

**Scriptures and Doctrine :: Sola Scriptura is logically untenable**

**Sola Scriptura is logically untenable, on: 2009/8/22 20:35**

You all have a very nice forum here. I am so glad to see so many seriously seeking to know God who is Truth.

Most here that I have read seem to have one doctrine in common: Sola Scriptura. The idea that the Bible Alone is the only rule for faith and practice. I submit that this is a self-refuting proposition.

The Bible never claims to be the only rule for faith and practice. Scripture claims to be God-breathed or inspired. We taught the world to believe this. It claims to be inerrant. We also taught the world to believe this over a millennium before Martin Luther ever came along. It claims to be the Word of God. We also taught the world to believe this.

But the Sacred Scriptures are NOT the only authoritative rule for belief and practice

It is not sufficient. And I would submit that the wide variance of opinions held by sincere seekers is proof that it is insufficient.

Why? Because the Scriptures need to be interpreted. And herein lies the problem. Each of us is FALLABLE. And therefore so is our interpretation.

It is amazing to me to see so many who believe that the Holy Spirit was able to preserve the written text of Scripture and yet not believe that He preserved an infallible interpreter of those Scriptures.

I think this is probably a good start. Along with the obvious opposition this statement is sure to receive here. I am curious to know how many here have every really considered what I am proposing.

FYI, this is the ancient belief of every church of apostolic origin: Catholic, Orthodox, Coptic, Armenian, Ethiopic, and Maronite.

I'm looking forward to this discussion.

CatholicApologist

**Re: Sola Scriptura is logically untenable - posted by starvn4truth, on: 2009/8/22 21:05**

I assume that when you use "we" you are referring to the catholic church.

There is no need for intellectual debate or discussion. Rather a need for more historical research and understanding regarding the origin of catholicism and even the reformation for that matter. In neither of these groups will you find the humble child like believers who suffered for the faith and were actually killed by these groups who termed them heretics for not bowing down to the imposed secular religion of the time but rather humbly worshipped the LORD in spirit and in truth. Flee your religion. Recognize your broken condition. Humble yourself and pray for the new life Jesus offers and wait upon Him.

Praying for you in Jesus' name,

Mike Stepien

**Re: , on: 2009/8/22 21:18**

Quote:  
-----In neither of these groups will you find the humble child like believers who suffered for the faith and were actually killed by these groups who termed them heretics  
-----

Which group of "humble child like believers" were you referring to?

The Gnostics? The Circumcisers (First Century)? Montanism (Late Second Century)? Iconoclasm (Seventh and Eighth Centuries)? Catharism (Eleventh Century)? I could go on.

But you are stalling. Please rebut my statement if you are able.

Nowhere does the Bible claim to be the ONLY rule for faith and practice.

If you can't prove me wrong from Scripture, then you have a self-refuting proposition.

**Re: Sola Scriptura is logically untenable - posted by InTheLight (), on: 2009/8/22 21:25**

Welcome to SermonIndex.

Quote:  
-----Most here that I have read seem to have one doctrine in common: Sola Scriptura. The idea that the Bible Alone is the only rule for faith and practice. I submit that this is a self-refuting proposition.  
-----

This is a straw man you are setting up by defining Sola Scriptura in these terms. Sola Scriptura does not mean that the Bible is the only source of truth, rather it means that the Bible is the only source of inerrant authority.

The Bible claims to be the word of God and I believe that the Bible substantiates that claim. If someone else is going to come along and claim to be a source of inerrant authority they then have the burden of substantiating that claim. If they don't demonstrate this then the Bible stands alone as the sole source just by process of elimination.

Quote:  
-----Why? Because the Scriptures need to be interpreted. And herein lies the problem. Each of us is FALLABLE. And therefore so is our interpretation. It is amazing to me to see so many who believe that the Holy Spirit was able to preserve the written text of Scripture and yet not believe that He preserved an infallible interpreter of those Scriptures.  
-----

This is a bit of untenable logic of your own. In one breath you claim that each is fallable, and then in the next you seem to claim that there is an infallible interpreter. Which is it?

In Christ,

Ron

**Re: Sola Scriptura is logically untenable - posted by anonymity, on: 2009/8/22 21:31**

Well,

the Law in the Bible claims to be the only truth.

The New Covenant also claims to be the only truth.

The Apostle's also claimed that they held the only truth. Therefore their writings are also the only truth.

So in these things we have the Bible as a whole which claims to be the only truth.

The main thing is that the Catholic Church has sought to add their tradition to the Scripture.

We do not hold that the Pope's have Apostolic succession nor that certain traditions that are not in the Bible have been passed on. This is mainly because many of the practices are unbiblical and that there is also a lack of proof to these claims on your side.

Now these things, brethren, I have figuratively transferred to myself and Apollos for your sakes, that you may learn in us not to think beyond what is written, 1Corinthians 4:6

**Re: Sola Scriptura is logically untenable, on: 2009/8/22 21:39**

Sir, I don't know what you're up to, besides endeavouring to stir up a whole lot of controversy, but let me ask you this question: what kind of feckless cur would I be, if I went onto a forum hosted by some variant of the roman institution, and asked, "How can the pope proclaim himself the "vicar" of Christ, when in reality he is the man of perdition?"

Would that be a conversation starter on such a forum? That's just looking for a cyber fight, which is what I think you are doing.

Light has no fellowship with darkness.

I'm sure there are many poor souls trapped within that scarlet whore of babylon, the roman institution that genuinely love Jesus, and I pray God frees them from this hellish system, some call the "roman catholic church". There's nothing "catholic" about it in the true definition of the word, and it certainly isn't a "church", or part of the Church, which is the Body of Christ, it's just a satanic ruse with its popery, priestcraft, superstition, mary worship, and it's gaggle of predatory homosexual priests that papa tries to either bury under the rug, or buy off the victims of these deviants who infest this demonic institution.

Repent now and flee rome, before you split hell wide open. Did I make that plain enough for you?

**Dear Moderators, on: 2009/8/22 21:45**

Dear brothers,

I urge in the Love of Christ, lock this thread, it's just troll bait, and certainly not edifying. I said what I HAD to say, I didn't enjoy saying it, but it had to be said....neil

**Re: , on: 2009/8/22 21:52**

Sir, have you ever even BEEN to a Catholic forum? If you had, you wouldn't have made such a silly accusation. There is probably every stripe of anti-Catholic such as yourself at:

<http://forums.catholic.com/>

I'm not in the least offended by your ignorant and superstitious, fear-filled assessment of the Church Jesus Christ left behind. I once was ignorant like you. Praise the name of Jesus, He opened my eyes to the truth through His grace.

So, no, I don't want a cyber fight. But I would to God that I could fight and overcome whatever force of Hell is blinding your mind to the truth.

BTW, you didn't answer my question. Show me a Scripture that claims that the Bible is the ONLY rule for faith and practice. Until you can, how can I expect to take you seriously?

**Re: - posted by starvn4truth, on: 2009/8/22 21:54**

Donatists, Stablers, Catharers, etc. Names given by the catholic church, and eventually by the reformers as well, to label those humbly following Jesus outside the realm of religious arrogance. God always keeps a remnant. See "The Reformers and Their Stepchildren" Leonard Verduin.

Your pride in your position blinds you from the truth which is in Christ.

Flee your religion. Recognize your broken condition. Humble yourself and pray for the new life Jesus offers and wait upon Him.

Praying for you in Jesus' name,

Mike Stepien

Re: Sola Scriptura is logically untenable - posted by jlosinski, on: 2009/8/22 22:18

Catholic,

It may be helpful to engage with only one or two of the brother or sisters here, as opposed to the few dozen that will likely post responses (myself included).

HOWEVER...

I'm sure that you are aware that your position "**...the Bible Alone is the only rule for faith and practice. I submit that this is a self-refuting proposition.**" is not the majority view on this site (which, btw, is centered on biblical revival). There are plenty of other sites dedicated to the type of dialogue that you desire, and plenty of sites that contain answers to your presuppositions (which obviously aren't original).

THEREFORE...

You have already shown that you are convinced of your position concerning your bible, so what is your intent? Is there any chance that your mind may be changed by the scriptures and doctrine that will be put forth? Perhaps a better question may be:

**What proof could we offer to you that would change your mind?**

If you can't think of any, move on please.

Semper Sola Fide,  
Joe

Re: , on: 2009/8/22 22:19

Quote:

-----Welcome to SermonIndex.  
-----

Thanks. Great to be here.

Quote:

-----This is a straw man you are setting up by defining Sola Scriptura in these terms. Sola Scriptura does not mean that the Bible is the only source of truth, rather it means that the Bible is the only source of inerrant authority.  
-----

Note taken. Since you are representing the Sola Scriptura side, I am more than happy to admit your clarification. I think it is quite helpful since I once held it myself. So let's go on from here. Where does the Bible claim to be the ONLY source of inerrant authority? Please see the following Scripture:

"Therefore, brethren, stand fast, and hold the traditions which ye have been taught, whether by word, or our epistle." - 2 Thess. 2:15 (KJV used as an olive branch)

So there are two forms of Sacred Tradition that are commanded to be kept.

- A. Oral Tradition (by word)
- B. Written Tradition (our epistle)

You can't have one without the other. Jesus commanded His apostles to preach (oral) and disciple (oral).

Which came first, the church or the Bible? Were the first Christians at Jerusalem and Antioch "Sola Scriptura"?

Quote:

-----The Bible claims to be the word of God and I believe that the Bible substantiates that claim.  
-----

There is no argument between us here. We taught the world to believe this over a millennium before Luther.

Quote:  
-----If someone else is going to come along and claim to be a source of inerrant authority they then have the burden of substantiating that claim.  
-----

Aren't you assuming that the Bible has made that claim? It hasn't. So where does that put you?

Quote:  
-----If they don't demonstrate this then the Bible stands alone as the sole source just by process of elimination.  
-----

Um..no..

The Scriptures are obviously not written like a catechism or council that leave no question to the casual reader as to proper interpretation. Here's a few examples:

Acts 8:30,31 "And Philip running thither, heard him reading the prophet Isaias. And he said: Thinkest thou that thou understandest what thou readest? Who said: And how can I, unless some man shew me? And he desired Philip that he would come up and sit with him. "

Why couldn't he just read and understand? Sola Scriptura...right? Why did he need a man to explain it to him?

"As also in all his epistles, speaking in them of these things; in which are some things hard to be understood, which they that are unlearned and unstable wrest, as they do also the other scriptures, unto their own destruction." 2 Pet. 3:16

Are you sure a child can pick up a Bible and understand it? Wouldn't a child fit the bill for "unlearned"?

Food for thought. I'm asking you before God to be honest with yourselves.

I mean, didn't you receive the doctrine of Sola Scriptura through tradition? Didn't someone hand you a Bible and say "this is the only inerrant source for authority in your life"? You took them at their word. Right?

Quote:  
-----This is a bit of untenable logic of your own. In one breath you claim that each is fallible, and then in the next you seem to claim that there is an infallible interpreter. Which is it?  
-----

Not quite. We are fallible as humans. But just as the writers of Scripture were fallible and had a divine charism to write Scripture infallibly, so also the Holy Spirit is with the church in her councils to prevent her from error. Else have the gates of hell prevailed against the church?

**Re: , on: 2009/8/22 22:24**

Last time I checked, the title of this section was "Scriptures and Doctrine". So forgive me if you sound a bit afraid of having your views challenged.

This issue has deep ramifications in the area of revival, renewal, and the moving of the Holy Spirit.

Or do you not believe that the Holy Spirit moved the writers of Scripture to write?

I think it's a bit funny that you signed your post "Semper Sola Fide" which I'm assuming many here would also decry as heresy.

If you don't like people disagreeing with you, why are you even here?

**Re: - posted by MaryJane, on: 2009/8/22 22:31**

Greetings Catholic

I do not know your motives for coming here to this forum, I pray that its the Fathers leading so that you might be set free from the bondage that is the Catholic church. You sound very much like my mother who sadly has placed her faith and trust in the tradition of men instead of Christ Jesus. I will be praying for you, debating you at this point does no good.

Praying  
mj

**Re: - posted by jlosinski, on: 2009/8/22 22:34**

Catholic,

No need to ask for forgiveness, I wasn't afraid :). I question your motivations for posting here, which is not an unreasonable thing to do, and simply think that you could find more fulfilling "discussion" on sites more suited for this type of thing.

My last question still stands, if you cannot (or will not) answer it, it would be best to move on.  
Semper Solus Christus,  
Joe

**Re: Sola Scriptura is logically untenable - posted by ADisciple (), on: 2009/8/22 22:35**

Quote:  
-----It is amazing to me to see so many who believe that the Holy Spirit was able to preserve the written text of Scripture and yet not believe that He preserved an infallible interpreter of those Scriptures.  
-----

...But there IS in the earth an infallible interpreter of the canon of Scripture: the Vicar of Christ: the Holy Spirit Himself. Any man who takes upon himself that title is anti-christ.

**Re: - posted by InTheLight (), on: 2009/8/22 22:42**

Quote:  
-----There is no argument between us here. We taught the world to believe this over a millennium before Luther.  
-----

Quote:  
-----Aren't you assuming that the Bible has made that claim? It hasn't. So where does that put you?  
-----

Sir, if you agree that the Bible is the word of God then by definition that makes it a source of inerrant authority. The Bible clearly claims in places to numerous to mention here that it is the Word of God. Only if you believe God to be errant is His word errant.

I affirm again, the Bible substantiates itself as the word of God (and therefore a source of inerrant authority). The Holy Spirit within me bears witness to its authority. I have found in practical living experience in walking with the Lord Jesus Christ that the Bible contains the mind of God, and the state of man, the way of salvation, the doom of sinners, and the happiness of believers. Its doctrines are holy, its precepts are binding, its histories are true, and its decisions are immutable.

All other comers have yet to substantiate such a claim therefore the Bible stands alone. This is Sola Scriptura.

Quote:  
-----I mean, didn't you receive the doctrine of Sola Scriptura through tradition? Didn't someone hand you a Bible and say "this is the only inerrant source for authority in your life"? You took them at their word. Right?  
-----

Where something was learned is of no relevance to whether it is true or not. That's like saying, "you only believe  $2+2=4$  because a schoolteacher told you. Yes, but does  $2+2=4$ ? Only if you can prove  $2+2$  does not equal 4 would it be of interest to discuss how I came to believe that it does.

In addition, the Holy Spirit bears witness to the authority of the word in a living relationship with the Lord. "But the anointing that you received from him abides in you, and you have no need that anyone should teach you. But as his anointing teaches you about everything, and is true, and is no lie--just as it has taught you, abide in him."  
(1John 2:27 ESV )

Quote:  
-----Not quite. We are fallible as humans. But just as the writers of Scripture were fallible and had a divine charism to write Scripture infallibly, so also the Holy Spirit is with the church in her councils to prevent her from error. Else have the gates of hell prevailed against the church?  
-----

Indeed the Holy Spirit is with and in every truly born-again believer but your claim that each is fallible and yet there is an infallible interpreter still remains illogical.

In Christ,

Ron

**Re: , on: 2009/8/22 23:12**

Quote:  
-----Sir, if you agree that the Bible is the word of God then by definition that makes it a source of inerrant authority. The Bible clearly claims in places to numerous to mention here that it is the Word of God. Only if you believe God to be errant is His word errant.  
-----

Yes. The Bible is inerrant. But it needs to be interpreted.

Quote:  
-----I affirm again, the Bible substantiates itself as the word of God (and therefore a source of inerrant authority). The Holy Spirit within me bears witness to its authority. I have found in practical living experience in walking with the Lord Jesus Christ that the Bible contains the mind of God, and the state of man, the way of salvation, the doom of sinners, and the happiness of believers. Its doctrines are holy, its precepts are binding, its histories are true, and its decisions are immutable.  
-----

You speak of the Bible as though it needs no interpretation or clarification or careful exegesis to be understood.

Further, let me ask you on what authority you rest that the canon of Scriptures on which you rely are indeed the Word of God?

The Bible contains no table of contents.

I mean, how do you know that Philemon belongs in the Bible. Don't give me this burning in the bosom stuff. Because your experience is subjective and can fail you to your eternal peril. You do not hear God clearly 100% of the time. I'm sure you don't claim to. So an internal witness doesn't suffice.

Quote:  
-----Indeed the Holy Spirit is with and in every truly born-again believer but your claim that each is fallible and yet there is an infallible interpreter still remains illogical.  
-----

I feel like I'm talking to a Mormon. St. Peter warns us against "private interpretation" of the scriptures. (burning in the bosom)

Sola Scriptura is Sola ME

**Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2009/8/22 23:17**

Quote:  
-----Not quite. We are fallible as humans. But just as the writers of Scripture were fallible and had a divine charism to write Scripture infallibly, so also the Holy Spirit is with the church in her councils to prevent her from error. Else have the gates of hell prevailed against the church?  
-----

God designed the churches (plural) to exist independent of each other so as to prevent the spread of error through associations and hierarchies. Jesus Christ is the head of the church and makes His will known within the gathering to them that 'have an ear to hear what the Spirit is saying unto the churches.' (Revelation 2-3) The Spirit and the word of God agree.

Based upon what I see in your quote you believe the scripture is infallible. You also believe the Holy Spirit deals with the Church. The issue then is who is in authority to convey the mind of God in any particular gathering? The Jews that rejected Christ stole the authority unto themselves and set the pattern that would eventually be followed by the established Catholic Church post Constantine. I dealt with this in a few articles:

(<https://www.sermonindex.net/modules/articles/index.php?viewarticle&aid1958>) Talmudic Revisionism and the Struggle for Authority

(<https://www.sermonindex.net/modules/articles/index.php?viewarticle&aid1962>) The Silencing of the Prophetic Voice

(<https://www.sermonindex.net/modules/articles/index.php?viewarticle&aid1963>) Dealing with those that rejected the Rabbi's

(<https://www.sermonindex.net/modules/articles/index.php?viewarticle&aid1959>) It is NOT in Heaven

The problem is that folk seek to reserve the right to be the voice of God dealing with the churches by assuming authority that God has not given them. The rightly divided word of God is the final authority in matters of doctrine and practice. Again, the Spirit and the word agree. The Canon is closed, but God is still moving in the churches revealing what is the mind of the Spirit in real time. He did not just give us the book and say, 'now get on with it.' He desires to make His will known, but the question is how?



The Jews gave the authority to the Rabbi's.  
The Catholic church gave it ultimately to the Pope.

But Paul did not trust men and commended the churches to God and to the word of His grace; that is, to give grace by bringing revelation to the people dealing with their present condition that would square with the written word of God in the midst of the congregation. (See Acts 20) This reality lifts the churches into a whole different level where it is necessary to recognize the Word of the Lord when it is coming to us and respond to it in faith. No one person or organization has been given the authority by God to function in this place; but reveals His Word severally as He wills and through whom He wills.

In this way the danger of error is greatly reduced as the conscious dependence is no longer on men but on God. It is His job to bring His word to the people or the person. He will do it. It is our job to have 'ears to hear what the Spirit saith' unto the churches. This command is repeated 7 times in Rev. 2-3. We must have ears to hear when God may choose at any moment in time for someone to be the vehicle of the word of His grace. God can speak through a mule or even our enemies; what is essential is that we recognize it is God speaking when He quickens the word to our hearts. When this happens though, if it is the Holy Spirit, it will never be in contradiction to the written word of God.

**Re: - posted by jlosinski, on: 2009/8/22 23:23**

Catholic,

As I've said already, there are dozens of sites that give a historic apologetic concerning the 66 books of scripture, it would behoove you to find your answers there. If you are not looking for answers, but rather helping us rethink our (in your opinion) wrong headed presuppositions, you are wasting your time here. Our brothers and sisters on this site do not hold to your beliefs, nor will they, God willing.

You have made your convictions known, as have we. Really, it's time to move on.

**Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2009/8/22 23:26**

Quote:  
----- mean, how do you know that Philemon belongs in the Bible. Don't give me this burning in the bosom stuff. Because your experience is subjective and can fail you to your eternal peril. You do not hear God clearly 100% of the time. I'm sure you don't claim to. So an internal witness doesn't suffice.  
-----

You have to believe that God has been at work protecting the Revelation of Himself throughout history. Those that are serious students of the word of God recognize the absolute consistency of the revelation to the point that even the most learned of students have glimpses of the majesty of God as they discover it's wonder. I have heard men say that had put the entire New Testament to memory that the bible is so dead on that if they did not worship God they would worship the bible. But of course that would be bibliolatry. And yet I affirm the majesty of God revealed in the written word so as to see how each book is fitly framed together and interwoven into a symphony of truth in perfect equilibrium.

**Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2009/8/22 23:36**

The Final Authority  
Robert Wurtz II

And this voice which came from heaven we heard, when we were with him in the holy mount. We have also a more sure word of prophecy; whereunto ye do well that ye take heed, as unto a light that shineth in a dark place, until the day dawn, and the day star arise in your hearts. Knowing this first, that no prophecy of the scripture is of any private interpretation. (II Peter 1:18-20)

Our passage is the beginning of a discourse on false teaching and false teachers that Peter continues describing saying, and in their greed they will exploit you with false words; their judgment from long ago is not idle, and their destruction is not asleep. (II Peter 2:3 NASB) He continues on well into the chapter describing them as deceivers... having eyes full of adultery that never cease from sin, enticing unstable souls, having a heart trained in greed, accursed children. (II Peter 2:14 NASB) This is a sobering account that dominates almost 3 chapters of II Peter. Yet we find in chapter 3 the solution for the deception; (I want you) to recall the words spoken in the past by the holy prophets and the commandment of our Lord and Savior spoken through your apostles. (II Peter 3:2 ISV) The rightly divided word of God is the final authority upon

n which we are to base our doctrine and practice. Many things have been used in the former days as well as our day to try to authenticate doctrine and practice, but the FINAL authority must be the rightly divided word of truth.

