

THE REVIEW AND HERALD

BATTLE CREEK, MICH., THIRD-DAY, NOV. 5, 1861

QUESTIONS FOR BRO. LOUGHBOROUGH

BRO. WHITE: The following questions I would like to have you give, or send, to Bro. Loughborough for explanation.

W. W. GILES.

Toledo, Ohio.

QUESTION 1. What serious objection is there to the **doctrine of the Trinity?**

ANSWER. There are many objections which we might urge, but on account of our limited space we shall reduce them to the three following: 1. It is contrary to common sense. 2. It is contrary to scripture. 3. Its origin is Pagan and fabulous.

These positions we will remark upon briefly in their order. And 1. It is not very consonant with common sense to talk of three being one, and one being three. Or as some express it, calling God "the Triune God," or "the three-one-God." If Father, Son, and Holy Ghost are each God, it would be three Gods; for three times one is not one, but three. There is a sense in which they are one, but not one person, as claimed by Trinitarians.

2. It is contrary to Scripture. **Almost any portion of the New Testament we may open which has occasion to speak of the Father and Son, represents them as two distinct persons. The seventeenth chapter of John is alone sufficient to refute the doctrine of the Trinity.** Over forty times in that one chapter Christ speaks of his Father as a person distinct from himself. His Father was in heaven and he upon earth. The Father had sent him. Given to him those that believed. He was then to go to the Father. And in this very testimony he shows us in what consists the oneness of the Father and Son. It is the same as the oneness of the members of Christ's church. "That they all may be one; as thou, Father, art in me, and I in thee, that they also may be one in us; that the world may believe that thou hast sent me. And the glory which thou gavest me I have given them; that they may be one, even as we are one." Of one heart and one mind. Of one purpose

in all the plan devised for man's salvation. Read the seventeenth chapter of John, and see if it does not completely upset the doctrine of the Trinity.

To believe that doctrine, when reading the scripture we must believe that God sent himself into the world, died to reconcile the world to himself, raised himself from the dead, ascended to himself in heaven, pleads before himself in heaven to reconcile the world to himself, and is the only mediator between man and himself. It will not do to substitute the human nature of Christ (according to Trinitarians) as the Mediator; for Clarke says, "Human blood can no more appease God than swine's blood." Com. on 2Sam.xxi,10. We must believe also that in the garden God prayed to himself, if it were possible, to let the cup pass from himself, and a thousand other such absurdities.

Read carefully the following texts, comparing them with the idea that Christ is the Omnipotent, Omnipresent, Supreme, and only self-existent God: John 14:28; 17:3; 3:16, 5:19,26; 11:15; 20:19; 8:50; 6:38; Mark 13:32; Luke 6:12; 22:69; 24:29; Matt.3:17; 27:46; Gal.3:20; 1Jno.2:1; Rev.5:7; Acts 17:31. Also see Matt.11:25,27; Luke 1:32; 22:42; John 3:35,36; 5:19,21,22,23,25,26; 6:40; 8:35,36; 14:13; 1Cor.15:28, etc.

The word Trinity nowhere occurs in the Scriptures. The principal text supposed to teach it is 1John 1:7, which is an interpolation. Clarke says, "Out of one hundred and thirteen manuscripts, the text is wanting in one hundred and twelve. It occurs in no MS. before the tenth century. And the first place the text occurs in Greek, is in the Greek translation of the acts of the Council of Lateran, held A. D. 1215." - Com. on John i, and remarks at close of chap.

