*, pp. 548-549; F. S. Dellenbaugh, *The North-Americans of Yesterday*, p. 49). Can the Latter-Day Saints offset this simply by saying : "Oh well, Smith was just mistaken about that but that does not destroy our confidence in the Book of Mormon ?" If you cannot trust a man where you can check him, would you trust him where you cannot check him? There are no plates of the book of Mormon to check what Smith said about it, but there are pictures of the faked plates which he claimed to translate. Since we discovered that he tried to deceive people where we can check him, can we trust him in his story about the Book of Mormon?

(3) The Book of Mormon represents the Indians as being of Jewish origin. This theory was held by a good many people during Smith's lifetime when the Book of Mormon was brought forth. But it is not held by scientists today.

(3) *Prophecies of Mormonism*

(1) Mormons maintain that Ezek. 37:15-20 is a prophecy of the Bible (the stick of Judah), and the Book of Mormon (the stick of Ephraim), being joined together into one. The answer to the following questions will show that they are wrong. What was written on the literal sticks? What did the sticks symbolize? What did the joining of the sticks in Ezekiel's hands, symbolize? Did it symbolize people or books?

(2) It is maintained that Rev. 14:6-7 is applied to their work. The seventh Day Adventists also apply it to their work. This angel, like some other references to angels, in the book of Revelation is evidently a symbol of the spread of the everlasting gospel after a time of apostasy. Mormonism teaches some false doctrines so we know that this cannot represent their work. Brigham Young, and some other men in Utah taught that God was once a man, and that we can some day become a God, just as God did—by having many wives and raising up a kingdom and creating the world for them!

(3) Isa. 29 is said to apply to the Book of Mormon. It is the sealed book of 29:11. They are wrong: (a) It applies to Israel's condition during the first century

(Isa. 29 : 9, 10; Rom. 11 : 7, 8; II Cor. 3 : 14, 15), (b) in 29 : 11 the "vision of all" is simply the revelation, the whole revelation, that God had given to Israel. It had become to them, because of their dull spiritual condition, as the words of a book that is sealed (Acts 13 : 27). (c) Christ applied it to the Jews of his day, and not to the people of Joseph Smith's day (Isa. 29 : 13; Matt. 15 : 1, 7-9; Mk. 7 : 5-7). (d) The marvelous work and a wonder, of 29 : 14, is not the Book of Mormon and Smith's work. It is the work that Jesus did. (Compare Isa. 29 : 14 with Matt. 11 : 25; 8 : 27; 21 : 20; Lk. 4 : 22).

(4) *Study Questions*

(1) When one examines and refutes their claims some L. D. S. state that they are being persecuted. Answer this, and use in your answer the L. D. S. position that all churches, except their church, are of the Devil (*Doctrine and Covenants* 1 : 30 *Book of Mormon*, 1 Nephi 14 : 10, Utah Edition).

(2) The L. D. S. teach that the apostasy completely destroyed the church, and that the church had to be restored from heaven in 1830. How do the following passages show that the apostasy did not completely destroy the church? (Acts 2 : 34-36; 1 Cor. 15 : 24-28; Dan. 24:4; Heb. 12 : 28; Rev. 12:6, 14-17; 13 : 7-10). How does the parable of the tares show that the evil would not completely destroy the good? (Matt. 13 : 36-43). Wherever the seed, the word, is accepted, men come into the kingdom (Lk. 8 : 11-15). As long as the new

covenant stands man can accept it and enter the church. It was established once for all.

(3) L. D. S. teach that men cannot be baptized unless they are baptized by someone in the priesthood who has "authority." This is one of the reasons that they state that apostasy destroyed the church. Apostasy, they say, broke the line of authority so that there was no one on earth who could preach and baptize. Thus the authority had to be restored from heaven. This contradicts their own teaching for they teach that John the apostle, and three Nephites in America, were to remain on earth, to bring souls to Christ, until the end of the world. So they had authority! (*Doctrine and Covenants*, 7:1-8. Utah Edition ; III Nephi 18:37). The Church, however, can exist without being fully organized (Acts 14:23. They had existed for some time without elders). The Scripturalness of a person's baptism does not depend on the "official authority" of the one who baptizes but on the individual's own faith and obedience. When we obey from the heart we are made free from sin, regardless of the moral character or "official character" of the one who does the baptizing (Rom. 6:17-18). Paul rejoiced even if hypocrites preached the gospel (Phil. 1:15-18). So evidently if anyone heard them preach Christ, and accepted what they preached, he would be saved. If one's baptism depends on the person who baptizes, then one can never know that he has baptized Scripturally. For who knows the heart of the man who baptized

him and the man who baptized him, etc. Thus how would you know whether or not the authority had been passed on!