#### An Appeal to the Conscience

Therefore, since we have this ministry, as we have received mercy, we do not lose heart. But we have renounced the hidden things of shame, not walking in craftiness nor handling the word of God deceitfully, but by manifestation of the truth commending ourselves to every man's conscience in the sight of God. (II Cor. 4:1-2)

There is a sense in which as Paul was preaching he was not ministering towards the heart for affirmation of what was being said as truth- but towards the conscience. This is important. Whenever we hear some doctrine or message being presented we have an inner witness that is hard wired into our being. That inner witness is like a judge that weighs words and concepts against what believe to be true. For those that truly desire truth and are willing to allow the word of God through the power of the Holy Spirit to teach them- they will come to the knowledge of God rightly. But if there are secret shameful desires lurking under the surface then those desires will be at work distorting what the person is willing to accept as truth. This is critical. Solomon stated in Proverbs 4:23, Keep thy heart with all diligence; for out of it are the issues of life. Corruption and deception walk hand in hand.

#### Pleasure in Unrighteousness = Candidate for Deception

The word 'worldly' is one that is no longer in vogue in many circles. But there is a great danger to giving oneself over to the pleasures of sin and compromise in this world. That primary danger is found in Paul's writings to the Thessalonians; And for this cause God shall send them strong delusion, that they should believe a lie: That they all might be damned who believed not the truth, but had pleasure in unrighteousness. (II Thess. 2:11-12) There is a price to pay for refusing to forsake this present world. Not only does the person's heart deceive them, but the risk is that God may in fact also send a strong delusion. This may well explain why many people seem to fall into deception after deception; they are trying to learn the ways of God without submitting to His authority and that is not possible. A twisted doctrine will always result.

#### Symptoms of Deception

One of the aspects of this behavior is that their sinful ways are openly revealed for all to see. They do not cover it- they celebrate it. Notice II Peter 2:13; They take pleasure in wild parties in broad daylight. The level of highhandedness of their compromise will dictate their level of deception. The more forward they are in worldliness and sin- the more deceived we can expect them to be. In fact, they even take it upon themselves to speak evil of celestial beings. We read in II Peter 2:10; Bold and arrogant, these men are not afraid to slander celestial beings. (Exodus 22:28) This is a characteristic of many in Charismatic circles today. It is evidence of an underlying pride in which neither God or His word is revered. Folk usurp God's authority by railing upon the demonic rather than submitting themselves to God and resisting the devil. There are even songs that are sung that border on 'railing' and by no means can they please the Lord.

#### False Authentication

Crafty words are not evidence of authority. Signs and wonders cannot be used as a measure for truth. A large following is no evidence of anything. Words of prophecy and other use of the prophetic gifts cannot authenticate matters of doctrine or practice. These matters must be reserved for the rightly divided word of God alone. Peter states it plainly when he reminds us that he had a glorious experience in which he heard the voice of God as it spoke of Christ. Yet he states; We have also a more sure word of prophecy; whereunto ye do well that ye take heed, as unto a light that shineth in a dark place. The word of God is of more value than an eyewitness account- especially in regards to fulfilled prophecy. We are to be led even by our Lord to 'search the scriptures...' In Acts 17:11 we read; These were more noble than those in Thessalonica, in that they received the word with all readiness of mind, and searched the scriptures daily, whether those things were so. There are two things here:

- 1) They received the word with a readiness of mind (an open mind)
- 2) They searched the scriptures 'daily' to ensure what Paul said was true

This must be our attitude in this crisis hour. The enemy is working deception after deception, while there is a readiness to receive everything false in many cases. Again we are warned that the coming of the lawless one will be accompanied by the power of Satan. He will use every kind of power, including miraculous signs, lying wonders, and every type of evil to deceive those who are perishing, those who refused to love the truth that would save them. (II Thess 2:9-10) This is an o

ongoing danger within the churches. But we have a more sure word of prophecy that we do well to give heed. We need a readiness of mind and a willingness to search the scriptures diligently in these deceptive times. We need an attitude that desires to know the truth rather than 'some new thing.' There are many false teachers in the land it is our responsibility to make sure we do not fall prey to them.

**Re: - posted by Miccah (), on: 2009/8/22 23:52**

jlosinski wrote:

Quote:

Catholic,

As I've said already, there are dozens of sites that give a historic apologetic concerning the 66 books of scripture, it would behoove you to find your answers there. If you are not looking for answers, but rather helping us rethink our (in your opinion) wrong headed presuppositions, you are wasting your time here. Our brothers and sisters on this site do not hold to your beliefs, nor will they, God willing.

You have made your convictions known, as have we. Really, it's time to move on.

Agreed.

But it is good to have you here Catholic. May the LORD open you to the truth of Himself.

*Fear of the Lord is the beginning of Wisdom. Fear of man is the path to hell.*

**"Catholic", on: 2009/8/22 23:55**

you asked:

Quote:

-----Sir, have you ever even BEEN to a Catholic forum?

Why would I do that? I'm a Jew who follows Jesus. why would I ever have anything to do with the dark satanic institution that murdered more of the kin of my flesh than hitler himself? In fact the roman institution's seat of satan the vatican was one of the first "nations" that sent an ambassador to greet hitler as the legitimate leader of germany and of course your "papa" during that era gave his blessing to hitler, but that isn't surprising, as they both followed the same master, satan.

Quote:

-----I'm not in the least offended by your ignorant and superstitious, fear-filled assessment of the Church Jesus Christ left behind. I once was ignorant like you.

It matters not one whit to me if you are offended by my forthtelling of the truth that scarlet whore of babylon, the roman institution engages in, nor do your insults affect me the least. If rome and her hell bound , priests and followers had it their way, they would be doing a lot more than merely engaging in insults, they would be murdering, as they have in their well documented past of satanic machinations.

Lastly, I don't care if you take me seriously, as you put it. You better take God seriously, repent and flee rome before it's too late, too late to realize hell is a million degrees hot, because that's right where you and that whole gaggle of mary worshipping idolators are headed, right to hell.

(<http://www.sermonaudio.com/sermoninfo.asp?sid6846>) Why True Protestants Reject the pope-Ian Paisley

**Re: - posted by ChrisJD (), on: 2009/8/22 23:56**

Hi everyone.

Ron, I appreciate what you've shared so far!

"...the Bible substantiates itself as the word of God"

It may not be that we need to answer the question put here exactly.

But how does the Bible direct us, for faith, and for practice?

Christ prayed for His followers to be set apart by means of the Truth. And He said that God's Word is Truth(John 17:17).

When Christ was put to the test by the Devil, He answered him by the Word of God(Mat 4:1-10).

And when those that opposed Christ challenged Him, He asked them:

**Have ye not read?**

...what David did when He was hungry(Mat 12:3)

...what God said in the beginning about marriage(Mat 19:4)

...what God said of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, God is the God of the living and not of the dead(Mat 22:29-32).

Saying to them also,

**Ye do err, not knowing the Scriptures, nor the power of God.**

When Joseph was in prison, it was the Word of the Lord that tried him(Psalm 105:17-19). And it was by faith in the Word of the Lord that Joseph sent his bones into the promise land(Gen 50:25).

And it was the Word of the Lord that

caused the Psalmist to hope(Psalm 119:49).

is upon the waters,

full of majesty,  
breaks the cedars,  
divides the flames  
and shakes the wilderness(Psalm 25)  
  
that brought all things into existence and upholds them even now(Heb 11:3, Col 1:17).  
  
is pure(Psalm 12:6)  
is tried(Psalm 18:30)  
and profitable for doctrine, reproof, correction, and instruction(2Ti 3:16).

Yes, the Apostle Paul did write to those in Thessalonica, that they should hold to the traditions they had been taught, either by their word, or their letter.

They were sent by God, and those that are sent by God speak the words of God, because God does not give them the Spirit by measure(John 3:34).

Surely they spoke according to the law, and to the testimony(Is 8:20).

#### **Why True Protestants Reject the pope, on: 2009/8/23 0:08**

This is a clear succinct sermon by Ian Paisley on the apostasy and error of the roman institution and that man of perdition that heads it up, the "pope".

(<http://www.sermonaudio.com/sermoninfo.asp?sid6846>) Why True Protestants Reject the pope.

#### **Re: , on: 2009/8/23 1:03**

##### **WHY THE BEREANS REJECTED SOLA SCRIPTURA**

By STEVE RAY

A prominent anti-Catholic organization out of Oregon, with Dave Hunt at the helm, publishes a monthly newsletter entitled The Berean Call. The title is taken from Acts 17, where Paul refers to the Bereans in Asia Minor as "noble-minded," and Hunt chose the title to promote his belief in sola scriptura.

Sola scriptura, or the "Bible only," is a Protestant doctrine invented in the fifteenth century. It declares the Bible is the sole source of revelation and the only and final judge in all matters of the Christian faith. Martin Luther developed it as a reaction to the historic teachings of the Catholic Church and of the Fathers of the first centuries. Luther rejected the authority of the Church and the apostolic tradition and so was left with sola scriptura—the Bible alone.

In reality, though, Hunt has turned the episode in Berea on its head, since the noble-minded Bereans actually condemn his sola scriptura position. This Bereans passage has been commandeered by Fundamentalists for too long, and it is time Catholics reclaim it. Many have been troubled by this text, and many explanations from a Catholic perspective have been mediocre at best. Not only can the text be explained easily by Catholics, but it is actually a strong argument against sola scriptura and a convincing defense of the teaching of the Catholic Church.

We are told that the Bereans were more noble-minded (open-minded, better disposed, fair)—but more noble-minded than whom? The Thessalonians! It is convenient for Fundamentalists to pull this passage out of context and force it to stand alone. That way their case seems convincing, but the context tells the real story. Before we look at the Bereans, let's take a look at those they are compared to, the Thessalonians. What did the Thessalonians do that made them less noble-minded?

We find out in Acts 17:11–19: "Now when they had passed through Amphipolis and Apollonia, they came to Thessalonica, where there was a synagogue of the Jews. And Paul went in, as was his custom, and for three weeks he argued with them from the Scriptures, explaining and proving that it was necessary for the Christ to suffer and to rise from the dead, and saying, 'This Jesus, whom I proclaim to you, is the Christ.' And some of them were persuaded and joined Paul and Silas, as did a great many of the devout Greeks and not a few of the leading women. But the Jews were jealous, and, taking some wicked fellows of the rabble, they gathered a crowd, set the city in an uproar, and attacked the house of Jason, seeking to bring them out to the people. And when they could not find them, they dragged Jason and some of the brethren before the city authorities, crying, 'These men who have turned the world upside down have come here also, and Jason has received them, and they are all acting against the decrees of Caesar, saying that there is another king, Jesus.' And the people and the city authorities were disturbed when they heard this. And when they had taken security from Jason and the rest, they let them go."

The Thessalonians rejected Paul and his message, and, after denouncing him, they became jealous that others believed. They treated Paul with contempt and violence, throwing him ignominiously out of town. Why? "For three weeks he reasoned with them from the Scriptures" in the synagogue, as was his custom. They did not revile Paul the first week or the second; rather, they listened and discussed. But ultimately they rejected what he had to say. They compared Paul's message to the Old Testament and decided that Paul was wrong. We must remember that many were proclaiming a wide variety of new teachings, all supposedly based on the Scriptures and revelations from God. Heresies, cults, and sects were as numerous in the Roman Empire as they are today. The Jews in Thessalonica had a right to be skeptical.

Now let's look at Luke's comment about the noble-minded Bereans: "The brethren immediately sent Paul and Silas away by night to Berea, and when they arrived they went into the Jewish synagogue. Now these Jews were more noble than those in Thessalonica, for they received the word with all eagerness, examining the Scriptures daily to see if these things were so. Many of them therefore believed, with not a few Greek women of high standing as well as men" (Acts 17:10–12).

When Protestants use this passage as a proof text for the doctrine of sola scriptura, they should realize that those in question were not Christians; they were Hellenistic Jews. There was no doctrine of sola scriptura within Jewish communities, but the Scriptures were held as sacred. Although the Jews are frequently referred to as "the people of the book," in reality they had a strong oral tradition that accompanied their Scriptures, along with an authoritative teaching authority, as represented by the "seat of Moses" in the synagogues (Matt. 23:2). The Jews had no reason to accept Paul's teaching as "divinely inspired," since they had just met him. When new teachings sprang up that claimed to be a development of Judaism, the rabbis researched to see if they could be verified from the Torah.

If one of the two groups could be tagged as believers in sola scriptura, who would it be, the Thessalonians or the Bereans? The Thessalonians, obviously. They, like the Bereans, examined the Scriptures with Paul in the synagogue, yet they rejected his teaching. They rejected the new teaching, deciding after three weeks of deliberation that Paul's word contradicted the Torah. Their decision was not completely unjustified from their scriptural perspective. How could the Messiah of God be cursed by hanging on a tree like a common criminal, publicly displayed as one who bore the judgment of God? What kind of king and Messiah would that be? This seemed irreconcilable to them (see Simon J. Kistemaker, Acts, 614).

When some of the Greeks and prominent citizens did accept Jesus as Messiah, the Jews became jealous—and rightly so, from their perspective, since the new believers separated themselves from the synagogue and began meeting elsewhere, at Jason's house. The Jews naturally considered themselves the authoritative interpreters of the Torah. Who

were the Gentiles to interpret Scripture and decide important theological issues or accept additional revelation? They were the "dogs," not the chosen custodians of the oracles of God (see William Barclay, *The Acts of the Apostles*, 128).

We can see, then, that if anyone could be classified as adherents to sola scriptura it was the Thessalonian Jews. They reasoned from the Scriptures alone and concluded that Paul's new teaching was "unbiblical."

The Bereans, on the other hand, were not adherents of sola scriptura, for they were willing to accept Paul's new oral teaching as the word of God (as Paul claimed his oral teaching was; see 1 Thess. 2:13). The Bereans, before accepting the oral word of God from Paul, a tradition as even Paul himself refers to it (see 2 Thess. 2:15), examined the Scriptures to see if these things were so. They were noble-minded precisely because they "received the word with all eagerness." Were the Bereans commended primarily for searching the Scriptures? No. Their open-minded willingness to listen was the primary reason they are referred to as noble-minded—not that they searched the Scriptures. A perusal of grammars and commentaries makes it clear that they were "noble-minded" not for studying Scripture, but for treating Paul more civilly than did the Thessalonians—with an open mind and generous courtesy (see I. Howard Marshall, *"The Acts of the Apostles"* in the Tyndale New Testament Commentaries, 5:280).

The Bereans searched the Torah no less than the Thessalonians, yet they were eager to accept words of God from the mouth of Paul, in addition to what they already held to be Scripture, that is, the Law and the Prophets. Even if one claims that Paul preached the gospel and not a "tradition," it is clear that the Bereans were accepting new revelation that was not contained in their Scriptures. These Berean Jews accepted oral teaching, the tradition of the apostles, as equal to Scripture, in addition to, and as an "extension" of, the Torah. This is further illustrated by the Christian community's reception of Paul's epistles as divinely inspired Scripture (see 2 Peter 3:16; here Peter seems to acknowledge Paul's writings as equal to the "other Scriptures," which can be presumed to refer to the Old Testament).

From the perspective of anti-Catholics, the Thessalonians would have been more noble-minded, for they loyally stuck to their canon of Scripture alone and rejected any additional binding authority (spoken or written) from the mouth of an apostle. In fact, at the Council of Jamnia, around A.D. 90, the Jews determined that anything written after Ezra was not infallible Scripture; they specifically mentioned the Gospels of Christ in order to reject them.

Why did the Bereans search the Scriptures? Because they were the sole source of revelation and authority? No, but to see if Paul was in line with what they already knew—to confirm additional revelation. They would not submit blindly to his apostolic teaching and oral tradition, but, once they accepted the credibility of Paul's teaching as the oral word of God, they put it on a par with Scripture and recognized its binding authority. After that, like the converts who believed in Thessalonica, they espoused apostolic Tradition and the Old Testament equally as God's word (see 2 Thess. 2:15, 3:16). Therefore they accepted apostolic authority, which means that the determinations of Peter in the first Church council, reported in Acts 15, would have been binding on these new Gentile converts.

By contrast, the Jews of Thessalonica would have condemned Peter's biblical exegesis at the Council of Jerusalem. They would have scoffed at the Church's having authority over them—the Torah was all they needed. Those who held to sola scriptura rejected Paul because he claimed to be the voice of "additional revelation."

Luke makes it plain that those who were willing to accept apostolic Tradition as binding were more noble-minded. The Bereans passage, therefore, is hardly a proof text for those who espouse sola scriptura. This text proves too much for Fundamentalists. Anti-Catholics love to associate themselves with the Bereans, but the example of the Bereans actually condemns their exegesis. Luke's praise of the Bereans cannot be applied to Fundamentalist Protestants, who resemble rather the Thessalonians, who held to sola scriptura and rejected the oral word of God contained in Tradition and in the teaching authority of the Church.

To be consistent with his novel theology of sola scriptura, Dave Hunt ought to rename his monthly newsletter. Let me suggest a new title: *The Thessalonian Call*.

**Re: , on: 2009/8/23 1:13**

you're just here to start trouble "Catholic", my prediction is that you wont be around long.

**Re: , on: 2009/8/23 1:17**

Look here, Natan. You're beginning to sound like a bit of a bully.

What you don't realize is that what you fear and have an infatuation with deriding verbally is the true Church of Jesus Christ.

I wish you had more substance.

**Re: - posted by live4jc, on: 2009/8/23 1:17**

Dear Catholic,

Welcome to the forum !

I believe that Sola Scriptura is indeed defensible on a number of lines of reasoning. One question I would ask you to consider is : If we believe the words in the Bible are 'God's words', then as David said, as recorded in Psalm 119:89, "Forever O Lord, thy word is established in heaven." If David is conveying God's truth here, then what is 'thy word' that He is pointing us towards ?

Let's also consider this, when Christ (who we agree was God in the flesh) was tempted by Satan, what words did he use to repel him ? They were the words we have recorded in the Old Testament, so this is further proof that the Bible is where we should go to, to find God's truth.

At the end of the book of Revelations, God gives a warning against taking away from the words of 'the book of this prophecy', so again the preeminent position of the Bible as the arbiter of truth is upheld here.

Earlier, there has been discussion about the verse (in 2 Peter) which talks about the fact that scripture is never subject to any 'private interpretation'. This brings up the vital question, can bishops or popes or other church leaders claim to have the final answer on the meaning of any particular scripture ? I would submit that the Holy Spirit is the one who has perfect understanding of what the meaning of any scripture is, and he alone can illuminate our minds about the meaning of specific Bible verses.

As to whether Bishops or Popes or anyone else should have the right to be the authority on what is the correct interpretations of any scripture, in love, I would ask you this : Why is it that the positions of many popes over the years have been in contradiction to one another ? Has God amended 'truth', over time ?

If they speak the words of God, then it seems that their teachings should all line up with one another. For example, it is my understanding that in times past, the Catholic church had been in favour of Creationism, but now espouses the belief that Evolution is true. I believe that pope John Paul advanced this position.

Also, here's a thought. The apostle Paul was, if anything, one of the 'early church fathers', though I would prefer to call him an early church leader. Yet Paul, as a church father, didn't simply say, 'Listen to me, because I'm a church father'. Instead, Acts 17:11 records that he commended the Bereans as being of noble character, because they "examined the scriptures every day to see if what Paul said was true". 'Search the scriptures' was also something that Christ told us to do.

Shouldn't we heed Christ's words, and follow the example of the Bereans, by searching the Scriptures ourselves to find out what God has to say in them ?

Ttyl,

John



Re: - posted by live4jc, on: 2009/8/23 1:40

Hi Catholic,

I just noticed that you had already brought up the passage about the Bereans- Acts 17:11 (below) that I had also posted about and your post is suggesting that the Bereans were not in favour of Sola Scriptura since they accepted Paul's teachings about Christ. It seems to me that this misses the point though. Paul was not just commending the Bereans because they searched the scriptures, but because they received the word that he was teaching. It is both these behaviours that Paul was in favour of. I firmly believe that what is being implied here, is that because they were searching the scriptures (with an open heart), they had come to see that Christ was the promised messiah who had been foretold in the Old Testament. Obviously, there was something about Christ and the gospel message which they saw as lining up with pre-revealed truth, which they had come across in the Old Testament.

I see no 'anti sola scriptura message here'. Rather, it is underscoring of the principle that whatever we come across that purports to be 'truth', whether in word or in writing, it needs to be in accordance with 'the scriptures'. Furthermore, the point remains that Paul was encouraging people to 'check' out the message we hear from 'anyone' with what is in the Scriptures. I think this point comes across quite clearly here and in other verses.

11 These were more noble than those in Thessalonica, in that they received the word with all readiness of mind, and searched the scriptures daily, whether those things were so.

Ttyl,  
John

"Look here?", on: 2009/8/23 2:04

You look here, you have unmitigated gall, as the blind and deceived follower of what is arguably the most anti-christ of all religious institutions, the "church" in Rome, to come onto a Full Gospel Bible believing Protestant forum, foist your apostate and heretical theo-suppositions on said forum and think you won't get a stern rebuke from this poster, think again. Much to my consternation, your being given a pass by most posters here, a pass which I find close to hypocritical.....

and I say that, because if you were a post modern adherent of the "Emergent Church" you would have had ten different posters leaping all over you. If you were a homosexual Episcopal clergyman, or woman, making a post telling us all how we were of a hate-filled nature you'd have 50 posters on you....and heaven forbid you were either a Calvinist or Arminian expousing your viewpoint, then this thread would explode into a 200 post cyber scum.

But since you're a poor blind fool trapped in Romanism, for some reason I can't figure out. Normally Full Gospel Protestants are giving you a pass for your error and blasphemy, which you have done in an aggressive manner. You dare say that Romanism is the "true Church of Jesus Christ"? Well sir, when you're in hell, you'll be cursing the name of the pope who committed the unpardonable sin of proclaiming himself the "Vicar of Christ" and led you into your error and confusion. For the Love of Christ, flee Rome now! The "church" doesn't save you, the Atoning Work of Christ on the Cross saves us, can save you, wake up from your slumber and realize that. REPENT and flee Rome, the pope and his priests are liars, they are leading you all straight into hell.