3. Its origin is pagan and fabulous. Instead of pointing us to scripture for proof of the trinity, we are pointed to the trident of the Persians, with the assertion that "by this they designed to teach the idea of a trinity, and if they had the doctrine of the trinity, they must have received it by tradition from the people of God. But this is all assumed, for it is certain that the Jewish church held to no such doctrine. Says Mr. Summerbell, "A friend of mine who was present in a New York synagogue, asked the Rabbi for an explanation of the word 'elohim'. A Trinitarian clergyman who stood by, replied, 'Why, that has reference to the three persons in the Trinity,' when a Jew stepped forward and said he must not mention that word again, or they would have to compel him to leave the house; for it was not permitted to mention the name of any strange god in the synagogue." 1 Milman says the idea of the Trident is fabulous. 2

This doctrine of the trinity was brought into the church about the same time with image worship, and keeping the day of the sun, and is but Persian doctrine remodeled. It occupied about three hundred years from its introduction to bring the doctrine to what it is now. It was commenced about 325 A. D., and was not completed till 681. See Milman's Gibbon's Rome, vol. iv, p.422. It was adopted in Spain in 589, in England in 596, in Africa in 534. - Gib. vol. iv, pp.114,345; Milner, vol. i, p.519.

QUESTION 2. Does Babylon's non-recognition of the first angel's message constitute her fall?"

ANSWER. The testimony of Rev.14:8, which speaks of the fall of Babylon, says it is fallen "because she hath made all nations drink of the wine of the wrath of her fornication." This wine refers to the unscriptural doctrines of Babylon. She causes the nations to drink by enforcing these doctrines upon their minds, and calling upon them to enforce them by law upon the people. The first angel's message gave Babylon a chance to be healed - to throw away her mystical principle of interpreting the Scriptures, and adopt the literal principle, which would expose her mystical doctrines; but in rejecting that message she refused to be healed, and her fall was complete. For further light on the subject of Babylon and the first angel's message, I would refer you to the pamphlet entitled, "The Three Messages of Rev.14:6-12," published at the Review Office.

QUES. 3. What is to be understood by Matt.24:34, taken in connection with the balance of the chapter?

ANS. The text reads, "Verily I say unto you, this generation shall not pass, till all these things be fulfilled." The generation that is not to pass till Christ comes, is the one that can learn the parable of the fig tree. Those who can learn this parable are those who can look into the past and see the fulfillment of these signs down to the falling of the stars, and what follows shows the condition of the two classes that are to form the generation that will witness Christ's second coming. For a full exposition of this matter, see "Exposition of Matt.24," published at the Review Office.

QUES. 4. Should we commence to keep the Sabbath at evening, or morning?

ANS. For an answer to this question I would refer you to the testimony on this subject found in Bro. Andrews' late History of the Sabbath, pp.107,108.

QUES. 5. If we keep the Sabbath, and inhabitants on the other side of the globe do too, then do we both keep the time abstractly? if not, what is the use in being so exact in regard to the seventh-day time?

ANS. I understand you to ask whether we keep the same minutes which our antipodes keep. We do not, and if we kept the same moments they were keeping we should keep the light part of the sixth day and the night or evening of the seventh, for their seventh day begins twelve hours before it begins here. But you say if this is so, "what is the use in being so exact in regard to the seventh-day time?" The use in being exact in regard to the time, is, that that is the time God has told us to keep. Because the seventh day actually commences twelve hours later here than in some parts of the eastern continent, is no reason why we should neglect it when it gets here. God tells us to keep the seventh day, and we cannot keep it until it comes to us. If it comes to other nations twelve hours

before it gets here, then they must keep it when it comes to them. God told Israel anciently that they must offer to him a lamb without blemish. They might have argued with equal propriety that their neighbor nations had no such lambs, therefore they might as well offer a goat. God is exact in his requirements, and means what he says. If he says "lamb," he means so. If he says "seventh day," he does not mean any day we please to choose. People generally argue from your proposition above that it shows that we cannot tell when the seventh day is, but it is not so. We are sure we have the reckoning of time correctly from the time of the institution of the Sabbath to the present, with the exception that it commences a few hours later than where instituted; nevertheless it is the seventh day, and what we are commanded to keep.

The Sabbath was instituted in Eden. The movement of time as we now have it has been westward. The emigration from country to country that has resulted in our being placed on this continent, has been westward, so that we can easily trace our emigration back to Eden, and also our time, and be sure that we have the seventh day which God there sanctified.

J. N. LOUGHBOROUGH.