(4) Some L. D. S. say that we cannot prove polygamy is wrong. How does Matt. 19 : 4-6 show that it is wrong ?

LESSON THIRTEEN

The Completeness Of The Scriptures

If the Ancient Book is to guide Modern Man its message must be the Message of Today as well as Yesterday. If its central figure—Jesus Christ—is to be our Saviour, He must be man's ever-present contemporary. If the Ancient Book is not able to guide Modern Man then there is no possibility of your being New Testament Christians today. If the Bible is not complete and sufficient then it cannot be our standard. Is it possible for us to be New Testament Christians if the Bible is incomplete and insufficient as our authority ?

(1) *Complete in Its Teaching*

(1) The Old Testament recognized that it was incomplete and that it would give way to something else. But the New Testament is God's revelation for the final dispensation. (a) The Old Testament promised another prophet, like unto Moses, who would be the authority and thus supersede Moses (Deut. 18:15-18). Who is this prophet ? (Acts 3:22-23). Christ is the spokesman of the last days and no one can take his place as mediator, deliverer, or lawgiver (Heb. 1:1-2). It is true that He promised the Comforter, but the Comforter was to reveal *His* law (John 14:26; 16:12-15; Heb. 2:2-4). There is no one to take the place of Christ. By Him and his word man shall be judged (John 12:48; Acts 17:30-32). (b) The Old Covenant promised a New Covenant (Jer. 31:31-34). Prove that it has been established (Heb.

8:5-10, 16). This New Covenant superseded the Old. The Old, in the promise of God in Jeremiah 31:34 recognized that it would not last but would be superseded. The New, however, promised no other covenant on earth, but looks to the consummation of this covenant and this dispensation in eternity (I Cor. 15:24-28). It is the dispensation of the last days (Acts 2:17-17; Heb. 1:1-2). (c) The Old Testament kingdom was shaken and removed, but the New Testament kingdom cannot be moved (Heb. 12:26-28). No kingdom is to take its place on earth. It shall finally be delivered up to the Father (Acts 2:33-36; I Cor. 15:24-28), but it shall not be superseded on this earth. Thus the New Testament completes the Bible for it is the fulfilment and culmination of that which went before. Nothing is to take its place, therefore the law which regulates this kingdom is sufficient since the same dispensation which started on Pentecost will continue until the end of time. No new revelation is needed for no new dispensation is needed.

(2) Some have thought that new heresies demanded new revelation, but this is not so since heresies and false doctrines are merely those things which God has not taught or permitted. Those things which deviate from the standard do not have to have an additional revelation in order to be exposed. They need only be measured by the standard. For example, some have taught that Christianity is a form of compulsory communism. Do we need a new revelation to stamp this as a false doctrine? Does the New Testament teach

that men must renounce their stewardship over His goods just because they become Christian ? (Acts 5:4). Do we need a new revelation to prove that heretics should not be put to death ?

(3) Jesus promised the apostles that they would be guided into all truth. This promise had to be fulfilled, if fulfilled at all, during their lifetime (John 16:12-13). No one, who believes in Jesus, can understand this and deny that all truth has been revealed. These men are not alive with us today and thus we cannot learn the whole counsel of God from their lips (Acts 20:27; II Pet. 1:3 shows that they did teach the whole counsel). Thus we are to learn from their writings. They wrote that we might understand and believe (John 20:30-31; Eph. 3:4). Inspired writings are able to make one complete (II Tim. 3:13-17). The Bible is the only inspired writings which we have, and in it we find the faith once for all delivered unto the saints (Jude 3). The completeness of its teaching is shown by a consideration of the following questions. What sin does it not condemn either by expressly labeling it as wrong, or by principles? What good does it fail to commend either expressly or by principle? List some of the sins which it condemns. List some of the good things it approves.

Anyone who maintains that there are more revelations for us today than those in the Bible has placed himself in the affirmative and the burden of proof is on his shoulders. For centuries the Bible has been considered as complete and final. Let our opponents prove that

there is the need for additional revelations or an additional dispensation. Let them prove that they have revelations from God which should form a part of the Bible today. The canon of Scripture has been considered closed for centuries, let them prove that it should be re-opened. When they bring forth their revelations, so-called, the writer is convinced that it can be shown that they are : (a) either in the Bible already; (b) or discernible by human wisdom; (c) or contrary to the Bible.

(2) *Complete for All Time*

(1) Those who think that it is impossible that such an ancient book can guide us aright today have generally looked on humanity from the standpoint of some theory of evolution. Thus they think that we have evolved two thousand years beyond the people of the Bible. They regard it not as revelation but as human speculation. They leave out the God who has revealed Himself. Since man has advanced in so many things they think that of necessity he must have advanced beyond the Bible. Have you ever heard anyone express this idea ?