I don't care if nobody else on this forum will tell you that, I will....and you call me a "bully"? You must not know history. Romanism and its machinations, its murders and murderers, Romanism is the real bully and tool of Satan, history backs me on that.

Repent before it's too late!

(<http://playmp3.sa-media.com/media/6863/6863.mp3>) Fundamentalism versus Apostasy

**Re: "Look here?" - posted by MaryJane, on: 2009/8/23 2:34**

Greetings Brother Neil

I wrote you a pm and I think I made you even more upset then you were. I am sorry for that, Please know that was not my intention. Perhaps my mother being in the Catholic church has caused me to come across as soft on this matter, but that is no excuse. You are correct when you said that the Roman Catholic church is not the true church of Jesus Christ. You are also correct in saying that what has been posted here by Catholic is blasphemy and should be called such. The Catholic church does not save anyone, only Jesus can, He alone is the way to salvation. There are many lost souls who believe the lies of the Catholic church and who follow after dead traditions that are rooted in paganism. I do pray for those who are being deceived by the lies that they might find Jesus, but in the end they are following a false dead religion that will only lead to hell.

To Catholic: your motive seems clear here, you have come and posted to the forums for one of two purposes, one to cause strife or two, hoping to persuade others that what you say is true. Either way I pray you will not be successful. Sadly I know all too well from personal experience that debating with you is pointless and does nothing to further the Kingdom of Jesus.

God bless you brother Neil  
Maryjane

**Re: , on: 2009/8/23 3:00**

God bless you dear sister MJ,  
much much love in Christ, neil

**Re: - posted by Laviver, on: 2009/8/23 4:18**

Just a thought to consider. Even if it is conceded that the first church used men in a more authoritative dimension (in what ever aspect or label), we still must consider the state of things in which they did. The first church cannot be a feasible model to base every point of current church activity, method, or practice. They were in a unique place and time with a unique purpose to carry out. The early church (of Acts) had to build the structure of the church, and so that's what they did.

1 Corinthians 3:10

According to the grace of God which was given to me, as a wise master builder I have laid the foundation, and another builds on it.

Ephesians 2:20

having been built on the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ Himself being the chief cornerstone

The foundation was laid and therefore "foundation-laying" methods need not be used and really cannot be used. It would take destroying the foundation or beginning in new ground to lay again a foundation.

**Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2009/8/23 4:51**

Quote:

-----WHY THE BEREANS REJECTED SOLA SCRIPTURA

By STEVE RAY

-----

I read the entire article and observe a couple of things:

1. The Jews that rejected Paul (keep in mind that many did not reject Paul or the gospel for that matter because the early church was almost exclusively Jewish) were resisting the Holy Ghost. This is not an academic issue, but a heart issue.

And the servant of the Lord must not strive; but be gentle unto all men, apt to teach, patient, In meekness instructing those that oppose themselves; if God peradventure will give them repentance to the acknowledging of the truth; And that they may recover themselves out of the snare of the devil, who are taken captive by him at his will. (II Tim 2:24-26 KJV)

Everyone must acknowledge the truth when they hear it. This is part of the idea of 'letting God be true and every man a liar.' Men must give their 'amen' to what God says. The unbelieving Jews refused to do that in spite of the manifold way in which Jesus Christ was evidently set forth and crucified among them (Galatians 3:1). Again Paul gives important insight as to their disposition:

In meekness instructing those that oppose themselves; if God peradventure will give them repentance to the acknowledging of the truth;

2. The primary cause of the rise of Rabbinic Judaism was that a particular sect of the pharisees fled to Yavneh (Jamnia) and with the help of Rome stamped out all other competing Jewish sects- including other dissenting pharisees. This was a power move to retain authority.

3. The pharisees could prove a false doctrine from scripture. This is why the final authority must be the *rightly divided* word of God. This plays out in Steven's sermon when the religious leaders were 'cut to their hearts.' (Acts 7:54)

He came to His own, and His own did not receive Him. But as many as received Him, to them He gave the right to become children of God, to those who believe in His name: who were born, not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God. John 1:11-13 NKJV

You will search the scriptures from cover to cover and will not find that God handed over the 'authority' to a hierarchy of leaders to interpret the word of God or to issue decrees to His Church. He speaks on a local level to issues at hand within that group if they have 'ears to hear.' There is no need for a bishop or a cardinal or a pope. Jesus Christ deals directly with His people and those to whom He gives revelation of His will are they that are responsible and accountable to God for what they do with that revelation. He did not set up gentile power structures in the churches. We must take seriously the words of the LORD:

But Jesus called them to Himself and said to them, "You know that those who are considered rulers over the Gentiles lord it over them, and their great ones exercise authority over them. Yet it shall not be so among you; but whoever desires to become great among you shall be your servant. And whoever of you desires to be first shall be slave of all. Mark 10:42-44 NKJV

**Re: sola the Word of God - posted by ChrisJD (), on: 2009/8/23 7:07**

Hi everyone,

Quote:  
-----We are told that the Bereans were more noble-minded (open-minded, better disposed, fair)—but more noble-minded than whom? The Thessalonians!  
-----

This isn't exactly true.

They were more noble than **the Jews of Thessalonica that rejected what Paul preached**(see Acts 17:5).

Some of them in Thessalonica did believe(v4), as well as *the devout Greeks a great multitude, and of the chief women not a few.*

Paul writing to the believers in Thessalonica commended them, saying:

"For this cause also thank we God without ceasing, because, when ye received the word of God which ye heard of us, ye received *it* not as the word of men, but as it is in truth, the word of God, which effectually worketh also in you that believe."

- 1Th 2:13(KJV)

Paul did write to them elsewhere, saying that they should hold to the traditions they had been taught, either by word or by letter from them.

They(the Apostles) were sent by God, and those that are sent by God speak the words of God(John 3:34).

And the Lord Jesus said that those that receive a prophet, in the name of a prophet, receive a prophet's reward, and those that received them(the Apostles), received Him that sent them(Mat 10:40-41).

I wish you all well.

**Re: Sola Scriptura is logically untenable - posted by ginnyrose (), on: 2009/8/23 9:48**

Catholic,

I did not read all the entries on this thread so if what I say has been posted, just know there are more folks that think alike! :-)

When I read your original post my mind went to 2 Peter 1:3,4.

Maybe you can start there and see where you end up?

ginnyrose

**Re: "Look here?", on: 2009/8/23 10:23**

Quote:

-----You look here, you have unmitigated gall, as the blind and deceived follower of what is arguably the most anti-christ of all religious institutions, the "church" in Rome, to come onto a Full Gospel Bible believing Protestant forum, foist your apostate and heretical theo-suppositions on said forum and think you won't get a stern rebuke from this poster, think again. Much to my consternation, your being given a pass by most posters here, a pass which I find close to hypocritical....

and I say that, because if you were a post modern adherent of the "Emergent Church" you would have had ten different posters leaping all over you. If you were a homosexual Episcopal clergyman, or woman, making a post telling us all how we were of a hate-filled nature you'd have 50 posters on you....and heaven forbid you were either a Calvinist or Arminian expounding your viewpoint, then this thread would explode into a 200 post cyber scrum.

But since you're a poor blind fool trapped in Romanism, for some reason I can't figure out. Normally Full Gospel Protestants are giving you a pass for your error and blasphemy, which you have done in an aggressive manner. You dare say that Romanism is the "true Church of Jesus Christ"? Well sir, when you're in hell, you'll be cursing the name of the pope who committed the unpardonable sin of proclaiming himself the "Vicar of Christ" and led you into your error and confusion. For the Love of Christ, flee Rome now! The "church" doesn't save you, the Atoning Work of Christ on the Cross saves us, can save you, wake up from your slumber and realize that. REPENT and flee Rome, the pope and his priests are liars, they are leading you all straight into hell.

I don't care if nobody else on this forum will tell you that, I will....and you call me a "bully"? You must not know history. Romanism and its machinations, its murders and murderer's, Romanism is the real bully and tool of Satan, history backs me on that.

Repent before it's too late!

Fundamentalism versus Apostasy

-----

Amen.

**Re: Sola Scriptura is logically untenable - posted by crsschk (), on: 2009/8/23 11:15**

Hello Catholic,

A little background, preliminaries. I was raised a 'Catholic' and have probably a different perspective than more than a few of those who contribute here.

I wanted to lift a section that Robert posted earlier and bring it forward for especial emphasis;

*Again Paul gives important insight as to their disposition:*

*In meekness instructing those that oppose themselves; if God peradventure will give them repentance to the acknowledging of the truth;*

It really could be shortened to; *In meekness instructing* and emphasized ultimately by further reducing it to just *In meekness ...*

That is intended to whomever it might apply to.

Quote:

-----It is not sufficient. And I would submit that the wide variance of opinions held by sincere seekers is proof that it is insufficient.

Why? Because the Scriptures need to be interpreted. And herein lies the problem. Each of us is FALLABLE. And therefore so is our interpretation.

It is amazing to me to see so many who believe that the Holy Spirit was able to preserve the written text of Scripture and yet not believe that He preserved an infallible interpreter of those Scriptures.

-----

It seems this last statement can only be attributed to what the Roman Catholic church believes is that infallible interpreter, namely the pope. But it then begs the question, where is this idea found in either written or 'oral' tradition that it was so?

Moreover, what is the track record of popery down through the centuries? 'Infallible'? If this was true at the onset then there should have been no need for a continued re-writing, clarifying and correcting of the volumes of Catholic canon's teachings\doctrines etc. It really brings us back to square one and your astute statement that "Each of us is FALLABLE."

Popes inclusive.

So where does it leave us?

Much gets lost in translation ... And by that I mean more so in the sense of where any of us are coming from. I would make no apology that this statement, from Scripture, holds more value and truth than any as it applies here;

Rom 3:4 God forbid: yea, let God be true, but every man a liar; as it is written, That thou mightest be justified in thy sayings, and mightest overcome when thou art judged.

My perspective is that there is far too much that we do not know and are not intended to know - It puts the necessary distance between us and Almighty God. Bluntly, there is that mystery that is honored and respected, even welcomed that I f

and curiously circumspect that we mere men would push this out of the way to force our cleverly designed schemes, interpretations as ipso facto ... We talk out of both sides of our mouths by granting that we are fallible and yet go on as if we were infallible in our understanding.

What I haven't seen yet reading through this is the very appeal that Paul used above;

"It is written."

Jesus, more than any appealed to this phraseology and variations of it. Why? Why the emphasis? Why the appealing to it?

I also read the article that was posted on the Bereans. It is interesting what we can hone in on and apply our emphasis to, not any different than what I am doing here, so it is only an observation. Mine would be to emphasize that aspect that stands out to my mind;

Act 17:11 These were more noble than those in Thessalonica, in that they received the word with all readiness of mind, and searched the scriptures daily, whether those things were so.

Since this seems to be the end result of the matter .. Are they so or are they not so? Part of the reasoning in the article that comes to mind is a forgetting of all the other scripture that warns us of the seemingly opposite - Of not trusting every wind of doctrine etc. Really the bridge word seems to be "and" - Ready to accept but not without some due diligence and checking of that which had been written or preserved .. does it square?

The study of the word "written" throughout scripture is telling and seems to answer most of the objections itself. I think there is some simple logic that has some if not most of us appealing to a "sola scriptura" as very logical indeed. Not that it has to be crafted or taken precisely from Luther or anyone else for that matter.

It is obvious enough that things were communicated 'orally' and preserved in written form, not the other way round. And wasn't the chief denunciation from Jesus Himself contained in;

Mat 15:3 But he answered and said unto them, Why do ye also transgress the commandment of God by your tradition?

Mar 7:8 For laying aside the commandment of God, ye hold the tradition of men, as the washing of pots and cups: and many other such like things ye do.

Mat 23:2 Saying, The scribes and the Pharisees sit in Moses' seat:

Mat 23:3 All therefore whatsoever they bid you observe, that observe and do; but do not ye after their works: for they say, and do not.

Mat 23:4 For they bind heavy burdens and grievous to be borne, and lay them on men's shoulders; but they themselves will not move them with one of their fingers.

Mat 23:5 But all their works they do for to be seen of men: they make broad their phylacteries, and enlarge the borders of their garments,

Mat 23:6 And love the uppermost rooms at feasts, and the chief seats in the synagogues,

Mat 23:7 And greetings in the markets, and to be called of men, Rabbi, Rabbi.

Mat 23:8 But be not ye called Rabbi: for one is your Master, even Christ; and all ye are brethren.

Mat 23:9 And call no man your father upon the earth: for one is your Father, which is in heaven.

Mat 23:10 Neither be ye called masters: for one is your Master, even Christ.

Mat 23:11 But he that is greatest among you shall be your servant.

Mat 23:12 And whosoever shall exalt himself shall be abased; and he that shall humble himself shall be exalted.

Mat 23:13 But woe unto you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! for ye shut up the kingdom of heaven against men: for ye neither go in yourselves, neither suffer ye them that are entering to go in.

Really more scripture than I intended and maybe not those that would emphasize the point - Was it not their interpretations themselves that Jesus took umbrage at? However they came about?

Is the issue really what the style of communication is\was or whether or not the point was made and understood?

Is it really any different then than it is today?

The reason that some of us hold strictly to what has been written is more logical than I would forward dogmatic or theological ... We do not and cannot live 2000 years ago. What are we going to appeal to after all? There is a written *record* of things that were said *then* and further back to that which Jesus Himself and the apostles appealed to in the Old Testament. It's all very simplistic. How we interpret it all is our issue and never-ending debate.

Coming back to your original premise;

Quote:  
-----The Bible never claims to be the only rule for faith and practice. Scripture claims to be God-breathed or inspired. We taught the world to believe this. It claims to be inerrant. We also taught the world to believe this over a millennium before Martin Luther ever came along. It claims to be the Word of God. We also taught the world to believe this.  
-----

Your emphasis on "we" colors your premise as biased and that is understandable, I am sure my own comes across just as well, but I am not interested in holding to something just because it is a 'teaching' or even a 'tradition' ... The only thing we have is something *comparable*, what is it that we can apply the test to if not scripture? At some point the 'canon' had to, of necessity, be closed ... I don't want to open up a whole Pandora's box here with endless questions and "what abounds" (not that I haven't given ample examples myself).

What does it amount to? You see, there is something contradictory about cloaking ourselves in the garb of certain constructs - For yourself as a Catholic Apologist apparently and for others and here there are more than one stripe or flavor if you will ...

Is the attempt to force a construct or is it really an attempt to understand where we are coming from? If it's the former, then the expectation is going to be met with a natural resistance, if the latter is really true then there is no reason for any nastiness or perceived motivation. I see no reason why these things cannot be discussed without accusation and conjecture.

I must come back to what seems to be the crux of your premise;

Quote:  
-----It is amazing to me to see so many who believe that the Holy Spirit was able to preserve the written text of Scripture and yet not believe that He preserved an infallible interpreter of those Scriptures.  
-----

Truly, isn't the onus on yourself then to provide something factual that supports an 'infallible interpreter'? Where does it come from? What supports it both in scripture and outside of it? To me, the reasoning becomes circular ... whether it's quote unquote 'oral', tradition or scripture it should reconcile itself. The cart before the horse or the cart after the horse is really just semantics. It is either so or it is not so, true or not true and it doesn't matter one iota what 'title' or heading, what lense it's viewed through.

Since I have gone on this long ... Fenelon, Familiar with him? I think in some way's I have met some silent resistance here over the years simply appealing to him. And that is due to his "Catholic" attributes, but I am less interested in the garb than what the man had to say and whether that can be reconciled with what is understood at the root or the heart of the

matter.

All that only to say that this is a very vast and wide set of resources available here, I can only hope that you might avail yourself of it, maybe be challenged by it ... I think most of us who participate here are really sincere at getting to the bottom of matters.

A warm welcome to you.

**Re: , on: 2009/8/23 15:27**

Why do you people keep calling the catholic religion the catholic church?

It is not a church, it never has been, never will be.

You know what the church is, the body of people

who have been purchased by the blood of Jesus.

On the other hand the catholic religion is a man made institution and although a few believers may attend it's functions the catholic religion itself cannot be the church.

It does not meet the requirements of the meaning of the word church or Ekklesia in Greek.

For you Greek Scholars

"The New Testament Greek Lexicon

Strong's Number: 1577

in a Christian sense

1. an assembly of Christians gathered for worship in a religious meeting
2. a company of Christian, or of those who, hoping for eternal salvation through Jesus Christ, observe their own religious rites, hold their own religious meetings, and manage their own affairs, according to regulations prescribed for the body for order's sake
3. those who anywhere, in a city, village, constitute such a company and are united into one body
4. the whole body of Christians scattered throughout the earth
5. the assembly of faithful Christians already dead and received into heaven

**Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2009/8/23 16:38**

Quote:

-----Why do you people keep calling the catholic religion the catholic church?  
-----

Your tone here is hardly moderate. But to answer your question it is in part because the condition of what was once known as the 'Universal Church' (Catholic church) in the beginning was not as it became during the Dark Ages post Constantine.

If we want to be pedantic then we would really be narrowing down who and what constitutes a 'church'. For example, it would not be proper to refer to 'the Baptist church', 'the Pentecostal church' or the Methodist church', etc. For a good look into what the scripture teaching is concerning the Church and churches I would recommend G.H. Lang's 'The Churches of God.'



Re: , on: 2009/8/23 17:01

Moderate ?

You are correct, having grown up in the catholic religion and having seen its influence on damning the souls of many of my relatives makes it pretty difficult to be moderate when discussing this religion spawned in hell.

Re: Sola Scriptura is logically untenable - posted by Heydave (), on: 2009/8/23 17:34

Quote:  
----- The Bible never claims to be the only rule for faith and practice. Scripture claims to be God-breathed or inspired. We taught the world to believe this. It claims to be inerrant. We also taught the world to believe this over a millennium before Martin Luther ever came along. It claims to be the Word of God. We also taught the world to believe this.  
-----

Quote:  
-----Why? Because the Scriptures need to be interpreted. And herein lies the problem. Each of us is FALLABLE. And therefore so is our interpretation.  
-----

From these two statements you make the issue is WHO IS THE INTERPRETER?

Well scripture (which you claim is inerrant) tells us very clearly.

Jesus said: 'But the helper, The Holy Spirit, whom the Father will send in my name, He will teach you ALL things and bring to your remembrance ALL things I have said to you'. (John 14 v26).

and again..."However when He, the Spirit of truth comes, He will guide you into ALL truth. (John 16 v13).

Paul said: 'Now we have not received the spirit of the world, but the Spirit who is from God, that we might KNOW the things that have been freely given to us by God'. (1 Corinthians 2 v12). 'But the natural man does not receive the things of God for they are foolishness to him, nor can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned.'(v14)

Now it is only to those who HAVE received the Spirit of God that can KNOW and understand the word of God. It is spiritually discerned.

Jesus said: 'Most assuredly, I say to you, unless a man is born again he cannot SEE the kingdom of God. (John 3 v3). ' Unless one is born of water and of Spirit, he cannot enter the Kingdom of God'.

Jesus said: 'He who believes (trusts and depends) in the Son has everlasting life and He who does not believe (trust and rely) on the Son shall not see life, but the wrath of God abides on him'. (John 3 v36).

So unless we come to Jesus Christ and trust Him alone for our salvation, we cannot be saved or have the promise of His Spirit.

So in a sense Scripture on it's own, although sufficient and complete is of no benefit to us without the Holy Spirit to interpret it to us.

However if you are trusting in a religious system or a pope, you are not trusting in The Lord Jesus Christ and therefore you are lost and need to be 'born again' by repentance from dead religion and sin and have faith in the FINISHED work of Christ on the cross.

I was there once and nothing but Christ Jesus and His Spirit can give you life and enlightenment. I pray you will look to Him and His word (they are one)alone and find true life. This LIFE is in the Son.

**Rev Enue, on: 2009/8/23 19:17**

this thread itself, and the responses given, and slack cut, are very illuminating, as to the supposed witness of the Church . Disturbingly illuminating. Amen to what you wrote, to me, its not even a "religion", its an "institution".

**Re: - posted by Logic, on: 2009/8/23 19:18**

Quote:

-----

Catholic wrote:

The Bible is inerrant. But it needs to be interpreted...

...You speak of the Bible as though it needs no interpretation or clarification or careful exegesis to be understood.

-----

Yes, the Scriptures do need to be interpreted.

In fact, every one has there own interpretation; Even though some may have the same interpretation as one group of people, while some have the same as another group of people.

This is where we get denominations.

However, when He, the Spirit of Truth, comes, He will guide you into all Truth. He will not speak on his own; he will speak only what he hears, and he will tell you what is yet to come. **John 16:13**

The Interpreter is in us.

**Mat 23:8** But do not be called Rabbi; for One is your Teacher, and you are all brothers.

**9** And do not call anyone on earth your father; for One is your Father, He who is in heaven.

**:10** And do not be called leaders; for One is your Leader, that is, Christ.

IOW: to not say that a man is your interpreter.

None the less, anyone can know the Scriptures with out knowing the Father, or even the Son for that matter.

It is vain to read the Scriptures without getting to know the Author of the Scriptures.

This verse is so true:

**John 5:39a** You diligently study the Scriptures because you think that by them you possess eternal life

Eternal life is only from a relationship with the Father through Christ.

**Re: - posted by BenBrockway, on: 2009/8/23 21:41**

crsschk and RobertW. Your posts were spot on. I couldn't have said it any better!

:-)

**Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2009/8/23 22:14**

Quote:

-----Moderate ?

You are correct, having grown up in the catholic religion and having seen its influence on damning the souls of many of my relatives makes it pretty difficult to be moderate when discussing this religion spawned in hell.

-----

This may be but the same can be said for all sorts of things. The wrath of man does not work the righteousness of God. And though I share in the resentment of any false doctrine or sin that may damn souls I must be careful not to allow that to come out in a way that would cause me to misrepresent God. I have been very disturbed by the tone of how this thread has gone. I have not posted on SI in a while and was surprised at what I was seeing. Just being honest. What hope do we have of reaching someone in deception if we manifest this type of behavior? What if Steven in Acts 7 would have acted out? I tell you Paul the Apostle may have had a very different attitude towards Christ. But it was in the heat of the battle

le that He still yielded the fruit of the Spirit that was so unlike anything Saul (later Paul) had ever seen. And this is the challenge of our times; are we full of the Holy Ghost in such a way as to battle it out in the marketplace of ideas in the union and power of the Holy Spirit- while being true to the virtues of the Holy Spirit.

The Lord's bond-servant must not be quarrelsome, but be kind to all, able to teach, patient when wronged,

**Re: - posted by ADisciple (), on: 2009/8/23 22:48**

Quote:

-----What hope do we have of reaching someone in deception if we manifest this type of behavior?  
-----

I agree. I understand that the heresy of Roman Catholicism cuts to the quick in many hearts. But error is defeated with Truth, not with inflammatory remarks.

Let us trust the One with the sharp sword with two edges. This is first and foremost His battle. Let us all submit ourselves to Him.

**Re: , on: 2009/8/24 0:07**

Moderator:

Thank you for your kind welcome. Thanks as well for your thoughtful engagement on this topic. I look forward to seeing where the Lord will take us with all of this.

Natan:

Just telling someone that hell is a million degrees hot and "repent" without any substantial thought joined with charity behind it would well classify as a clanging gong and sounding symbol. Don't you think? Especially since I already believe in hell and the necessity of repentance.

I could easily digress into such a rampage about your blasphemy against the Church of Jesus Christ which is His body (notice its the body/physically represented not soul/invisible).

But I will refrain because I honestly don't think you've ever read an objective piece of paper on the subjects you claim to speak of. You are filled with anti-Catholic claims that you blindly accept as fact.

I still don't see how you think the gospel was lost for 1500 years and suddenly appeared on the scene with Luther and Calvin.

To the rest of you:

I am very glad that so many have taken time to honestly engage me on these issues. RobertW, please be patient with me as I truly want to respond to all of your questions and issues raised.

I think the best thing for me to do with the time I have is to eat this elephant a bite at a time and God-willing we can get to everything in time. Sound OK?

All I can do is ask you all to please read all of this. I am doing my best to read all of your posts. I think it is reasonable to ask you all to at least read my one post. Here we go:

Let me state this...that the man who declares that he accepts only the Bible as his authority in religious matters does not really mean it. For he really believes in what he himself thinks any given passage of the Bible to mean, which might not be what the Bible means at all. For such a person, the only ultimate authority in religious matters is not that of the Bible, BUT THAT OF HIS OWN JUDGEMENT CONCERNING IT, and he has no assurance that his own judgment is any more reliable than that of others whose interpretation differs from his and who honestly believe his interpretation to be quite mistaken.

I mention this here merely to bring out the fact that the Catholic position is not affected by such difficulties. For it holds that Christ never intended the Bible alone to be each man's "guide book" to religious truth.

His method was to establish a Church authorized by him to teach mankind in his name. He chose his apostles, trained them, and commissioned them to go and to teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost, "teaching them all things whatsoever I have commanded you" (Matt. 28:20). He did not tell them to write any books. No books of the New Testament were written until years after his death.

But the first Christians were not without guidance. The Acts of the Apostles tells us that they "were persevering in the doctrine of the apostles" (Acts 2:42).

Christ, therefore, meant the official teaching of the apostles and of their successors in the Church to be our guide, not the written Bible which is so liable to misinterpretation by its various individual readers, however sincere they may be.

The Bible, as the very Word of God, is true in itself, but not all the conclusions people choose to draw from it are necessarily right. And this brings us to a further and very vital point of divergence between the position of Protestants generally and that of the Catholic Church.

"Private interpretation"

Apart from the question of the adequacy or inadequacy of the Bible, the problem of its interpretation is one of the first importance. It can have authority for us as the Word of God only provided we rightly grasp exactly what God intended to say. No meanings other than those he intended to be read into the text by men have any divine authority at all.

It has been said that once one admits that the Bible contains the revelation of God himself, then we have to admit that no man can go wrong if he is guided by it. If he were really guided by it, that would of course be true, at least as regards that part of divine revelation which has been recorded in its pages.

But the trouble is that a man can wrongly think he is being guided by the Bible when in reality he is not, owing to his having misunderstood it. And is it not true, passing over for the moment the fact that for over a thousand years before the invention of the printing press it was impossible for each man to have a Bible, that when universal distribution became possible sincere and earnest Bible readers arrived at a multitude of conflicting conclusions?

If private interpretation were God's way, the same Holy Spirit would have led all confiding in his assistance to one and the same truth. (this forum might not even exist?)

Against these considerations, the command of Christ has been urged that we "search the Scriptures" (John 5:39). But the thousands of well-intentioned Protestants who have quoted those words as if indeed they were a command have been led astray by the translation in the Protestant Authorized Version of the Bible, a translation which has been corrected in the Protestant Revised Version to "You search the Scriptures."

Christ was stating a fact, not giving a command. He was addressing a group of Jews and blaming them for not recognizing him as the fulfillment of all that the Scriptures had predicted about him. The . . . Protestant Revised Standard Version describes him as saying, "You do not have his word abiding in you, for you do not believe him whom he has sent. You search the Scriptures, because you think that in them you have eternal life; and it is they that bear witness to me."

As a matter of fact, the whole passage is fatal to the contention that by searching the Scriptures one will necessarily arrive at the truth. The very ones to whom Christ was speaking had searched the Scriptures in the sincere belief that by such means they would learn all that was necessary for eternal life. Christ acknowledged that they really thought in such a way. And yet they had not arrived at the truth!

"Bible its own interpreter"

A way out of these difficulties was thought to be found in the contention that the Bible, as no other book can boast, is its own interpreter. After all, it was urged, since the Bible contains the inspired Word of the infinite God, no interpretation of it by any finite mind could possibly do it justice. We must therefore hold that the Word of God interprets itself to each

sincere reader of the Bible.

It is really impossible, though, to maintain such a position. Although sacred Scripture is inspired by the "infinite God," we cannot escape accepting the interpretation placed upon it by finite minds.

After all, Scripture must mean something. To declare that meaning is to interpret it. And as human beings have only finite minds, they must either rely on meanings derived from it by their finite minds or refuse to attribute any meaning to Scripture at all.

No book, even one inspired by God, can be its own interpreter, and the very suggestion that the Bible is self-interpreting is opposed to its own teaching. For not only does the Bible nowhere claim to be "its own interpreter," it declares the very opposite. Thus we read in the Acts of the Apostles that, when Philip found the Ethiopian reading the Bible, he said to him, "Thinkest thou that thou understandest what thou readest?" The man replied, "And how can I, unless some man show me?" Then Philip, in the name of the Church, interpreted the Scriptures for him (Acts 8:27-39).

Writing to Timothy, St. Paul tells him that it is the Church of the living God which is "the pillar and the ground of truth" (1 Tim. 3:15). Again, he tells him, as a bishop of that Church, to "keep the good thing committed to thy trust by the Holy Ghost...Preach the word...reprove, entreat, rebuke in all patience and doctrine" (2 Tim. 1:14, 3:2). What does that mean but to interpret Scripture correctly and insist on the acceptance of the true interpretation declared in the name of the Church wherever it is a question of such doctrines as are contained in the Bible?

The choice, then, is between interpretations proposed by unauthorized and fallible human minds and those of an authorized and infallible teacher in this world if such exists. The Bible contains the truth, but not everyone, even with the best of good will, is able to discern the truth it contains.

The Bible needs an authoritative teacher to explain its meaning in innumerable passages if misunderstandings are to be avoided. If a teacher is needed in schools to explain the text-books dealing with the mysteries of nature itself, how much more necessary is a teacher to explain the mysteries of divine revelation contained in Holy Scripture!

The Catholic Church, and the Catholic Church alone, claims to be the divinely-appointed and infallible teacher at hand for this purpose, and hers is the only truly biblical position.

"Holy Spirit speaks"

Lacking faith in the Catholic Church and not finding her claims acceptable, Protestants go on to declare that even if the Bible as a book cannot be its own interpreter, at least the Holy Spirit is infallible, and he can render each reader infallible in his interpretations provided he has faith in Christ and is prepared to rely entirely upon the guidance of the Holy Spirit.

But if each sincere reader of the Bible is rendered infallible by the Holy Spirit in discerning the meaning God intended to reveal, what is this but to claim for each believer an infallibility before which the much more modest claims of Catholics to one infallible pope pale into insignificance!

But descending from the ideal plane to that of the real, is it not astonishing that millions of would-be infallible readers of the Bible are not dismayed by the fact that they arrive at a multitude of mutually-exclusive conclusions?

Results in practice make it almost a blasphemy to say that the Holy Spirit has anything to do with such a host of contradictory interpretations!

Just consider the multitude of different Protestant churches which have been established in accordance with the immense variety of opinions arising from the private interpretation of Holy Scripture! Thus we have Lutherans and Calvinists, Anglicans and Baptists, Congregationalists, Presbyterians, and Methodists, and the host of more recent sects, such as the Seventh Day Adventists, Mormons, Christian Scientists, Witnesses of Jehovah, and an almost unending list of others, each claiming to be based upon the Bible.

The height of absurdity is reached by such extravagances as those of the Kentucky snake cults whose members believe they can be bitten at will by poisonous reptiles without any ill-effects, thinking their practice to be justified by a passage in St. Mark's Gospel: "They shall take up serpents...and it shall not hurt them" (Mark 16:18).

In reality, they base their practice on their own wrong interpretation of those words. Christ did not say that the miraculous sign he promised would be always operative for everybody. Among the signs shown by his followers sometimes even such things as being unharmed by serpents could be expected. But always it would be a miracle wrought by God when God willed, not a kind of magic within the power of deluded people when they willed.

The Acts of the Apostles tells us that St. Paul was bitten by a viper and that God preserved him from harm (Acts 28:5). But St. Paul was not guilty of presumption, deliberately allowing himself to be bitten and then challenging God to protect him--a form of presumption which our Lord expressly condemned (Luke 4:12).

When the devil told Christ to cast himself down from the pinnacle of the Temple, quoting Scripture to show that no harm would come to him, our Lord replied, "Thou shalt not tempt the Lord thy God" (Matt. 4:7). Men have not the right to dare God to do even what they think, rightly or wrongly, that God has promised to do.

Even in the earliest years of the Protestant Reformation, during the Elizabethan era, Shakespeare made Bassanio say, "In religion, what damned error, but some sober brow will bless it, and approve it with a text" (Merchant of Venice, III:2). But it is doubtful whether Shakespeare himself foresaw such grotesque outbreaks resulting from the so-called principle of private judgment as those of the Kentucky snake cults!

What has to be noticed, however, is that such fantastic cults are the effect of the same principle as that claimed for themselves by the more sedate and respectable Protestant denominations which reject the authority of the Catholic Church and declare that they have the right to be guided by their own individual interpretations of Holy Scripture.

#### Bible and reunion of churches

There is a growing consciousness of the evil of all these divisions among Protestants today. They pay much more attention than they once did to the prayer of Christ "that they all may be one as thou, Father, in me, and I in thee" (John 17:21). More and more we hear them speaking about "the sin of our disunity." But the astonishing thing is that they still believe that the only thing needed to bring about unity is for all men to take up the study of one and the same Bible for themselves. This is merely to propose as a remedy for their divisions the very thing that caused them in the first place!

#### Catholic Attitude

In the light of all this, surely it is not difficult to understand the objections of the Catholic Church to the idea that each reader individually should constitute himself an independent judge as to the meaning of the Bible.

As I have suggested earlier, this is practically to claim that each reader is rendered infallible by the Holy Spirit as often as he devotes himself earnestly to the reading of Holy Scripture, a claim far in excess of any claim made by Catholics even for that one man only, the pope, whose infallibility is exercised on isolated occasions only and within the limits of the most exacting conditions.

What, then, does the Catholic Church say? She permits and encourages the private reading of Scripture. But she says definitely that no one has the right to interpret the Bible for himself in any way opposed to the official teachings of the ancient Catholic Church. Passing over the fact that the majority of people lack the required training in the many different sciences bearing upon scriptural interpretation necessary even for a merely natural understanding of the Bible, we have to reckon with the positive provision made by Christ for our instruction in his religion.

The Bible itself tells us that "no prophecy of Scripture is made by private interpretation" (2 Pet. 1:20). It tells us that Christ established and guaranteed his Church, that he commissioned that Church to "teach all nations" (Matt. 28:19) in his name, and that he said of it, "he that heareth you, heareth me" (Luke 10:16), and also, "If a man will not hear the Church, let him be to thee as the heathen" (Matt. 18:17). No wonder St. Paul declared the "Church of the living God" to be "the pillar and the ground of truth" (1 Tim. 3:15).

That, then, is the Catholic position. Christ never made his religion dependent upon each individual's private interpretation of the Bible. His infinite wisdom would not choose a method which would lead, and has led, as we have seen, to division, chaos, and driftage from religion altogether. He established the Catholic Church, and that Church can say with her divine Master to those who profess to believe in the Bible that the very Scriptures upon which they claim to rely bear witness of her (John 5:39). She is the appointed guide to which, in obedience to Christ, we Catholics submit.

Speaking of the sixteenth-century Reformers, the eminent Congregationalist Scripture scholar, Professor C. H. Dodd, says, "In placing the Bible at the disposal of the uninstructed they took a fateful step. It could now be read, and was widely read, 'without note or comment,' without the guidance which had been supplied by tradition. To allow and encourage this was inevitably to admit the right of private judgment in interpreting it. exposed to the possible vagaries of private interpretation, an absolute authority displacing the authority of the Catholic Church."

May the Holy Spirit enlighten your hearts as you consider these things,

Catholic

**Re: - posted by Heydave (), on: 2009/8/24 5:10**

Catholic wrote:

Quote:  
-----The Catholic Church, and the Catholic Church alone, claims to be the divinely-appointed and infallible teacher at hand for this purpose, and hers is the only truly biblical position.  
-----

This statement would be laughable if it were not so serious!

Jesus said: 'by their fruit you will know them'. We all know the fruit of the Roman Catholic system, it is well recorded in history and even in this present day continues to exhibit the same bad fruit.

So I know without doubt that it IS NOT divinely appointed, but by Jesus' instructions on how to test teachers, it is clearly a FALSE PROPHET.

You are a Catholic apologist, so what will you apologise for?

The sexual abuse of tens of thousands of innocent children (still happening today)?

The murder and torture of tens of thousands of people who disagreed with the Roman doctrine?

The worship of idols?

Praying to the dead?

Selling forgiveness of sins?

I could go on, but the point is 'By their fruit you will know them'.....

Your position is untenable! Even if God chose to use one organisation to preserve the true interpretation of truth, it cannot be the Roman Catholics, YOU FAIL THE TEST!

**to the 'wolf' in sheep's clothing, "catholic" , on: 2009/8/24 5:55**

if I am the only poster on this forum who repudiates your romanism and your apostasy, so be it, for the institution in Rome totally and utterly denies the Atoning Precious Blood of Christ, It is Jesus and Him crucified, Saviour and Messiah, taking the form of man, Son of God who went to the Cross, the cruel tree, to make atonement to cover our sins, Jesus is the One Who saves us, not that faux sinful Roman institution, and the man of perdition, your pope, who claims he is the vicar of Christ. This is sinful, and spits in the Eye of God, and you are right, I have no love for this sinfulness. For a GROUP OF PEOPLE TO CALL THE POPE "Holy Father" is the most sinful denomic pronouncement ever uttered, there is only ONE Holy Father and that is God Almighty, any other pronouncement is of the devil.

You wrote:

Quote:  
-----Don't you think? Especially since I already believe in hell and the necessity of repentance.  
-----

Insult aside, I'm glad you "believe" in hell and glad you "believe" in the necessity of repentance, but stop "believing" and start walking in the way of Truth, and walk away from Rome and walk away from the dictates of popery and walk into the waiting Arms of Jesus, He is your only Hope. Romanism and popery are the road to hell, the other posters around here, I believe, think that they can convince you of your error by dialogue. I disagree. Light has no fellowship with darkness, and right now, you are firmly embraced in the bosom of the anti-Christ. I say that because you lift up the pope and since the pope in all truth denies Christ's provisions, he is anti-Christ, and by you embracing that hellish blasphemous institution, you are a minion of anti-Christ, a confused soul trapped in the tar pits of Romanism and popery.

I am not speaking out of ignorance as you so claim, I am speaking out of truth, and the Gospel of the Lord Jesus Christ was NOT lost, it was embraced by Godly men who would not kiss the ring of this beast in Rome, men who gave their blood as martyrs to protect the True Gospel of the Lord Jesus Christ, a True Gospel that utterly repudiated the blasphemy of Rome and its idolatry and fornications, superstitions and Mary worship. Its history is so sick and sinful, I am bewildered that I am one of the few posters that is calling that scarlet whore of Babylon, Romanism, what is really is, blasphemous and sinful, a tool of Satan.

Please, I am begging you, turn away from this sin, before it's too late, please. Jesus can and WILL save you.

**Re: Authority and Accountability - posted by RobertW (), on: 2009/8/24 7:45**

Quote:  
-----Let me state this...that the man who declares that he accepts only the Bible as his authority in religious matters does not really mean it. For he really believes in what he himself thinks any given passage of the Bible to mean, which might not be what the Bible means at all. For such a person, the only ultimate authority in religious matters is not that of the Bible, BUT THAT OF HIS OWN JUDGEMENT CONCERNING IT, and he has no assurance that his own judgment is any more reliable than that of others whose interpretation differs from his and who honestly believe his interpretation to be quite mistaken.  
-----

This is where error begets more error. When it comes to accountability it is not an organization or some other man that will give an account to God for me- but each person will give an account to God for himself/herself and that which the Lord has entrusted to them. The scriptures do not support the notion of an additional mediator between us and God. And because God has made me accountable as an *individual* for all I believe and how I respond to that belief, the responsibility for discovery also rests on me as an *individual*.

Yes, and all that will live godly in Christ Jesus shall suffer persecution. But continue you in the things which you have learned and have been assured of, knowing of whom you have learned them; And that from a child you have known the holy scriptures, which are able to make you wise to salvation through faith which is in Christ Jesus. All scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness: That the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished to all good works. (II Timothy 3-4) ASV

This is just one example of how individuals are accountable for responding rightly to those things that they know are true. At this stage in Church history there is absolutely no framework of authority whatsoever in the Church, but that individual churches with their individual lampstands received revelation from Christ intended to keep that local church a right representation of God fulfilling the purposes of the churches as God had designed them.

The apostles founded churches and nothing else. Those churches existed independent of each other. Keep that clear. There was never a 'head of the Churches' or an organized hierarchy of leadership passing on rulings and doctrines enforced upon the rest. This is certainly the case also in Acts 15. God did not intend that the church at Jerusalem would somehow impose authority over the church at Antioch, but rather the question was more of a general position as to what was to be expected of the gentiles as they came to Christ. Keep that clear also.

Any attempt to establish anything beyond a local church must be admitted to be a humanly devised entity.

And when they had preached the gospel to that city, and had taught many, they returned again to Lystra, and to Iconium, and Antioch (Acts 14:22)

And he went through Syria and Cilicia, confirming the churches. (Acts 15:41)

This is just a few examples, again, of how the apostles were in the business of winning souls to Christ that might become



e assemblies meeting together in the name of the Lord and that Christ would walk in the midst of them revealing His will and purpose to that local assembly. This is Christ as the head of the Body focusing on the specific needs of that local group. In this way though there are 7 lampstands in Revelation 2-3 there are as many lampstands in the earth as there are local assemblies gathering together in His name. Each of these lampstands serve the purpose as being a light in the area they are established.

So accountability to God can pass no father than the local assembly and the individuals within that assembly because that is the extent to which God designed His order within the churches. Jesus Christ our great High Priest functions as the Holy Priest of the Old Testament maintaining the oil and flame of the lampstand. It is HIS job and no one else.

And because the local churches are autonomous they can live and die without effecting the rest of the Body. This model cannot be improved upon. Had men hearkened to God's design in establishing churches we had seen a great deal more progress in the spread of the Gospel and a lot less deception spreading like wildfire through hierarchies and organizations. I have come to realize over the years both the Wisdom of God and the folly of men as they have presumed to alter His design in their lust for power and authority. What will God do with men that have run roughshod over His design desiring to ascend into the hill of God and be like the Most High God?

**Re: - posted by whyme, on: 2009/8/24 8:13**

Catholic,

I apologize if my response to your original question has already been addressed in a like manner to my question back to you but the thread responses are long and I hope my question has an answer inherently in it that is satisfying to you. I would answer your question with a question and that is, is Scripture sufficient for the believer? If so, then I don't have to look anywhere else or to anyone else but merely discern the spirits in the manner prescribed in the epistles and check all teaching by Scripture ( as the Bereans did ) to see if what is being taught is true.

**Re: - posted by ginnyrose (), on: 2009/8/24 10:04**

Quote:  
-----that is, is Scripture sufficient for the believer? If so, then I don't have to look anywhere else or to anyone else but merely discern the spirits in the manner prescribed in the epistles and check all teaching by Scripture ( as the Bereans did ) to see if what is being taught is true.  
-----

AMEN!

I have one observation to share.

Protestants like to think they believe in sola scripture, that they have no pope to whom they must look to know how scripture is to be understood. But let an issue come up on which there is a disagreement, sola scripture is not adequate: a writer, a scholar, leader must be used to tell one how this is to be understood. Yup, evangelicals do the same thing: they just do not call these scholars, leaders pope.

My conclusion is this is an area all Christians struggle with in some form or another - we are not immune from it, unfortunately, because the enemy of our souls is working hard to destroy wherever and however he can (EDIT) to divert our attention away from God himself, a violation of the first commandment. And he is succeeding.

ginnyrose

**Re: - posted by InTheLight (), on: 2009/8/24 10:17**

Quote:  
-----To allow and encourage this was inevitably to admit the right of private judgment in interpreting it. exposed to the possible vagaries of private interpretation, an absolute authority displacing the authority of the Catholic Church  
-----

Statements such as this, no matter what their source, make it very clear that Catholics have authority in the wrong place.