(2) They seem to think that a thing which is old must be false, and some of them regard the new as true because it is new. Time, however, does not exist for God as it does for us (II Pet. 3 : 7). Thus his revelations are not dated in the sense that they become musty with the passage of time. Are any true principles turned into falsehood by the passing of the years ? Name some

things which were true two thousand years ago and which are still true.

(3) These critics also overlook the fact that man's nature and needs are constant. Man's problem is still the sin problem. Man still has need of a redeemer and the knowledge of God. Man still needs faith, hope, comfort, love and light on the pathway of life. Illustrate this from current events.

(4) The revelation which flowered forth in its fulness in Christ is the greatest possible revelation of God; of man; of sin's sinfulness; of man's danger; of man's potentialities; and of man's responsibilities. What more should be said than has been said concerning these things? Discuss each one of these things and show that the revelation in the Bible on these matters is sufficient for us. The Bible is complete for all time because it centers in Christ. There can be no higher revelation of God to man on earth than that made by Him who said, "he that hath seen me hath seen the Father" (John 14 : 9). In what sense do we see the Father when we see Jesus?

Yes, this Book is complete because it contains God's revelation to men. It does not deal with changing things which are now out of date, but with truths which do not change, and which are needed to change men.

(3) *Complete for all Races*

(1) The Bible teaches that the great commission states the message which is essential for all men (Matt. 28 : 19-20 ; Mk. 16 : 15-16). It also teaches that men are fundamentally one (Gen. 1 : 26-27 ; Acts 17 : 26).

And when we read the Bible we do not feel that it is racial, but that it is universal in its nature and appeal. What we learn by reading is confirmed in the appeal which it actually has for men of all races. Can you illustrate this?

(2) Men who have travelled widely and thought deeply have been impressed with the unity of the human race. A. R. Wallace, although he was an evolutionist, wrote (May, 1855) that: "The more I see of uncivilized people, the better I think of human nature on the whole, and the essential differences between so-called civilized and savage man seem to disappear." (James Marchant. Editor, *Alfred Russell Wallace: Letters and Reminiscences*. London: Cassell and Co., Ltd., 1916, Vol. 1: 55). The Author of *Savage Civilizations* lived for many months among cannibals, and yet concluded that man was man wherever found. In a conversation, H. G. Wells stated that that was his belief also.

(3) Yes, men are human beings where we find them. Sin does something to a person regardless of the age or the clime in which he lives, and the race of which he is a member. A holy character is recognizable regardless of the color of the skin through which the character shines. Men of all races need what the gospel offers, and men of all races can hear, believe, obey, be transformed by and enjoy the gospel. Indeed it is the book for all ages and all men. How do these considerations help undermine racial hatreds and prejudices?

(4) *Complete for the Whole Man*

Intellectually, emotionally, volitionally, and spiritually, man is developed by the Bible. The Bible is psychologically sound in that it meets man's inner needs and develops his highest potentialities. It meets the need of the intellect, satisfies his emotions, and strengthens his will. It furnishes him with the faith, hope and love which is essential to a happy life. It undermines the selfishness which dwarfs character and blights life. It recognizes his moral nature and develops it. It cultivates intellectual honesty and shows him what is wrong with his inner working. How does it help the physical body?

(5) *Complete for All Situations in Life*

(1) In all our *relations* in life (father and child; husband and wife; employer and employee; etc.) the Bible guides us aright. Give some Scriptures which show how we are to conduct ourselves in these relationships. How does Matt. 7:12 apply in all of them?

(2) In all moods it has for us the right message. Can you think of a passage which can help you when you are angry? Depressed? Jealous? Zealous?

(3) In all temptations it has the way out, and the strength for us to take the way out; although we can close our eyes to it or fail to use this source of strength (I Cor. 10:11-14). Can you illustrate this?

(6) *Complete as a Book*

The Bible is a complete book. If it had started without Genesis it would have lacked the beginning. If it

had ended without Revelation it would have just been chopped off without an ending. If it had lacked the person of Christ there would have been no central character. If it had left out redemption it would have had no central theme. But even as a book it is complete.

Each one of the aspects which have been mentioned could be developed into one or more chapters in a book but enough has been said to indicate something of the completeness of the Bible. Let us by this be encouraged to study it more diligently and follow it more closely so that we shall be complete men and women who are completely furnished unto every good work. If you have not yet accepted the Christ set forth therein let Him meet your needs; complete your life; and develop you into a whole man or woman.

(7) Study Questions

Think of the traits of a good well rounded personality, and show how by following the principle in the Bible one may grow into such a character.