The authority is not in the body, it is in the Head (Eph. 1:22-23; Col. 1:18). The ruling is not in the kingdom, but in the King (Heb. 7:1-2; Rev. 1:5-6). The authority is not in the church, but in Christ (Matt. 28:18; 1 Pet. 3:22). The church is not the Savior, but simply the body of the saved (Acts 2:47; Eph. 5:22-24).

Quote:  
-----The Catholic Church, and the Catholic Church alone, claims to be the divinely-appointed and infallible teacher at hand for this purpose, and hers is the only truly biblical position.  
-----

It's interesting that the Catholics claim that the church cannot teach error because Jesus promised to always be with the church but there are many verses in the New testament that declare that the church would not be preserved from error. The Bible clearly speaks of a great falling away and that many false teachers would come from **within** the church and **many** would follow them. Even bishops would be the source of false teaching according to Acts 20.

The Apostle Paul wrote in 2 Thessalonians 2 that the apostasy was already underway, "for the mystery of iniquity is already at work..." (Verse 7). It started in Paul's day and was to continue until the second coming of Christ. He added, "...Whom the Lord Jesus will slay with the breath of his mouth and will destroy with the brightness of his coming." (Verse 8). It is interesting to note the fact that the characteristics of the departing group are identical with those of the Catholic Church. Everyone knows that the Catholic Church forbids its people to eat meat on Friday and also forbids some from marriage. Also, the only way for the wicked one to last from Paul's day to the second coming of Christ is to have a continual succession. It could not be some wicked person of the past because he will not be here for the Lord to slay when He comes. Furthermore, it could not be ones in the future because their iniquity would not have started in Paul's day. It must, therefore, be a continual succession from the beginning until now. The Catholic Church fits the apostles' description of the great apostasy.

The seven letters to the churches in Asia that are found in the book of Revelation make it clear that a church keeps its identity as belonging to Christ only as it continues in Christ's word. They reveal that Christ did not establish His church as one that could never fall into error, because some of them did. The early churches had to "earnestly contend" and be ever watchful for error from within. The Catholic idea of an infallible church makes it a church that can neither recognize or correct its errors.

In Christ,

Ron

EDIT: corrected spelling and grammatical errors

**Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2009/8/24 10:23**

Quote:  
-----Statements such as this, no matter what their source, make it very clear that Catholics have authority in the wrong place. The authority is not in the body, it is in the Head (Eph. 1:22-23; Col. 1:18). The ruling is not in the kingdom, but in the King (Heb. 7:1-2; Rev. 1:5-6). The authority is in not in the church, but in Christ (Matt. 28:18; 1 Pet. 3:22). The church is not the Savior, but simply the body of the saved (Acts 2:47; Eph. 5:22-24).  
-----

Well said Ron.

**Re: - posted by whyme, on: 2009/8/24 10:58**

Catholic,

I would also like to add to the comments previously made about the Berean example and Paul's commendation of the Bereans. You must find it at least interesting if not persuasive that in the Berean example Paul did not commend the Bereans on the basis of their bowing down and submission to his apostolic authority. Rather, Paul commended them on their belief in the truth of the doctrines about which he preached as they compared such teaching to Scripture. If the apostles and those they annointed believed they were the true "head" of the church in the sense held by the RCC, then would n't that authority be the only necessary argument or claim for accuracy Paul would ever need to make to believers or unbelievers in order to require obedience to the teachings of the "Church"? Paul clearly doesn't do that.

There are many instances, including examples where Christ Himself used the Scriptures as proofs of His teaching based on internal consistencies of Scripture and His teachings, rather than resorting to a strict authoritarian approach advocated by the RCC. Why would there be this constant appeal to Scripture if what is really sufficient is not Scripture itself, but rather the bottom line that if the "Church" says it is true, then it is true.

**Re: - posted by ADisciple (), on: 2009/8/24 11:36**

Quote:  
-----If the apostles and those they annointed believed they were the true "head" of the church in the sense held by the RCC, then would n't that authority be the only necessary argument or claim for accuracy Paul would ever need to make to believers or unbelievers in order to require obedience to the teachings of the "Church"? Paul clearly doesn't do that.  
-----

Amen to that.

Quote:  
-----There are many instances, including examples where Christ Himself used the Scriptures as proofs of His teaching based on internal consistencies of Scripture and His teachings, rather than resorting to a strict authoritarian approach advocated by the RCC. Why would there be this constant appeal to Scripture if what is really sufficient is not Scripture itself, but rather the bottom line that if the "Church" says it is true, then it is true.  
-----

And Amen to that.

**Re: , on: 2009/8/24 12:57**

Quote:  
-----I have one observation to share. Protestants like to think they believe in sola scripture, that they have no pope to whom they must look to know how scripture is to be understood. But let an issue come up on which there is a disagreement, sola scripture is not adequate: a writer, a scholar, leader must be used to tell one how this is to be understood.  
-----

Quick note here to ginnyrose:

Thank you for your honesty. As a former anti-Catholic protestant, I too saw this reality. I was on an ocean driven by every wind of doctrine trying to hold fast.

I've got to work at the moment, but I look forward to responding to the rest of you later today, God willing. I think there are some serious misunderstandings about what the church believes.

I do recognize that the way many of you think hasn't been shaped over night. But let me say that there is a reason why the puzzle isn't quite fitting for you.

If only I could explain to you the overwhelming peace I now have in my soul. If only I could explain how Jesus said, "Pe

ace! Be still" to the waves and the winds of doctrine. It is WONDERFUL!

But I know you all want and need answers. I pray that God helps this sinful servant give them. I also pray that the Holy Spirit will hide me behind the victorious cross of Jesus Christ my saviour who loved me and gave himself for me.

You are all special to God and to me.

Catholic

**Re: , on: 2009/8/24 13:13**

"What, then, does the Catholic Church say? She permits and encourages the private reading of Scripture. But she says definitely that no one has the right to interpret the Bible for himself in any way opposed to the official teachings of the ancient Catholic Church. ....Passing over the fact that the majority of people lack the required training in the many different sciences... bearing upon scriptural interpretation necessary even for a merely natural understanding of the Bible...., we have to reckon with the positive provision made by Christ for our instruction in his religion." Catholic

Then which one are you?? Are you the one who is qualified or the one who submits to the qualified?? Are you one who is qualified to interpret scripture as it pertains to the protocol of the Catholic Church?

If so, I would like to be enlightened to the sciences that are necessary for a natural understanding of scripture. What kind of training are we taking about here??? What does it entail??

**Re: - posted by whyne, on: 2009/8/24 13:45**

At the end of the day, the RCC's ability and authority to definitively interpret Scripture without error lies in the RCC's interpretation of Scripture. This sentence is why this issue cannot be meaningfully debated with an RCC apologist.

**Re: - posted by MaryJane, on: 2009/8/24 14:00**

Greetings Catholic

You wrote:But let me say that there is a reason why the puzzle isn't quite fitting for you.

For me there are no puzzle that are not quite fitting as you said. I have peace and joy in the Lord that I never had as a Catholic. I know Jesus personally as my Lord and Savior. I seek to walk with Him daily and grow in Him moment by moment. I do not need a priest to tell me about Jesus because I have the Holy Spirit that convicts and guides me and the Bible that confirms God's truth.

You also wrote:But I know you all want and need answers.

Sadly if you are espousing the lies of the Catholic church then you have no answers that I need. IF I have questions I have no further than the Bible to find the answers I need. I also can pray directly to the Lord(no need of dead saints or mary) to find those answers.

The Catholic church is still filled with much false pagan tradition, from the veneration of mary, to the praying for the dead, praying to dead saints, mary being co-savior, confessing of sins to men(priest) the lists goes on and on. The Catholic church is "NOT" the body of Christ. Jesus is the head of the body of believers called the church and His work on the cross is sufficient for them. We have no need of mary to pray or intercede for us because we have fellowship with the Lord Jesus personally.

I am praying for you to see the truth, just as I am praying for others that are lost inside the Catholic church. Jesus is deserving of His reward, He alone suffered and died so that we might have life. Sadly in the end there is no way you and I can walk in agreement or fellowship with one another. You follow the false teaching of a pagan faith that holds no life. My hope is in Jesus alone, while as a Catholic your hope is in the Roman Catholic church system. May God open your eyes to see His truth before it is too late.  
maryjane

Re: - posted by Miccah (), on: 2009/8/24 15:10

Catholic wrote:

Quote:

-----But I know you all want and need answers.

-----

Friend... Just a quick reminder. You came here trying explain why we need the catholic church. Maybe it is you that is needing and wanting answers on why you *need* the catholic church.

Friend. Please open yourself up to council from the elect that are here. I pray that you will find the truth and wisdom behind those here who truly fear and honor the Lord. May the Lord open your eyes to His truth.

Re: Sola Scriptura is logically untenable - posted by murrcoir (), on: 2009/8/24 15:45

Quote:

-----Catholic wrote:

The Bible never claims to be the only rule for faith and practice.

-----

Quote:

-----But the Sacred Scriptures are NOT the only authoritative rule for belief and practice

It is not sufficient. And I would submit that the wide variance of opinions held by sincere seekers is proof that it is insufficient.

-----

Romans 15:4 For **whatsoever things were written aforetime were written for our learning**, that we through patience and comfort of the scriptures might have hope.

2 Timothy 3:16 **All scripture is given by inspiration of God**, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness.

1 Corinthians 4:6 And these things, brethren, I have in a figure transferred to myself and to Apollos for your sakes; **that ye might learn in us not to think of men above that which is written**, that no one of you be puffed up for one against another.

Quote:

-----Catholic wrote:

It is amazing to me to see so many who believe that the Holy Spirit was able to preserve the written text of Scripture and yet not believe that He preserved an infallible interpreter of those Scriptures.

-----

So I guess by this statement you mean that the Popes is the infallible interpreter of scriptures.

That, however, which Catholics assume as self-evident that God has appointed someone on earth able to give infallible guidance to religious truth admits of no proof, and is destitute of all probability.

Catholicism claims that Christ intended us to learn His religion, not from the Bible but from the Church. If the Pope is infallible

lible, why was the Bible was given?

Another reason Catholicism gives for keeping back the Scriptures from common use is the claim that they are too difficult for the unlearned to understand.

Historically, Catholicism discouraged Bible reading by the laity for a very good reason: they knew some were likely to be struck by **the fact that the Church of the NT is very unlike that of modern Romanism.**

When translations printed in the languages of Europe, a knowledge of the New Testament became general when discrepancies between Catholic doctrine and Scripture became apparent, Catholic apologists stopped insisting that the doctrines of the Church could be deduced from Scripture and revived the theory of some early heretics, that the Bible does not contain the whole of God's revelation and that a body of traditional doctrine existed in the Church equally deserving of veneration.

When it was pointed out that things were taught in the Roman Church for which the Bible furnished no adequate justification, Roman advocates insisted that though the Bible contained truth, it did not contain the whole truth, and that the Church was able by them to supplement the deficiencies of Scripture, having in those traditions a secure record of teaching on many points on which the Bible contained only obscure indications, or gave no information at all.

**The Pope, the ecumenists and their dupes tell us, is a truly godly man, a sweet and blessed representative of Christ, the 'Holy Father' in deed and in truth!**

**Matt. 23:9 And call no man your father upon the earth: for one is your Father, which is in heaven.**

**The ordinary man in the pew must know where the truth lies. If the Lord Jesus be Christ, SERVE HIM. If the Pope be Christ, SERVE HIM.**

Edit:- Typo put Matt 23:99 instead of Matt 23:9.

**Re: Sola Scriptura is logically untenable - posted by hmmhmm (), on: 2009/8/24 17:01**

Is Roman Catholicism Biblical?

by

John MacArthur

In today's spirit of ecumenism, many evangelicals have called for the Protestant Church to lay aside its differences with Rome and pursue unity with the Catholic Church. Is that possible? Is Roman Catholicism simply another facet of the body of Christ that should be brought into union with its Protestant counterpart? Is Roman Catholicism simply another Christian denomination?

While there are many errors in the teaching of the Catholic Church (for example its belief in the transubstantiation of the communion wafer and its view of Mary), two rise to the forefront and call for special attention: its denial of the doctrine of sola Scriptura and its denial of the biblical teaching on justification. To put it simply, because the Roman Catholic Church has refused to submit itself to the authority of God's Word and to embrace the gospel of justification taught in Scripture, it has set itself apart from the true body of Christ. It is a false and deceptive form of Christianity.

The Doctrine of Sola Scriptura

In the words of reformer Martin Luther, the doctrine of sola Scriptura means that "what is asserted without the Scriptures or proven revelation may be held as an opinion, but need not be believed." Roman Catholicism flatly rejects this principle, adding a host of traditions and Church teachings and declaring them binding on all true believers—with the threat

of eternal damnation to those who hold contradictory opinions.

In Roman Catholicism, “the Word of God” encompasses not only the Bible, but also the Apocrypha, the Magisterium (the Church’s authority to teach and interpret divine truth), the Pope’s ex cathedra pronouncements, and an indefinite body of church tradition, some formalized in canon law and some not yet committed to writing. Whereas evangelical Protestants believe the Bible is the ultimate test of all truth, Roman Catholics believe the Church determines what is true and what is not. In effect, this makes the Church a higher authority than Scripture.

Creeds and doctrinal statements are certainly important. However, creeds, decisions of church councils, all doctrine, and even the church itself must be judged by Scripture—not vice versa. Scripture is to be accurately interpreted in its context by comparing it to Scripture—certainly not according to anyone’s personal whims. Scripture itself is thus the sole binding rule of faith and practice for all Christians. Protestant creeds and doctrinal statements simply express the church’s collective understanding of the proper interpretation of Scripture. In no sense could the creeds and pronouncements of the churches ever constitute an authority equal to or higher than Scripture. Scripture always takes priority over the church in the rank of authority.

Roman Catholics, on the other hand, believe the infallible touchstone of truth is the Church itself. The Church not only infallibly determines the proper interpretation of Scripture, but also supplements Scripture with additional traditions and teaching. That combination of Church tradition plus the Church’s interpretation of Scripture is what constitutes the binding rule of faith and practice for Catholics. The fact is, the Church sets itself above Holy Scripture in rank of authority.

### The Doctrine of Justification

According to Roman Catholicism, justification is a process in which God’s grace is poured forth into the sinner’s heart, making that person progressively more righteous. During this process, it is the sinner’s responsibility to preserve and increase that grace by various good works. The means by which justification is initially obtained is not faith, but the sacrament of baptism. Furthermore, justification is forfeited whenever the believer commits a mortal sin, such as hatred or adultery. In the teaching of the Roman Catholic Church, then, works are necessary both to begin and to continue the process of justification.

The error in the Catholic Church’s position on justification may be summed up in four biblical arguments. First, Scripture presents justification as instantaneous, not gradual. Contrasting the proud Pharisee with the broken, repentant tax-gatherer who smote his breast and prayed humbly for divine mercy, Jesus said that the tax-gatherer “went down to his house justified” (Luke 18:14). His justification was instantaneous, complete before he performed any work, based solely on his repentant faith. Jesus also said, “Truly, truly, I say to you, he who hears My word, and believes Him who sent Me, has eternal life, and does not come into judgment, but has passed out of death into life” (John 5:24). Eternal life is the present possession of all who believe—and by definition eternal life cannot be lost. The one who believes immediately passes from spiritual death to eternal life, because that person is instantaneously justified (see Rom. 5:1, 9; 8:1).

Second, justification means the sinner is declared righteous, not actually made righteous. This goes hand in hand with the fact that justification is instantaneous. There is no process to be performed—justification is purely a forensic reality, a declaration God makes about the sinner. Justification takes place in the court of God, not in the soul of the sinner. It is an objective fact, not a subjective phenomenon, and it changes the sinner’s status, not his nature. Justification is an immediate decree, a divine “not guilty” verdict on behalf of the believing sinner in which God declares him to be righteous in His sight.

Third, the Bible teaches that justification means righteousness is imputed, not infused. Righteousness is “reckoned,” or credited to the account of those who believe (Rom. 4:3–25). They stand justified before God not because of their own righteousness (Rom. 3:10), but because of a perfect righteousness outside themselves that is reckoned to them by faith (Phil. 3:9). Where does that perfect righteousness come from? It is God’s own righteousness (Rom 10:3), and it is the believer’s in the person of Jesus Christ (1 Cor. 1:30). Christ’s own perfect righteousness is credited to the believer’s personal account (Rom. 5:17, 19), just as the full guilt of the believer’s sin was imputed to Christ (2 Cor. 5:21). The only merit God accepts for salvation is that of Jesus Christ; nothing man can ever do could earn God’s favor or add anything to the merit of Christ.

Fourth and finally, Scripture clearly teaches that man is justified by faith alone, not by faith plus works. According to the Apostle Paul, “If it is by grace, it is no longer on the basis of works, otherwise grace is no longer grace” (Rom. 11:6). Elsewhere Paul testifies, “By grace you have been saved through faith; and that not of yourselves, it is the gift of God;



not as a result of works, that no one should boast" (Eph. 2:8-9, emphasis added; see Acts 16:31 and Rom. 4:3-6). In fact, it is clearly taught throughout Scripture that "a man is justified by faith apart from works of the Law" (Rom. 3:28; see Gal. 2:16; Rom. 9:31-32; 10:3).

In contrast, Roman Catholicism places an undue stress on human works. Catholic doctrine denies that God "justifies the ungodly" (Rom. 4:5) without first making them godly. Good works therefore become the ground of justification. As thousands of former Catholics will testify, Roman Catholic doctrine and liturgy obscure the essential truth that the believer is saved by grace through faith and not by his own works (Eph. 2:8-9). In a simple sense, Catholics genuinely believe they are saved by doing good, confessing sin, and observing ceremonies.

Adding works to faith as the grounds of justification is precisely the teaching that Paul condemned as "a different gospel" (see 2 Cor. 11:4; Gal. 1:6). It nullifies the grace of God, for if meritorious righteousness can be earned through the sacraments, "then Christ died needlessly" (Gal. 2:21). Any system that mingles works with grace, then, is "a different gospel" (Gal. 1:6), a distorted message that is anathematized (Gal. 1:9), not by a council of medieval bishops, but by the very Word of God that cannot be broken. In fact, it does not overstate the case to say that the Roman Catholic view on justification sets it apart as a wholly different religion than the true Christian faith, for it is antithetical to the simple gospel of grace.

As long as the Roman Catholic Church continues to assert its own authority and bind its people to "another gospel," it is the spiritual duty of all true Christians to oppose Roman Catholic doctrine with biblical truth and to call all Catholics to true salvation. Meanwhile, evangelicals must not capitulate to the pressures for artificial unity. They cannot allow the gospel to be obscured, and they cannot make friends with false religion, lest they become partakers in their evil deeds (2 John 11).

**Re: - posted by hmmhmm (), on: 2009/8/24 17:05**

I don't agree on everything brother MacArthur has ever said or what he believes, but concerning catholic teachings and practices I agree with him, for those who would like to "dig in" you can find much on this link if you scroll down a bit.

(<http://www.biblebb.com/mac-a-g.htm>) <http://www.biblebb.com/mac-a-g.htm>

**Re: , on: 2009/8/24 19:03**

Woops, I posted this on the wrong thread. It belongs here on this one. Sorry for the inconvenience and here you all go:

Let me first say that I am NOT "Roman Catholic". I am an Eastern Catholic. I am under the authority of the Patriarch of Antioch and then the Pope. We are the church that was first called "Christian." Further, "Roman Catholic" is not any official name for the Catholic Church as such. It is a pejorative term applied at the Revolt/Reformation to Catholics through ignorance. Latin Catholics have accepted the term unofficially in many cases. But it can never apply to the whole church. Possibly to the West. So please refrain from referring to me or the Church as "Roman Catholic."

The assumption of the Protestant Reformers that the Bible contains an adequate account of all that is necessary for a Christian to believe accounts to a great extent for the widespread Protestant prejudice against "tradition," which unfortunately is understood by them as implying a merely human tradition, far removed from Catholic doctrine on the subject. For, where it is a question of the transmission of revealed truths in the Church, the Catholic doctrine is concerned, NOT with any merely HUMAN traditions, but with what is known as DIVINE tradition - that is, with truths ORIGINALLY REVEALED BY GOD and handed down IN the Church under the protection of the Holy Spirit against all dangers of distortion or perversion.

Now it is certain that there were many important doctrines taught by Christ and by the apostles which were not written down in the books of the New Testament, books which were essentially of a fragmentary character. NONE OF YOU CAN DENY THIS.

As a matter of fact, as we have already seen, it was not until some twenty or thirty years after the foundation of the Church that even part of the apostolic preaching which we have in the New Testament was committed to writing.

What the first Christians treasured was the apostolic teaching, a teaching which has been preserved in the Church partly by the New Testament writings, partly by tradition.



So St. Paul wrote to the Thessalonians, "Brethren, stand fast, and hold the traditions which you have learned, whether by word, or by our epistle" (2 Thess. 2:14). St. Jude speaks of the necessity of maintaining "the faith once delivered to the saints" (Jude 3). He does not speak of that part of it only which was written in the books of the New Testament. Christian teaching in its fullness, not merely the part of it which was written in the New Testament, has been preserved in the official teachings of the Catholic Church.

The transmission of traditional doctrines, however, **MUST NOT** be thought of as a kind of mechanical and continuous handing on by word of mouth from age to age of every express teaching of Christ and of the apostles, over and above that written down in the New Testament. (like the game of telephone) Some of these doctrines may be found recorded in the writings of the early Christian Fathers, but **ONLY** those which came within the scope of the particular subjects which happened to engage their attention.

Others may be discovered from a study of archaeological inscriptions, or of religious customs prevailing among the faithful, or of disciplinary canons and liturgical books. But all these are only points, as it were, where the living consciousness of the Church breaks through to the surface.

Stuck with a partial presentation

Tradition is essentially the living memory of the Church, manifesting itself primarily in her authentic and infallible teachings, in which the Holy Spirit, according to the promise of Christ, preserves her from the possibility of error and leads her into "all truth" (John 16:13).

Those who will not hear the infallible voice of the Catholic Church and who take the Bible only as their guide are committed to a merely partial presentation of Christianity, even granted that they may possibly at times accurately understand so much as is contained in the written Word of God. At least within the Canon they admit.

It was William Tyndale who imagined that even "the boy that driveth the plough," if given the Bible in his own language, would find no difficulty in discovering its true meaning. But things have not turned out as he expected. And how differently Protestant scholars speak today!

**YOU ALL ARE PROOF OF THAT!**

Thus we find Dr. W. K. Lowther Clarke writing, "To understand the Bible thoroughly one needs an equipment of wide and varied knowledge compared with which that needed by, say, a Shakespearean scholar is modest . . . We see men with their limited capacities grappling with ideas which they comprehend only in part; obscurities, misapprehensions, even contradictions, are inevitable."

Translators as traitors

In the first place it must be remembered that, where it is a question of translating from one language into another - and it is still more difficult in translating ancient languages into modern speech- it is not always possible to convey to us exactly what the original writers meant.

It is this difficulty which has given us the Italian proverb "Traduttore traditore" - a "translator is a traitor." In many passages, it is true, substantial accuracy can be attained, but in others, and very important ones, the true sense will almost necessarily be obscured in any other language than the one originally spoken. For even when words of practically identical meaning are chosen in the new language to translate words of the original language, there are characteristic differences of thought and culture between the two languages which introduce variations of meaning.

Scholarship no guarantee

Besides a knowledge of Hebrew and Greek words and grammar, therefore, one who would understand the sense intended by the original writers of the books in the Bible needs a thorough knowledge of the ideas current in their time. A further element of difficulty also arises where the Bible is concerned from the fact that it is not an ordinary book. It contains a mysterious revelation of God, and the wisest men, left to their own resources, are not competent judges of revealed truth.

So we see even the MOST LEARNED Scripture scholars, men profoundly versed in Hebrew and Greek, the fruit of YEARS of study, falling into innumerable and serious errors, CONTRADICTING ONE ANOTHER and engaging in endless controversies.

Would any one of you dare to deny this? You know it is true. Admit it.

There is but one way out. The interpretation of Scripture must be controlled by the constant Christian teaching handed down in the Church from the very beginning, if it is not to go astray, and only the authoritative voice of the Catholic Church can give us absolute certainty as to what that authentic and traditional Christian teaching really is.

Is it any wonder that those brought up in a Protestant environment should be bewildered by the host of conflicting sects confronting them or that they should be dismayed when they come across such words in their Bible as those of St. Paul: "Now I beseech you, brethren, by the name of the Lord Jesus Christ, that ye speak the same thing, and that there be no division among you; but that ye be perfectly joined together in the same mind and in the same judgment" (1 Cor. 1:10)?

In sheer despair, seeing the diversity of denominations, some have decided that it is wrong to belong to any of them, and they have washed their hands of them all, determined to live their own lives, attached to no particular church, but just following out the teaching of the Bible as they themselves have conceived it to be. Yet what, more often than not, has happened in such cases? Again and again the same phenomenon has occurred. Unable to keep their ideas to themselves, such people have gathered around them others whom they have persuaded to adopt their views, and the result in the end has only been to add further new denominations to the already existent multitude of sects, rendering "confusion worse confounded." . . . Had the Protestant Reformers been true to St. Paul's admonition they would never have left that Church in order to set up rival churches, with all the divisions and sub-divisions to which they have led. And those among their later followers who have realized this have returned to the Catholic Church as converts, now from this Protestant denomination, now from that, as I myself have done.

Their Bible is from our Church

One can understand, of course, the reluctance of present-day Protestants to turn back to the Catholic Church for the solution of their difficulties, however disconcerting the position at which they have arrived. They still treasure the thought of the "open Bible," and the whole of their tradition is that the Reformers had to leave the Catholic Church in order to give it to them.

Moreover, they have inherited the idea that if they returned to the Catholic Church they would have to abandon such devotion to the reading of the Bible as they may have retained. If we add to these the many charges they have heard or read of actual hostility to the Bible on the part of the Catholic Church, we are still less surprised by their refusal to so much as consider her claims to their allegiance.

Yet the fact remains that all such impressions are based upon a misunderstanding and that much more thought needs to be bestowed upon the subject than is usually given to it.

There is no need to dwell at length upon the antiquated charge that the Catholic Church used to burn all the Bibles she could lay her hands upon in pre-Reformation times, in order to keep them out of the hands of the people. What the Catholic Church did condemn and order to be burned were false translations of the Bible, and that was out of her sheer reverence and respect for the Bible as the Word of God which she positively refused to allow to be corrupted. Or maybe someone can answer why the Douay Rheims English translation predated your beloved King James Version which copied the DRV in many places.

We could have obliterated it

Always the Catholic Church has held Holy Scripture in the highest esteem as constituting one of the greatest gifts of Almighty God to mankind. Through the centuries before the invention of the printing press her monks carefully multiplied copies of the Bible by hand in beautifully illuminated manuscripts, thus preserving Holy Scripture for later ages.

Had the Catholic Church wanted to destroy the Bible she could easily have done so during the millennium and a half before the Protestant Reformation, when all the manuscripts of it were practically in her sole possession!

Nor were manuscript translations into the vernacular wanting in pre-Reformation times, although naturally they could not

be widely diffused before the invention of the printing press. But these versions were known and read and quoted by the writers of all the countries both in the East and in the West. Many people have labored under misconceptions on this subject, but as the facts are becoming better known less and less is heard of any charges that the Catholic Church has ever wanted either to suppress or destroy the Bible.

Even so, it is urged, although the Catholic Church has no wish to suppress or destroy the Bible, she does not regard it as necessary. Here we come to an impression which is not without some grounds for it.

Indeed, Catholic apologists themselves have stressed the fact that even if the Bible should suddenly perish from the earth, through some great calamity, it would not affect one single doctrine of the Catholic Church nor imperil her existence (See Irenaeus, Against Heresies, 3:4:1 ). BTW - Irenaeus was the disciple of Polycarp who was the disciple of the apostle John.

It is to be noted that such a loss would, in the estimate of Catholics, be a GREAT CALAMITY. They regard the possession of the Bible as a very great blessing. At the same time, they declare that the Bible is not necessary to the existence of the Catholic Church or to the continuance of her mission to mankind, and it is that which needs to be understood.

We could be reminded from the outset, as mentioned above, that if the Bible has not perished from the face of the earth we owe it to the Catholic Church, for, as we have seen, she it was who preserved it in manuscript form through all the earlier centuries.

The Bible is not strictly necessary

But a much more important aspect of the subject must here be considered. The actual statement under discussion is quite evidently true, for the Catholic Church existed before a line of at least the New Testament was written, and if she could exist then, she could undoubtedly exist and have continued existing had not a line of the Gospels and of the rest of the New Testament ever been committed to writing.

We must remember that the tremendous tidings of the birth of our Savior and of his accomplishment of our redemption were made known from the very beginning by the preaching of the apostles, and certainly the three thousand converts from St. Peter's first sermon in Jerusalem were not given New Testaments!

In the Acts of the Apostles, written about sixty-three years after the birth of Christ, we have the remark added that when St. Peter had completed his first discourse in public "the Lord added to the Church daily such as should be saved" (Acts 2:47). And we have already seen the statement in an earlier verse that the first Christians were "all persevering in the doctrine of the apostles" (Acts 2:42).

Advantageous not essential

So the Church existed then, even though not a line of the New Testament had then been written. Yet those first members of the Church were equally Christians with those of later centuries who had the good fortune to possess copies of the Gospels.

Nevertheless, although it was not absolutely essential to the existence and mission of the Church which Christ had founded, as an additional advantage to her in her work God was pleased to inspire the apostles and evangelists in their later years to commit the main part of their teaching - not all of it - to writing.

Even so, a general diffusion of the documents they left as a legacy to the Church, documents which had to be laboriously transcribed by hand, was not possible. The vast majority of Christians had still to depend on the teaching of the Church as their immediate guide to an understanding of their religion. And the invention of the printing press some fifteen hundred years later, which did make the distribution of printed Bibles possible, could not alter the age-long and God-appointed method of dependence upon the authority of Christ's Church as the authentic source of doctrine.

There is a great difficulty here for Protestants who base their religion on the written Gospels. They are naturally puzzled by the period which elapsed between the death of Christ and the writing of the New Testament. How did Christians manage without the New Testament in the days when it did not exist?

Acutely aware of this difficulty, the prominent American Baptist, Dr. Stanley I. Stuber, declared that Protestants "believe t

hat the New Testament preceded and paved the way for what we know today as the Church. If it had not been for the letters of Paul, the Gospels, and the Book of Revelation, there might have been no Church at all." But that is simply to defy the facts of history. If there is one thing certain, it is that the New Testament depicts Christ as having called his twelve apostles and as having personally founded his Church upon them (Matt. 16:18, Eph. 2:20), although not a book of the New Testament was written until some twenty or thirty years after the death of Christ.

#### Insuperable difficulty

The Catholic, who accepts the Church as his guide and knows that the Church existed before the New Testament was written, has no difficulty in this matter. If, however, a man thinks of the New Testament as his only guide, the difficulty for him is insuperable. But he has a mistaken notion.

Not the reading of Scripture, but the teaching of the Church, was intended to be the guide of Christians. That is why Christ said, "I will build my Church," and later commissioned that Church to go and to teach all nations (Matt. 16:18, 28:19-20).

To complete our brief study of these matters, it is now necessary to consider the actual attitude of the Catholic Church in our own days toward Bible reading. For there are many misconceptions prevalent among non-Catholics from this point of view also. One can understand that this is almost necessarily so.

The still-accepted idea that the Bible should be an "open book" and that everyone is capable of reading and interpreting it correctly for himself must make it difficult for those brought up as non-Catholics to understand the much more guarded attitude of the Catholic Church toward Holy Scripture. As a result of such an outlook, wise control is almost inevitably interpreted either as a prohibition of Bible reading or at least as reluctance that it should be engaged in at all.

#### Let's abandon silly notions

In this matter difficulties are due above all else to one's initial mental approach to the subject, and to keep one's mental outlook balanced it is necessary to take comprehensive historical views.

In the first place, all thought that the Catholic Church, during the centuries before the invention of printing, kept her people in ignorance of the contents of Holy Scripture must be abandoned. Educated Protestants are more and more altering their conclusions on this point. Thus Dr. Cutts writes, "There is a good deal of popular misapprehension about the way in which the Bible was regarded in the Middle Ages. Some people think that it was very little read, even by the clergy, whereas the fact is that the sermons of the medieval preachers are more full of scriptural quotations and allusions than any sermons in these days, and the writers on other subjects are so full of scriptural allusion that it is evident their minds were saturated with scriptural diction."

From Germany comes similar testimony. The Lutheran, Kropatscheck, says, "It is no longer possible to hold, as the old polemics did, that the Bible was a sealed book to both theologians and laity. The more we study the Middle Ages, the more does this fable tend to dissolve into thin air." Another German Lutheran scholar, Dobschutz, writes, "We must admit that the Middle Ages possessed a quite surprising and extremely praiseworthy knowledge of the Bible, such as might in many respects put our own age to shame."

#### Vernacular nonsense

A great deal of nonsense has been written on the subject of translations of the Bible into the vernacular or current speech of the people. It is often asked whether it is not true that, before the Protestant Reformation, the Bible existed only in Greek and Latin manuscripts. It is forgotten that the Latin manuscripts themselves were translations from the Greek into the vernacular or current speech of the Latins. And from the earliest times, in all countries, there were further translations of Scripture into their various languages.

Restricting ourselves here to England, we find St. Thomas More writing in the sixteenth century that "the whole Bible was long before his day, by virtuous and well-learned men, translated into the English tongue; and by good and godly people, and with devotion and soberness, well and reverently read." The Venerable Bede died in 735 as he was finishing the translation of the Gospel of St. John. A manuscript containing a complete Anglo-Saxon interlinear translation of the Book of Psalms, dating from 825, is still preserved in what is known as the Vespasian Psalter.

King Alfred the Great also undertook the work of translating the psalms into the vernacular English of his time. The abbot Aelfric about 990 translated many parts of both the Old and the New Testaments into English.

This translation was condemned by the Catholic authorities mainly because it was issued with a prologue containing the heretical views of the Lollards, Wycliffe's disciples. Later editions of it, without the prologue, escaped ecclesiastical censure and attained to a wide general use even among Catholics -as far, of course, as the laborious transcription by hand in the pre- printing press days would permit the multiplication of copies.

#### Ecclesiastical permission slips

From the time of the Lollards onward, and above all during the first years following upon the invention of the printing press and the flood of Bibles which then began to be circulated, Catholics had to obtain ecclesiastical permission to possess and read vernacular translations of Holy Scripture. But it was wisdom itself on the part of the Catholic Church to condemn unauthorized translations and to insist that those who did read approved copies must interpret them in the light of consistent Catholic teaching through the ages, granting permits for such reading only to those sufficiently well-instructed in the faith. The Catholic Church had learned by long experience the danger to the faith of the people themselves if, without sufficient knowledge and instruction, the reading and interpreting of Scripture without reference to any authoritative guidance became widespread.

The history of the heresies in the first years of the Church, and in the earlier and later Middle Ages, long before the Protestant Reformation, had amply proved the fallacy and danger of the private interpretation of Scripture.

Every heretic made the Bible mean just what he wished. Misuse of the sacred text by the Albigensians in France, by the Lollards in England, by the Hussites in Bohemia, and by other heretics compelled the Church to adopt a conservative attitude and restrict permissions for Bible reading to persons qualified according to the judgment of local ecclesiastical authorities.

#### The proof is in the pudding

The results which followed almost immediately among Protestants after the Reformation and their general acceptance of the "open Bible" theory are really the best possible vindication of the prudence exercised by the Catholic Church in this matter. The more thoughtful among Protestant scholars are themselves beginning to see this. Thus the Anglican Canon Wilfrid L. Knox wrote, "There can be no doubt that the Catholic claim that the Bible without some standard of interpretation cannot be applied to the daily life of the Christian individual was true.

The Reformers' claim that the Bible alone is the final and sufficient guide for Christian belief and morality was entirely untenable. In actual fact it involved not the appeal to the Bible, but the appeal to the Bible as interpreted by some particular Reformer. The result was a multitude of warring bodies, each holding a different system of belief and anathematizing all others, the only ground of agreement being their denunciation of the errors of Rome."

To a great extent the heated controversies of the sixteenth century belong to the past, together with all the actions and reactions they provoked. In many matters accordingly the disciplinary laws of the Catholic Church have become much milder than those designed to meet emergencies then, and here it will be of interest to ask what the Catholic position is today where Bible reading is concerned.

In the first place it must be said frankly that until recently it has not been customary in Catholic churches to lay stress on the practice of Bible reading, although Catholics are certainly in no way discouraged from engaging in it. In Catholic churches stress is naturally laid on the fulfillment of necessary duties, attendance at Mass on Sundays and other days of obligation, reception of the sacraments, the duty of personal prayer, the observance of the Ten Commandments, and fidelity to the precepts of the Church. Outside these basically necessary duties, Catholics are encouraged to participate in extra and optional devotional functions and to increase their knowledge of their religion by keeping up their Catholic reading of religious books, magazines, and newspapers.

#### Bible known well if indirectly

They cannot do all this without growing in their understanding of the religion of the Bible, even though they do little or no direct reading of the Bible itself. It is not an exaggeration to say that if a Catholic knows his religion well he knows the religion of the Bible, and that is far better than reading the Bible yet not understanding what it really means.

How many non-Catholics there are, hosts of them, who do give themselves to Bible reading and who end by being able to quote a veritable torrent of Scripture texts they misunderstand, and who equally end therefore with very little real knowledge of the Christian religion!

Who has not encountered Christadelphians, Seventh Day Adventists, Witnesses of Jehovah, and others like them, who pour out streams of Scripture texts without rhyme or reason, and who seem to make almost the whole of their religion consist in their ability to do so!

It would, however, be an understatement to say of Catholics merely that they are "not discouraged" from taking up the study of Holy Scripture for themselves, leaving it at that. They are positively encouraged to do so. Thus it is usual to find in the introductory pages of Catholic translations of the Bible various papal commendations of the regular habit of Bible reading. Catholics are there informed that Pope Leo XIII granted an indulgence of 300 days to all the faithful who devoutly read the Scriptures for at least a quarter of an hour each day, that Pope Pius X conferred special blessings upon Catholic societies established to propagate ever more widely among Catholics the reading of the Bible, and that Pope Benedict XV declared, "Our one desire for all the Church's children is that, being saturated with the Bible, they may arrive at the all-surpassing knowledge of Jesus Christ. "

We must not, of course, misinterpret these exhortations as constituting a law. The reading of Holy Scripture for themselves still remains optional for Catholics, not necessary. There is no room in the Catholic religion for the "bibliolatry" which would like to make Bible reading the very foundation of the Christian religion. It is not.

We must not lose sight of what has been said earlier in this booklet. Christ never ordered a line of Scripture to be written. He did not command his apostles to go and distribute Bibles. He commanded them to teach all nations as he had taught them and said to them, "He who hears you, hears me" (Luke 10:16). His religion is not the "religion of a book," but the "religion of a Church" - the religion of the Catholic Church founded by himself. . . .

Even in reading approved Catholic versions, since there is always the possibility of individual readers misinterpreting the Bible, Catholics are obliged to make sure that they do not adopt any interpretation which is opposed to the defined teachings of the Catholic Church. Catholics at least have the humility to admit that, where it is a question of the meaning of Holy Scripture, they themselves are more liable to be mistaken than the Catholic Church, with its accumulated wisdom of two thousand years and the abiding protection of the Holy Spirit promised to their Church by our Lord himself.

We aren't fetishists

It is sometimes said by non-Catholics that Catholics do not read their Bibles or that at least they give no signs of being familiar with them. Now it is true that Catholics do not make a fetish of memorizing an endless list of isolated Bible texts in order to be able to quote from them, whether intelligently or unintelligently, whenever an opportunity occurs. But in devout Catholic homes it is common that they participate in the Liturgy of the Hours or Divine Office whereby they join with monastic communities worldwide to pray the Psalms each night and through the Scriptures throughout the year.

But, as we have seen, it would not really matter if they did not. Bible reading is not necessary for salvation, and it is even better not to read it than to read it and be led astray through one's own incompetence, "wresting it," as St. Peter says, to one's "own destruction" (2 Pet. 3:16).

If any individual Catholic is ignorant of any particular aspect of biblical knowledge, it would obviously be because he had had neither the time, nor perhaps the ability, nor even perhaps the inclination to devote himself to the study of the particular aspect in question. But whatever may be said from that point of view, no ordinarily well-instructed Catholic is ignorant of the substantial contents of the Bible.

Even though he does not devote additional time to reading the Bible for himself, he has been taught his Bible history during his school days, he hears the Bible read publicly and explained to him at Mass on Sundays, he finds biblical truths enshrined in all forms of Catholic devotion, and he knows how to live the faith which the Bible teaches.

In conclusion, let us sum up briefly the position I hold. Firstly, without the authority of the Catholic Church there can be no absolutely certain guarantee that the Bible is the Word of God. Secondly, the Bible is a book which needs an interpreter. Thirdly, the Bible itself tells us that it is not the only source of religious truth and that Christian tradition is also a source from which we can learn what God has revealed. Fourthly, the Bible tells us that Christ instituted his Church to teach us

in his name what we must believe and do in order to be saved.

Our immediate standard, therefore, is the official teaching of Christ's Church. The Bible and tradition are remote standards of doctrine, to be understood as interpreted by the Church. The Catholic Church insists that all men must accept the true religion of Christ and that all those teachings she has defined as articles of faith truly represent the religion of Christ. And however else they may differ, she does secure the complete unity of over four hundred and fifty millions of Catholics throughout the world where the essential teachings of their religion are concerned.

She outnumbers in membership all other Churches separated from her, and these other Churches are ever lamenting their divisions among themselves and their inability to devise ways and means to attain to a unity which is a reality in the Catholic Church.

It is in the Catholic Church, then, and in the Catholic Church only, that the unity for which our Lord prayed is to be found, and the innumerable converts who have become Catholics in order to share in that unity are unanimous that the Bible itself, properly understood, leads only in the direction they took and which led them to that "peace of Christ in the kingdom of Christ" which he wills all his followers to possess.

**Re: , on: 2009/8/24 19:06**

Quote:

-----I dont agree on everything brother MacArthur has ever said or what he believes  
-----

How decidedly Protestant of you. :-)

You guys always disagree with each other. Did you ever consider that the problem might just be "Sola Scriptura"?

**Re: - posted by twayneb (), on: 2009/8/24 20:31**

Here is something to think about.

God created man as a perfect and good creation, but man fell. Because of this fall man was corrupted in every way, physically, mentally, etc. Because of this corruption, man is fallible. This means that man does not always interpret scripture correctly. On this point I hope we can agree.

So, if we are not to rely solely on scripture as the final authority in all matters spiritual, on what are we to rely? On the word of a spiritual leader, be it the Pope or Billy Graham? These men are both equally fallible as I am. Should we rely on a special revelation from God, a vision or a dream? I have had dreams that were motivated by what I ate the night before. I cannot trust any of these things to be authoritative in themselves. How can my corrupted mind which is fallible be sure that any one of these other authorities are even trustworthy?

I must not trust subjective authority. I must have a totally objective authority to which I can compare all other subjective authorities and judge their merit. If I do not have this one objective authority then there is no such thing as authority at all.

I contend that this one authority is the written word of God. I don't mean in any way to pick a fight with you when I say that I accept the canon that is accepted by the majority of the protestant world both because it is the one accepted by the majority of the men forming apostolic foundations of the church, but also because these books are in unbroken harmony.

I believe in special revelation from the Lord through His Holy Spirit, but this revelation must ALWAYS be considered subjective and compared to the inerrant objective truth of the Bible. I dare not trust my own fallible mind and heart.

If sola scriptura is in error, then my question is, "What objective measure of truth and revelation do we have with which to compare all other subjective truths?"

**Re: catholic, on: 2009/8/24 20:42**

dialoging with the devil

**question: to Catholic, on: 2009/8/24 20:43**

did you write that post yourself, or was that a cut and paste job? just curious thats all.

**Re: - posted by rainydaygirl, on: 2009/8/24 20:46**

Hey Catholic

You mentioned that you are not Roman Catholic, that you are in fact Eastern Catholic. Do you hold to the same traditions concerning mary, praying to mary? Confessing to priests? Praying to dead saints? mary being the queen of heaven? infant baptisms? pope being infallible? pope being the vicar of Christ?

with care  
rdg

**Re: , on: 2009/8/24 20:55**

Quote:

-----So, if we are not to rely solely on scripture as the final authority in all matters spiritual, on what are we to rely?  
-----

Quote:

-----If sola scriptura is in error, then my question is, "What objective measure of truth and revelation do we have with which to compare all other subjective truths?"  
-----

The following is taken from an article you can find on catholic.com. I just think this says what I would say myself very well:

The true "rule of faith"—as expressed in the Bible itself—is Scripture plus apostolic tradition, as manifested in the living teaching authority of the Catholic Church, to which were entrusted the oral teachings of Jesus and the apostles, along with the authority to interpret Scripture correctly.

In the Second Vatican Council's document on divine revelation, Dei Verbum (Latin: "The Word of God"), the relationship between Tradition and Scripture is explained: "Hence there exists a close connection and communication between sacred Tradition and sacred Scripture. For both of them, flowing from the same divine wellspring, in a certain way merge into a unity and tend toward the same end. For sacred Scripture is the word of God inasmuch as it is consigned to writing under the inspiration of the divine Spirit. To the successors of the apostles, sacred Tradition hands on in its full purity God's word, which was entrusted to the apostles by Christ the Lord and the Holy Spirit.

"Thus, by the light of the Spirit of truth, these successors can in their preaching preserve this word of God faithfully, explain it, and make it more widely known. Consequently it is not from sacred Scripture alone that the Church draws her certainty about everything which has been revealed. Therefore both sacred Tradition and sacred Scripture are to be accepted and venerated with the same devotion and reverence."

But Evangelical and Fundamentalist Protestants, who place their confidence in Martin Luther's theory of sola scriptura (Latin: "Scripture alone"), will usually argue for their position by citing a couple of key verses. The first is this: "These are written that you may believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God, and that believing you may have life in his name" (John 20:31). The other is this: "All Scripture is inspired by God and profitable for teaching, for reproof, for correction, and for training in righteousness; so that the man of God may be equipped, prepared for every good work" (2 Timothy 3:16–17). According to these Protestants, these verses demonstrate the reality of sola scriptura (the "Bible only" theory).

Not so, reply Catholics. First, the verse from John refers to the things written in that book (read it with John 20:30, the verse immediately before it to see the context of the statement in question). If this verse proved anything, it would not prove



the theory of sola scriptura but that the Gospel of John is sufficient.

Second, the verse from John's Gospel tells us only that the Bible was composed so we can be helped to believe Jesus is the Messiah. It does not say the Bible is all we need for salvation, much less that the Bible is all we need for theology; nor does it say the Bible is even necessary to believe in Christ. After all, the earliest Christians had no New Testament to which they could appeal; they learned from oral, rather than written, instruction. Until relatively recent times, the Bible was inaccessible to most people, either because they could not read or because the printing press had not been invented. All these people learned from oral instruction, passed down, generation to generation, by the Church.

Much the same can be said about 2 Timothy 3:16-17. To say that all inspired writing "has its uses" is one thing; to say that only inspired writing need be followed is something else. Besides, there is a telling argument against claims of Evangelical and Fundamentalist Protestants. John Henry Newman explained it in an 1884 essay entitled "Inspiration in its Relation to Revelation."

#### Newman's argument

He wrote: "It is quite evident that this passage furnishes no argument whatever that the sacred Scripture, without Tradition, is the sole rule of faith; for, although sacred Scripture is profitable for these four ends, still it is not said to be sufficient. The Apostle requires the aid of Tradition (2 Thess. 2:15). Moreover, the Apostle here refers to the scriptures which Timothy was taught in his infancy.

"Now, a good part of the New Testament was not written in his boyhood: Some of the Catholic epistles were not written even when Paul wrote this, and none of the books of the New Testament were then placed on the canon of the Scripture books. He refers, then, to the scriptures of the Old Testament, and, if the argument from this passage proved anything, it would prove too much, viz., that the scriptures of the New Testament were not necessary for a rule of faith."

Furthermore, Protestants typically read 2 Timothy 3:16-17 out of context. When read in the context of the surrounding passages, one discovers that Paul's reference to Scripture is only part of his exhortation that Timothy take as his guide Tradition and Scripture. The two verses immediately before it state: "But as for you, continue in what you have learned and have firmly believed, knowing from whom you learned it, and how from childhood you have been acquainted with the sacred writings which are able to instruct you for salvation through faith in Christ Jesus" (2 Tim. 3:14-15).

Paul tells Timothy to continue in what he has learned for two reasons: first, because he knows from whom he has learned it—Paul himself—and second, because he has been educated in the scriptures. The first of these is a direct appeal to apostolic tradition, the oral teaching which the apostle Paul had given Timothy. So Protestants must take 2 Timothy 3:16-17 out of context to arrive at the theory of sola scriptura. But when the passage is read in context, it becomes clear that it is teaching the importance of apostolic tradition!

The Bible denies that it is sufficient as the complete rule of faith. Paul says that much Christian teaching is to be found in the tradition which is handed down by word of mouth (2 Tim. 2:2). He instructs us to "stand firm and hold to the traditions which you were taught by us, either by word of mouth or by letter" (2 Thess. 2:15).

This oral teaching was accepted by Christians, just as they accepted the written teaching that came to them later. Jesus told his disciples: "He who hears you hears me, and he who rejects you rejects me" (Luke 10:16). The Church, in the persons of the apostles, was given the authority to teach by Christ; the Church would be his representative. He commissioned them, saying, "Go therefore and make disciples of all nations" (Matt. 28:19).

And how was this to be done? By preaching, by oral instruction: "So faith comes from what is heard, and what is heard comes by the preaching of Christ" (Rom. 10:17). The Church would always be the living teacher. It is a mistake to limit "Christ's word" to the written word only or to suggest that all his teachings were reduced to writing. The Bible nowhere supports either notion.

Further, it is clear that the oral teaching of Christ would last until the end of time. "But the word of the Lord abides forever. That word is the good news which was preached to you" (1 Pet. 1:25). Note that the word has been "preached"—that is, communicated orally. This would endure. It would not be

supplanted by a written record like the Bible (supplemented, yes, but not supplanted), and would continue to have its own authority.

This is made clear when the apostle Paul tells Timothy: "that you have heard from me before many witnesses entrust to faithful men who will be able to teach others also" (2 Tim. 2:2). Here we see the first few links in the chain of apostolic tradition that has been passed down intact from the apostles to our own day. Paul instructed Timothy to pass on the oral teachings (traditions) that he had received from the apostle. He was to give these to men who would be able to teach others, thus perpetuating the chain. Paul gave this instruction not long before his death (2 Tim. 4:6–8), as a reminder to Timothy of how he should conduct his ministry.

What is Tradition?

In this discussion it is important to keep in mind what the Catholic Church means by tradition. The term does not refer to legends or mythological accounts, nor does it encompass transitory customs or practices which may change, as circumstances warrant, such as styles of priestly dress, particular forms of devotion to saints, or even liturgical rubrics. Sacred or apostolic tradition consists of the teachings that the apostles passed on orally through their preaching. These teachings largely (perhaps entirely) overlap with those contained in Scripture, but the mode of their transmission is different.

They have been handed down and entrusted to the Church. It is necessary that Christians believe in and follow this tradition as well as the Bible (Luke 10:16). The truth of the faith has been given primarily to the leaders of the Church (Eph. 3:5), who, with Christ, form the foundation of the Church (Eph. 2:20). The Church has been guided by the Holy Spirit, who protects this teaching from corruption (John 14:25–26, 16:13).

Handing on the faith

Paul illustrated what tradition is: "For I delivered to you as of first importance what I also received, that Christ died for our sins in accordance with the scriptures. . . . Whether then it was I or they, so we preach and so you believed" (1 Cor. 15:3, 11). The apostle praised those who followed Tradition: "I commend you because you remember me in everything and maintain the traditions even as I have delivered them to you" (1 Cor. 11:2).

The first Christians "devoted themselves to the apostles' teaching" (Acts 2:42) long before there was a New Testament. From the very beginning, the fullness of Christian teaching was found in the Church as the living embodiment of Christ, not in a book. The teaching Church, with its oral, apostolic tradition, was authoritative. Paul himself gives a quotation from Jesus that was handed down orally to him: "It is more blessed to give than to receive" (Acts 20:35).

This saying is not recorded in the Gospels and must have been passed on to Paul. Indeed, even the Gospels themselves are oral tradition which has been written down (Luke 1:1–4). What's more, Paul does not quote Jesus only. He also quotes from early Christian hymns, as in Ephesians 5:14. These and other things have been given to Christians "through the Lord Jesus" (1 Thess. 4:2).

Fundamentalists say Jesus condemned tradition. They note that Jesus said, "And why do you transgress the commandment of God for the sake of your tradition?" (Matt. 15:3). Paul warned, "See to it that no one makes a prey of you by philosophy and empty deceit, according to human tradition, according to the elemental spirits of the universe, and not according to Christ" (Col. 2:8). But these verses merely condemn erroneous human traditions, not truths which were handed down orally and entrusted to the Church by the apostles. These latter truths are part of what is known as apostolic tradition, which is to be distinguished from human traditions or customs.

"Commandments of men"

Consider Matthew 15:6–9, which Fundamentalists and Evangelicals often use to defend their position: "So by these traditions of yours you have made God's laws ineffectual. You hypocrites, it was a true prophecy that Isaiah made of you, when he said, 'This people does me honor with its lips, but its heart is far from me. Their worship is in vain, for the doctrines they teach are the commandments of men.'" Look closely at what Jesus said.

He was not condemning all traditions. He condemned only those that made God's word void. In this case, it was a matter of the Pharisees feigning the dedication of their goods to the Temple so they could avoid using them to support their aged parents. By doing this, they dodged the commandment to "Honor your father and your mother" (Ex. 20:12).

Elsewhere, Jesus instructed his followers to abide by traditions that are not contrary to God's commandments. "The scribes and the Pharisees sit on Moses' seat; so practice and observe whatever they tell you, but not what they do; for they preach, but do not practice" (Matt. 23:2–3).

What Fundamentalists and Evangelicals often do, unfortunately, is see the word "tradition" in Matthew 15:3 or Colossians 2:8 or elsewhere and conclude that anything termed a "tradition" is to be rejected. They forget that the term is used in a different sense, as in 1 Corinthians 11:2 and 2 Thessalonians 2:15, to describe what should be believed. Jesus did not condemn all traditions; he condemned only erroneous traditions, whether doctrines or practices, that undermined Christian truths. The rest, as the apostles taught, were to be obeyed. Paul commanded the Thessalonians to adhere to all the traditions he had given them, whether oral or written.

#### The indefectible Church

The task is to determine what constitutes authentic tradition. How can we know which traditions are apostolic and which are merely human? The answer is the same as how we know which scriptures are apostolic and which are merely human—by listening to the magisterium or teaching authority of Christ's Church. Without the Catholic Church's teaching authority, we would not know with certainty which purported books of Scripture are authentic. If the Church revealed to us the canon of Scripture, it can also reveal to us the "canon of Tradition" by establishing which traditions have been passed down from the apostles. After all, Christ promised that the gates of hell would not prevail against the Church (Matt. 16:18) and the New Testament itself declares the Church to be "the pillar and foundation of the truth" (1 Tim. 3:15).

**Re: question: to Catholic - posted by twayneb (), on: 2009/8/24 20:58**

Natan4Jesus

Just a question (of mine) to provoke thought in a direction that perhaps has not been taken yet. If scripture is not the final authority, then what is? Something has to be the final authority or there is no such thing as authority at all.

**Re: question: to Catholic - posted by RobertW (), on: 2009/8/24 21:02**

Quote:

-----did you write that post yourself, or was that a cut and paste job? just curious thats all.

-----

Similarly I wondered if there was not a whole loaded set or materials pre-prepared to come in here and start lobbing around like hand grenades or something. There is no way in the world this conversation is going anywhere positive. All that can really happen at this point is for some poor new believer to be sifted or deceived.

**Re: - posted by twayneb (), on: 2009/8/24 21:13**

2Ti 3:16 All scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness:

Mar 7:13 Making the word of God of none effect through your tradition, which ye have delivered: and many such like things do ye.

If the traditions of the apostles are to be put on level playing field with the written scripture, then we have an obvious problem here. Be it tradition of the pharisees as is referred to here, or be it traditions of apostolic fathers, they are all traditions of men, and ultimately make the word of God of none effect.

I understand how deeply rooted traditions are. They go to the very core of who we are. To abandon them is often painful. I am not concerned with what the Vatican council said, I am concerned with what the Word of God says. If you believe that scripture is the inerrant word of God, scripture itself precludes trusting in any other thing as being inerrant. Abandon tradition, put your total faith and trust in the finished work of Christ when he died and shed His blood, and rose again victorious over death, hell, and the grave so that you might have a PERSONAL relationship with Him. You don't have to earn a place in heaven by how well you keep ordinances. That place is offered to you as a free gift. After you accept that gift, God begins to work in you and changes you from glory to glory into His image.

God is not interested in how well you know the catechism of the Catholic church, or in how well you keep the traditional ordinances handed down to you by your forefathers. He is interested in knowing YOU in a very personal and intimate way. The issue is not whether we can figure out which traditions are authentic and which are not. The issue is what we have done with this Jesus called the Christ. Have we fallen at His feet and cast our EVERY hope of ever being right with God on what He has done, or have we tried to approach him with the proper academic understanding and with the correct rules and ordinances?

I won't argue with you. I will only leave you with my question so that you may ponder it, and with the reminder that it is in Christ alone that any of us can be saved.

**Re: - posted by MaryJane, on: 2009/8/24 21:26**

Greetings

I have to agree completely with what RobertW posted!

Similarly I wondered if there was not a whole loaded set of materials pre-prepared to come in here and start lobbing around like hand grenades or something. There is no way in the world this conversation is going anywhere positive. All that can really happen at this point is for some poor new believer to be sifted or deceived.

I am praying the moderators will lock this thread before some new babe in Christ is deceived by the lies being posted by Catholic.

God Bless  
mj

**Re: , on: 2009/8/24 21:54**

Quote:  
-----Quote: did you write that post yourself, or was that a cut and paste job? just curious thats all. Similarly I wondered if there was not a whole loaded set of materials pre-prepared to come in here and start lobbing around like hand grenades or something. There is no way in the world this conversation is going anywhere positive. All that can really happen at this point is for some poor new believer to be sifted or deceived.  
-----

Please allow me to answer. I have not come with a "pre-loaded" set of arguments.

I am sincerely trying to read the enormity of posts that are coming my way. In an effort to answer you all, I have opted to deal with the major topics as they have come up.

I was advised by one of you upon starting this discussion not to try and answer every individual person. Was this bad advice?

Would it be better if I went the route of answering you all personally and individually?

I would hate to think that any of you wanted to shut this down because you weren't up to the discussion.

I'm having a great time here with you all.

God love you all,

Catholic

**Re: - posted by ChrisJD (), on: 2009/8/24 22:13**

Hi everyone.

Quote:

-----The true "rule of faith"—as expressed in the Bible itself—is Scripture plus apostolic tradition

The New Testament scripture and the Apostolic traditions **are one and the same**(John 20:31, Mat 13:52, 2Pe 3:16, 2Pe 1:15 John 17:20 -John 3:34).

If anyone claims to have knowledge of words of the Apostles that are not preserved in the Scriptures, **we can compare their claims with what is written**, much in the same way that Paul admonished the believers to do in Thessalonica(see 2Th 2:1-2).

Just as there, if anyone is claiming to you that they have a special knowledge of what Paul or the other Apostles taught, **we have not been left in the dark** by God. We can compare their claims with what the Apostles did leave us, their writings. And it is sufficient to do so!(2Ti 3:16). It is the scripture that is sufficient friends, not oral traditions or any man's claims to have them.

Do not be troubled or surprised friends that there are men in the world seeking to draw you away to themselves as the Apostles warned us that there would be also(Acts 20:30).

The Lord Jesus warned us of men that teach out of their own authority(John 7:16-18, John 5:43), seeking their own glory

If anyone is troubled by the claims that are being made here by a certain one, listen to your friends that have pointed you to the words of the Bible and of God that we have been given for our safety and protection.

There are many voices in the world friends, many vain talkers and deceivers.

But we have the pure words of God.

Re: , on: 2009/8/24 22:14

Quote:  
-----Hey Catholic You mentioned that you are not Roman Catholic, that you are in fact Eastern Catholic. Do you hold to the same traditions concerning mary, praying to mary? Confessing to priests? Praying to dead saints? mary being the queen of heaven? infant baptisms? pope being infallible? pope being the vicar of Christ?  
-----

All of the ancient church who have apostolic succession believe 99.9% exactly the same. It doesn't matter if you want to talk about Catholic, Orthodox, Coptic, Ethiopic, Maronite, Thomas Christians of India, Armenian...they all have the same seven sacred mysteries and deposit of faith.

I can't really address every issue you brought up in one reply. But I must say that some of the issues I would state and understand differently than you may. But I don't know that for sure until we get into them one at a time. (preferable in a different thread)

God love you

Re: - posted by ChrisJD (), on: 2009/8/24 22:32

Friends, may I say something else also,

Do not be troubled or moved by any man's testimony of himself. No man's testimony of himself is anything(John 5:31).

Re: twayne, on: 2009/8/24 22:34

you asked of me:

Quote:  
-----Just a question (of mine) to provoke thought in a direction that perhaps has not been taken yet. If scripture is not the final authority, then what is? Something has to be the final authority or there is no such thing as authority at all  
-----

I pray God you are not confusing me with this hell bound romanist. I believe and the Holy Ghost that lives in me agrees with this Truth, that all Scripture, our Holy Bible is God breathed, inerrant and infallible, usefull for teaching reproving and correction.

I dont know if ANY of you have noticed but this confused soul NEVER once mentions the Tanakh, the Old Testament, as if it didnt exist. The Old Testament repeatedly testifies and prophesies the Coming of the Messiah, there are even theophanies, where Jesus makes appearances within the Old Testament, yet romanist never mentions these once in his prepared hand grenades.

this is a very very strange thread, and what I find most unsettling about it all, is that the moderators seem to have fallen asleep on the job. Come on brothers! I relish freedom in Christ, and secular freedom of speech, but what this man is doing is outlining very precisely rome's ecclesiastical bondage, and their satanic arrogance, and yet you bid welcome to this minion of popery?

Yes and amen God can do anything, but this man is a hard core follower of rome,. lock this thread for the sake of Jesus, please.

Re: - posted by murrcolr (), on: 2009/8/24 22:54

Â‘Dignity and Duties of the Priest or SelvaÂ’. (A collection of Materials for Ecclesiastical Retreats. Rule of Life and Spiritual Rules) by St. Alphonsus de Liguori.

Just how high Alphonsus is reckoned in the scale of precedence of Roman saints can be seen from the 'Notice' which appears in the preface to the volume. It concludes with this eulogy Â‘LIVE JESUS, MARY, JOSEPH AND ALPHONSUS! Â’

#### JESUS DIED TO INSTITUTE THE ROMAN PRIESTHOOD

Â“Jesus has died to institute the priesthood. It was not necessary for the Redeemer to die in order to save the world; a drop of his blood, a single tear, or prayer, was sufficient to procure salvation for all; for such a prayer, being of infinite value, should be sufficient to save not one but a thousand worlds. But to Institute the priesthood, the death of Jesus Christ has been necessary. Had he not died, where should we find the victim that the priests of the New Law now offer? a victim altogether holy and immaculate, capable of giving to God an honour worthy of God. As had been already said, all the lives of men and angels are not capable of giving to God an infinite honour like that which a priest offers to him by a Single Mass.Â”

The above statement is a hideous blasphemy. Â‘Christ died for the ungodly.Â’

Â‘God, who at sundry times and in divers manners spake in time past unto the fathers by the prophetsÂ’.

Â‘Hath in these last days spoken unto us by His Son, whom He hath appointed heir of all things by whom also He made the worlds. Who being the brightness of His glory, and the express image of His person, and upholding all things by the word of His power, when He had by Himself purged our sins, sat down on the right hand of the Majesty on high.Â’

Â‘But this man, after he had offered one sacrifice for sins for ever, sat down on the right hand of God.Â’ The purpose of the Blood&#8209;shedding on the Cross was not to institute the massing priesthood of Rome but to purchase the redemption of the people of God.

Any system which holds such an unscriptural view of the Work of the Cross as Rome does is plainly not a Christian system at all but is part of the system of Satan and Antichrist.

#### THE ROMAN PRIEST GREATER THAN GOD

Â“Thus the priest may, in a certain manner, be called the creator of his Creator, since by saying the words of the consecration, he creates, as it were, Jesus in the sacrament, by giving him a sacramental existence, and produces him as a victim to be offered to the eternal Father. As in creating the world it was sufficient for God to have said, Let it be made, and it was created. He spoke, and they were made, so it is sufficient for the priest to say, Â‘Hoc est enim corpus meum,Â’ and behold the bread is no longer bread, but the body of Jesus Christ. Â‘The power of the priest,Â’ says St Bernardine of Sienna, Â‘is the power of the divine person; for the transubstantiation of the bread requires as much power as the creation of the worldÂ’.Â”

Â“With regard to the mystical body of Christ, that is, all the faithful, the priest has the power of the keys, or the power of delivering sinners from hell, of making them worthy of paradise, and of changing them from the slaves of Satan into the children of God. And God himself is obliged to abide by the judgment of his priests, and either not to pardon or to pardon, according as they refuse or give absolution, provided the penitent is capable of it.Â”

The practice of the Roman priesthood submerged the universal priesthood of all believers and the only real and active assertion of the believer is priesthood in the world today is in Biblical Protestantism.

The Reformation purged out the pagan priesthood and banished the title Â“priestÂ” as the name of the Christian minister of the Word of God.

Well may we ask, what is the real nature of the universal priesthood of all believers? We as Bible believing Protestants do not reject the priesthood. That is something which is inherent to the entire church of all believers. We are a nation of priests Â– a royal priesthood.

The Church, the whole church, is a priesthood. The Church has not got a priesthood but is a priesthood.

While acknowledging the priesthood of all believers Rome goes on to virtually destroy the New Testament priesthood and to elevate its conceptions of its own pagan priesthood.

The Council of Trent is specific and plain, I quote:-

‘The outward priesthood belongs not to all the faithful, but only to certain men, who are instituted and consecrated by the imposition of hands and the due rites of the Church to a specially sacred ministry. And the power of this outward priesthood is the power of offering to God the great sacrifice of the Church for the living and the dead – the Mass.’

While acknowledging the priesthood of all believers Trent exalts far above its own unscriptural pagan priestly cult and what is more, empties the universal priesthood of all belief as the result of the pretended magic of baptismal regeneration.

Trent teaches plainly that the priesthood of all believers is not theirs by virtue of their faith but in virtue of their baptism, so that the inward priesthood is wholly dependent on the pagan priests of Mother Church.

Moreover it is not necessary, for the power of the outward priesthood should have the grace of the inward. The outward priest has all the power of the priest no matter how filthy he may be in his everyday living, because his priesthood rests not in his personal faith and holiness but on his appointment.

He does not need to be the truly regenerated man, he only requires to be the Church created priest.

Power and sanctity are not joined. They may be entirely divorced but the man is still a priest because his priesthood is not attainment but appointment.

The Roman priest may be as filthy as sin but that does in no way hold against the validity of his priestly powers. He can live in sin but his powers are unchallenged and unchallengeable.

Roman Catholicism makes the assent of the Church an institution instead of the Gospel. It believes in a church rite rather than in Christ's faith.

‘The two priesthoods have, in fact, nothing in common except the name. They are not an essential and spiritual connection. The cleric is above the Church; he becomes the Church; he is described as a God. He draws his official power directly from God. His is the sole medium of grace for believers, who become and remain such only through the sacraments in his hands. And yet he need not be a personally holy man.’

Bible Protestantism is in clear antagonism to Roman pagan sin-practising priests.

The individual believers have no mediatorial place, Christ is the only mediator between God and man.

Luther declared a simple truth when he said:-

‘We take our stand on this. There is no other Word of God than that whose publication is enjoined on all Christians’

The temper of the hour in which we live is to a large extent pagan priestliness. It longs for the material, that which is seen in its worship. It has rejected the teaching of Christ. ‘He that worships Him (the Father) must worship Him in spirit and in truth’. No wonder the Reformers rejected the worship of Rome. The penitents in the worship of today dress up. The penitents in the Bible rent their clothes.

We hear a lot about cultured Protestantism today. Cultured Protestantism is Protestantism without the Gospel!

There are those today who are more content to be in a cultured Church than in a true Church. They respond to the amenities of a cultured society better than to the vigour of the Christian faith.

‘The real roots of the Roman reaction lie in the unrealised Romanism of Protestants. And the Protestant root of a mass priesthood is the idea so dear to the English mind, so central to a rational broad Churchism in every Church, and so plausible.’



sible as the ethical movement – the idea that the best action or conduct is contributory to salvation instead of produced by it. This is the Pelagian and Synergistic (man helping God to save himself), faith of medieval Catholicism reappearing in the circles of humanist Protestantism. Nothing is in more distinct contrast with the Protestant doctrine of justification by faith alone, nor in contrast more fatal. To adopt it is in principle to renounce the Reformation, whether it be done on a gnostic or on Catholic lines. The Reformation had to break away for its life both from the Catholics and from the humanists.

‘It was not mere sacramental works that the Reformers denied to have saving value, but ethical no less. It was not the mere ritual of worship that Paul fought when he led Luther’s way, but that of conduct as well. Man can contribute nothing to his own salvation. “Work out your own salvation, for it is God that worketh in you.” Yes, but God the Redeemer. What works in you is the redemption which you have already apprehended by faith alone. The words were spoken not to the natural conscience but to the redeemed. Any form of Synergism (man’s ability to help God in saving him) is fatal to justification by grace alone, which is the base of the true Protestant priesthood of all believers’.

Christianity is a religion and a faith before it is an ethic. It is ethical because of its faith in the supreme and all-inclusive ethical act of God in the Redeemer.’

There is much we must learn and there is much we must forget.

To be taught of God is to unlearn much and to grow in grace and in the knowledge of our Lord Jesus Christ.

What must I do to be saved?

Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ and thou shalt be saved. Acts 16:31.

By Ian Paisley

a "discussion"?, on: 2009/8/24 23:14

Quote:

-----I would hate to think that any of you wanted to shut this down because you weren't up to the discussion.  
-----

This is no "discussion", this is you, a romanist, coming onto a Full Gospel Bible believing website, who's main purpose is to catalogue sermons from Protestant preachers and revivalists and attempting to totally refute every tenet of this Most Holy Faith with your foul lies and romanizing ways.

You make no reference to the Tanakh that the Lord Jesus and all the disciples read from, that's just for starters, I will not bandy words with a roman trojan horse that is being used of satan to sow confusion and dissent on this dear forum. I'm a Jew, raised in the synagogue, taught in the ways of the Hebrew, Messiah Jesus took mercy upon me, and opened the eyes of my heart, and before that I know all about the roman institution, and their crusaders, murders, whose cry would be "KILL a JEW FOR JESUS!! I know all about your papa who would hug up with hitler, in exchange for stolen goods from the people of my flesh.

and even when you write:

Quote:

-----I'm having a great time here with you all.  
-----

.....all I can see is a cat batting a ball of yarn across the living room .

But GLORY TO GOD!!! Its appears you are fooling very few of the saints around here.

Re: a "discussion"?, on: 2009/8/24 23:35

Quote:

-----coming onto a Full Gospel Bible believing website  
-----

The fullness of the faith is only found in the ancient Orthodox Catholic church. Though we do allow that you do have part of it. (i.e. the Trinity, the deity of Christ, etc.)

Quote:

-----You make no reference to the Tanakh that the Lord Jesus and all the disciples read from  
-----

Have you ever wondered why the Catholic liturgy is based upon the pattern of the synagogue and Jewish meal? I doubt you dare you to find the nearest Maronite or Syrian Orthodox church near you. You'll recognize a lot.

Yet you deny Jesus' his role of High Priest who continually offers sacrifice to God the father on our behalf. Not to mention the priests whom He ordained to minister with Him the eternal sacrifice of His resurrected body and blood.

Actually your Masoretic Tanakh is the product of the 8th to 10th century AD. Any non-Catholic or non-Protestant encyclopedic source would bear this as the truth.

Quote:

-----I'm a Jew, raised in the synagogue, taught in the ways of the Hebrew, Messiah Jesus took mercy upon me  
-----

Quote:

-----crusaders, murders, whose cry would be "Kill a JEW FOR JESUS!!  
-----

This has never been the teaching of the Church Universal. You cannot use the existence of tares in the Master's field to discredit the wheat. Rather you prove that what exists in His field is exactly what He said would exist.

I bear you no animosity. In fact, I would to God that you see your blasphemy and repent as I did. For, like me, I think you are probably doing it in ignorance and in unbelief. May God have mercy on your soul as He did on mine.

Please know that I love your soul. It has more worth to God than you or I could possibly know.

Quote:

-----I know all about your papa who would hug up with Hitler, in exchange for stolen goods from the people of my flesh.  
-----

I guess this Jew would take issue with your statement:

<http://www.catholicleague.org/pius/dalinframe.htm>

**no cut and paste?, on: 2009/8/24 23:46**

word for word.

([http://www.catholic.com/library/Scripture\\_and\\_Tradition.asp](http://www.catholic.com/library/Scripture_and_Tradition.asp)) roman swill catholic pasted up

**Re: no cut and paste?, on: 2009/8/24 23:58**

Quote:

----- word for word. roman swill catholic pasted up

-----

Um...I said that I took this from Catholic.com.

But thanks for giving everybody the link. I think that is quite helpful. I never took you for a Catholic apologist. You're doing the Lord's work here.

Bless you.

**Re: apostasia - posted by savannah, on: 2009/8/24 23:59**

From God through Paul to Christ's little flock,

Gal 1:6-9 I wonder that you are so quickly turning back from the One having called you by the grace of Christ to another gospel, which is not another; only there are some troubling you, even determined to pervert the gospel of Christ. But even if we, or an angel out of Heaven, should preach a gospel to you beside the gospel we preached to you, let him be accursed. As we have said before, and now I say again, If anyone preaches a gospel beside what you received, let him be accursed.

2 Cor 11:1-4 I earnestly wish ye could bear with me a little in my folly: and indeed bear with me.

For I am jealous over you with godly jealousy: for I have espoused you to one husband, that I may present you as a chaste virgin to Christ. But I fear, lest by any means, as the serpent beguiled Eve through his subtilty, so your minds should be corrupted from the simplicity that is in Christ. For if he that cometh preacheth another Jesus, whom we have not preached, or if ye receive another spirit, which ye have not received, or another gospel, which ye have not accepted, ye might well bear with him.

Would to God that such a Word not be spoken unto us as was spoken to some long ago as an example to us (Rev. 2:20). May we not allow/tolerate one to teach us who is self-condemned and whose intentions are to seduce and lead astray Christ's servants.

Re-read some of Catholic's posts. Flattering lips are dripping with the poisonous saliva of the subtle serpent.

**BE NOT DECEIVED LITTLE FLOCK!!!**

What has possessed some here to do as Eve did in the garden I know not!

**REPENT & TURN AWAY FROM THIS STRANGER!**

Greet not this impostor nor welcome this deceiver!

May the men of God here rise up and stand against this one with words of sharp rebuke!

May there be no effeminacy, but strength like that of David who stood against the enemy of Israel, Goliath.

For the LOVE of Christ, His Kingdom, His Truth & His Gospel...

Stand ye therefore,

His friend & yours

May we receive such a report as this,

Rev 2:2,3 I know thy works, and thy labor, and thy patience, and that thou canst not bear them who are evil; and thou hast tried them who say they are apostles, and are not; and hast found them liars: And hast borne, and hast patience, and for my name's sake hast labored, and hast not fainted.

The following link may apply somewhat and speak to some here:

<https://www.sermonindex.net/modules/articles/index.php?view=article&aid=697>

**Re: a "discussion"?, on: 2009/8/25 0:06**

Quote:

-----attempting to totally refute every tenet of this Most Holy Faith with your foul lies and romanizing ways.

One more thing. You referred to all of your beliefs as "this Most Holy Faith". He he he. That tickles my funny bone. He he he. LOL

You all DISAGREE WITH EACH OTHER!!!

How can you call something so varied, "this Most Holy Faith?"

You should have said "THESE Most Holy Faiths"

...if you wanted to be accurate.

Sincere thanks for a great chuckle. (Nothing snide intended - that was real cute) he he

**Re: - posted by murrclor (), on: 2009/8/25 0:07**

Catholic where is Jesus in your life?

**Re: - posted by murrclor (), on: 2009/8/25 0:20**

Must have gone to check his books to find the answer.

**Re: - posted by rbanks, on: 2009/8/25 0:28**

Catholic,

I have just now noticed and skimmed through this thread. I must say that you sound like some other people who I have talked to in the past. One was a mormon and the other was a Jehovah's witness. The mormon said that they prayed to the father and got peace about the mormon doctrine. My reply was what father because Jesus said to the religious people of his earthly days that their father was the devil. The Jehovah's witness was taught to accept the teaching and both of them had peace about their belief.

Now I have read where you have stated that you have found peace in your Catholic religion. I would like to advise anyone not to base your eternal future on a peace you have found unless He is the "prince of peace". There are many who have a false peace. True salvation comes through faith in Jesus resulting in true justification that brings about true peace with God. True peace must be based solely upon the Lord Jesus Christ and his atonement for our sins.

Catholic I have very good reason to believe that you have been deceived just as the Mormon and the Jehovah's witness. According to the doctrine of Jesus Christ all three of you have been deceived and Jesus has told us much about taking heed to his teachings and let no man deceive you.

Once a person is deceived they won't be persuaded as long as they are held by the spirit of deception. When the deceiv

ed person has accepted what they believe with all their soul then they spend great lengths at trying to deceive others at what they truly believe, because they actually believe it, and don't thing that they have been deceived.

Some may wonder how can a person believe in Jesus and be deceived. Well anytime a person has added another teaching or person to Jesus as being a necessity to their salvation experience will be deceived.

You stated that you have the scriptures, plus the catholic teachings, plus the pope in order to understand God and his salvation. I was born again on my knees in my bedroom calling on the name of the Lord Jesus to save me. I received a wonderful experience in God that by his spirit he led me to read the scriptures and grow deeper in love and fellowship with the Lord. I went to different places as he led me but He kept me away from many fellowships that were not true to his teachings like the mormons, jehovah witnessess, and the catholic church.

**Re: - posted by MaryJane, on: 2009/8/25 0:34**

Catholic you are deceived, very very deceived and I shudder to think of what your eternity will be if you do not repent. You mock and laugh trying to bait true believers, attempting to stir them to anger. Where is Christ's love in that?

John 14:6

Jesus answered, "I am the way and the truth and the life. No one comes to the Father except through me.

John 14:5-7

mj

**Re: - posted by Miccah (), on: 2009/8/25 1:00**

Catholic wrote:

Quote:

-----

One more thing. You referred to all of your beliefs as "this Most Holy Faith". He he he. That tickles my funny bone. He he he. LOL

-----

Thank you for exposing your true nature. It only took a few days to come about. Thank you Lord for exposing this charlatan.

Quote:

-----You all DISAGREE WITH EACH OTHER!!!

-----

Not true at all! We all agree that you are a clown. :-)

**Re: , on: 2009/8/25 1:16**

Quote:

-----Thank you for exposing your true nature. It only took a few days to come about. Thank you Lord for exposing this charlatan.

-----

I don't know what you're reading into this. But if I can't share a giggle with you all, I don't know what I can share.

Like I said. I am not trying to incite anyone.

I just think some of your arguments are silly in a child like sort of way.

Quote:

-----Not true at all! We all agree that you are a clown.

-----

Yes, maybe I am a clown for Christ. Or a fool for Christ.

**Re: , on: 2009/8/25 1:19**

Quote:

-----You mock and laugh trying to bait true believers, attempting to stir them to anger. Where is Christ's love in that?

-----

Please forgive me. I really am not trying to incite you.

If you only knew how much I love your soul!

I'm so happy to be speaking with you. You are precious to me and to God.

**Re: , on: 2009/8/25 1:23**

Quote:

-----The mormon said that they prayed to the father and got peace about the mormon doctrine.

-----

But isn't this how you all claim to know that your canon contains the right books? You think a "believer" can just pray and that God will reveal to him/her that the books included are the ones that belong and are inspired by God?

You certainly don't hold to the Catholic/Orthodox view that the Holy Spirit led an ecumenical church council to define it for all men in all times.

So shouldn't I be the one pulling the "mormon" card?

**Re: - posted by Miccah (), on: 2009/8/25 1:36**

Catholic wrote:

Quote:

-----

I don't know what you're reading into this. But if I can't share a giggle with you all, I don't know what I can share.

-----

Laughing at the elect of Gods by a deceiver is not funny in most people's books. But it does show your character.

Quote:

-----Yes, maybe I am a clown for Christ. Or a fool for Christ.

-----

No, I'm pretty sure that you're just a regular old clown. Or if you prefer, I can just call you what you are.?

I think someone said it best earlier. You should be refuted at every turn lest you attempt to deceive others.

**Re: - posted by MaryJane, on: 2009/8/25 2:08**

Catholic you wrote: Please forgive me. I really am not trying to incite you.

If you only knew how much I love your soul!

I'm so happy to be speaking with you. You are precious to me and to God.

---

You have not incited me to anger, at first I felt sorry for you because I thought perhaps you were like many in the Catholic church lost and deceived, but the things that you have posted here reveal your true intentions and heart. You come to try and deceive others, to spread the lies of a false and pagan religion that only holds eternal separation from God for its followers. There is no love in what you say or what you are about.

I praise God though, the sheep here know their Shepard voice and they are not listening to your lies.

I will continue to pray for your salvation and that one day very soon you will see the truth and repent.

mj

**Re: Sola Scriptura is logically untenable - posted by Lordoitagain (), on: 2009/8/25 6:53**

Catholic,

In reading through this thread, I have noticed that you like to return to your original thesis:

Quote:

-----The Bible never claims to be the only rule for faith and practice.  
-----

While that exact phrase: "the only rule for faith and practice" is not found in the Bible, other scriptures as pointed out by brother Murray give the understanding of the superiority of scripture:

Romans 15:4 For whatsoever things were written aforetime were written for our learning, that we through patience and comfort of the scriptures might have hope.

2 Timothy 3:16 All scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness.

1 Corinthians 4:6 And these things, brethren, I have in a figure transferred to myself and to Apollos for your sakes; that ye might learn in us not to think of men above that which is written, that no one of you be puffed up for one against another.

While that exact phrase is NOT in the Bible, and the very last chapter states:

Rev 22:18 For I testify unto every man that heareth the words of the prophecy of this book, If any man shall add unto these things, God shall add unto him the plagues that are written in this book:

Rev 22:19 And if any man shall take away from the words of the book of this prophecy, God shall take away his part out of the book of life, and out of the holy city, and from the things which are written in this book.

Which could very well be God's application to the entire Bible . . .

Repeatedly you affirm:

Quote:

-----It is not sufficient. And I would submit that the wide variance of opinions held by sincere seekers is proof that it is insufficient.

Why? Because the Scriptures need to be interpreted. And herein lies the problem. Each of us is FALLABLE. And therefore so is our interpretation.

-----  
While your statement:

Quote:

-----The Bible never claims to be the only rule for faith and practice.  
-----

may be true, the Bible gives VERY CLEAR AND UNMISTAKABLE instruction on WHO to take interpretation from:

Mat 7:15 Beware of false prophets, which come to you in sheep's clothing, but inwardly they are ravening wolves.

Mat 7:16 Ye shall know them by their fruits. Do men gather grapes of thorns, or figs of thistles?

Mat 7:17 Even so every good tree bringeth forth good fruit; but a corrupt tree bringeth forth evil fruit.

Mat 7:18 A good tree cannot bring forth evil fruit, neither can a corrupt tree bring forth good fruit.

Mat 7:19 Every tree that bringeth not forth good fruit is hewn down, and cast into the fire.

Mat 7:20 Wherefore by their fruits ye shall know them.

I wish that you could be honest enough with yourself to go to <http://www.unshackled.org/> and hear life story after life story of the dramatic life transformations that God has brought about in thousands of lives who had no connection to the "pure" interpretation that you suppose the Catholic church to have. Those are just a few of the MILLIONS whose lives have been made holy and Christlike OUTSIDE of the teachings of the Catholic church.

"Ye shall know them by their fruits". I don't know how the Catholics are that you are associated with, but unfortunately, many of the Catholics that I have known live in fornication, drunkenness, and revelry during the week, and once a week confess to the priest, and then return to their enslavement to sin.

Perhaps the Catholics that I have known didn't have the privilege of seeing good Catholic examples of holy lives as perhaps you have, and therefore the blind are leading the blind and both are falling in the ditch.

Perhaps the local priests aren't correctly passing on the "pure interpretation" and that is why they show no fruit of a holy life.

Rom 6:20 For when ye were the servants of sin, ye were free from righteousness.

Rom 6:21 What fruit had ye then in those things whereof ye are now ashamed? for the end of those things is death.

Rom 6:22 But now being made free from sin, and become servants to God, ye have your fruit unto holiness, and the end everlasting life.

Catholic, in all honesty, do you have a relationship with Christ that produces fruit unto holiness in your life, or are you a servant of sin?

As a young person, I went to school with a lot of Baptist young people who believed "once you're saved you're always saved", and the way that they interpreted their doctrine, it didn't matter how much they sinned, they were still going to heaven. At a young age, I formed the opinion that all Baptists who believe that doctrine are on their way to hell. Since then I have met several WONDERFUL Baptists (such as Paul Washer) who believe that same doctrine but the way that they interpret it is that if you are living a life that is not producing "fruit unto holiness", it is evident that you are not really saved.

In reality, interpretation IS AN INDIVIDUAL MATTER!!!! No matter how "pure" you believe your stream of interpretation to be, the way that you apply it personally is an individual matter.

Unfortunately, I have never met a Catholic who was "free from sin" and had "fruit unto holiness" as described in Romans



6:20-22. That is why I as well as millions of other protestants have formed the conclusion that the Catholic religion is full of "false prophets, which come to you in sheep's clothing, but inwardly they are ravening wolves".

PROVE US WRONG on a local level!!!! Send Catholics to our cities and towns who are living in a way that it is OBVIOUS that the Author of the Bible has transformed their lives!!!!

In the meantime, those protestants whose lives have been transformed by the Author of the Bible will continue to proclaim His word and translate it into every language that we possibly can so that others may know what it is like to become a new creation in Christ:

2Co 5:17 Therefore if any man be in Christ, he is a new creature: old things are passed away; behold, all things are become new.

**Re: Sola Scriptura is logically untenable - posted by ginnyrose (), on: 2009/8/25 7:05**

Catholic,

Many folks have posted scripture, and would appreciate a reaction from you concerning them. Mind obliging us? And while you are it, keep the answers short and sweet! :-) Share in your own words and not resort to a copy/paste job. Thanks!

ginnyrose

**Re: - posted by sermonindex (), on: 2009/8/25 8:21**

Hi,

After reviewing this thread I am going to lock and close it down. SermonIndex is really not the place to re-open discussions and try and argue if the Catholic church or other cults are right or not. This thread has been brought to my attention by many brothers and sisters as not beneficial. I am locking this and ask that it not be carried on in another thread.