

Rules of Interpretation. Elder Parminder Biant. February 13, 2020.

How to approach inspiration? How do we see and interpret law? The issue is Methodology. Many of us think about methodology in a superficial fashion

When you are reading plainly, do you need the Holy Spirit to do that? Do you need the Holy Spirit to understand what the Scripture is teaching? Why?

Miller' s rule #2 (All Scripture is necessary and may be understood by diligent application and study. 2 Timothy 3:15,16,17) states that one has to work diligently, and if we do that, we should be able to understand what the Scripture teaches.

If you want to be a surface reader you can do that through diligent effort.

The implications of this is that you do not need to be a Christian in order to understand what the Bible or spirit of prophecy teaches. When people hear statements like that, they would find it disturbing. Do you have any problem with a statement like that? Why not?

Many people say that you need Holy Spirit to understand Bible and the Spirit of Prophecy. If you follow that logic, then consider this: if you're an atheist and you hate God, could God lead you? So that an atheist couldn't have come to the same conclusion as us?

Let me ask you a question: how does public evangelism work? How would you get someone from the world into the church? How to present God's work to them and what do you say to them when you do that (because they're the ones that you need to convert)? do you tell them to pray first? No? Why, but if you don't pray how would you understand God's word?

God has to speak to them so they can understand what He said? Can't they just do it by themselves? So, they have to pray first, and if they didn't, they wouldn't understand the difference between the sixth day in the seventh day?

So, if we write a track or a leaflet, and we must distribute that, we pray over the booklet, and if we didn't pray, people wouldn't be able to understand what the booklet said? That is what you are saying.

So, we write a booklet, or we go and visit someone and unless we pray the Holy Spirit's not going to help them to understand what we're trying to teach them?

So, you go to another religion, they would do the same, wouldn't they? They would pray, and if they're a Buddhist, or a Hindu, or Muslim, or they're another denomination of apostate Protestantism they would do the same thing we did (Pray). How would that person become a Methodist or a Baptist? - They'd say the Holy Spirit led them because we prayed.

That is the argument that my brother's using. Would we agree with that methodology that God is going to lead people into apostate Protestantism because it's good for them, and because they prayed?

So those who promote the Cyrus prophecy (That D. Trump being led by God) was he being led by God when he had to either the dream or the vision? We would say NO. You know it just doesn't work that way. It really should be simple for us to see that when we deal with public evangelism, we hand out inspiration to people, and there's no prayer, there's no Holy spirit that's guiding and directing that people who could just read plain statements. And when you do that what Bible brochures do you use? The easy ones or the difficult ones? The plain ones or the complex ones? If you go to an evangelistic series today, what Bible version do they use? - A reformed version they don't use King James. Why? Because it's hard to understand, it's common sense that you wouldn't use the King James because it's hard to understand or get the point across.

I'm not suggesting that God is not involved in Providence and doesn't lead and direct the movements of human beings, that you can meet someone providentially.

Rule #3: Nothing revealed in the Scripture can or will be hid from those who ask in faith, not wavering. Deuteronomy 29:29; Matthew 10:26, 27; 1 Corinthians 2:10; Philippians 3:15; Isaiah 44:11; Matthew 21:22; John 14:13, 14; 15:7; James 1:5, 6; 1 John 5:13, 14, 15.

Notice it uses the word "revealed" or "hidden" and that's how I'm using this concept of hidden treasure and surface treasure. If you want to find hidden treasure and to understand the deeper truth that are contained in the Scriptures, then that's the work of the Holy Spirit, without that you cannot understand what's going on.

Now, if we were to talk about adultery and I were to say to you what's the surface understanding of adultery? How would I know if you committed adultery or if you're involved with another person? Someone took a picture, and now we have the evidence: we see physical contact. That's the surface understanding. We will call it surface treasure.

Tell me what hidden treasure is when it comes to the concept of adultery? surface understanding: physical contact.

A: Hidden treasure is false doctrines.

Where are you getting that idea from? -let's turn to Matthew 5:27: "But I say unto you, that whosoever looketh on a woman to lust after her hath committed adultery with her already in his heart."

So, you've taken a surface understanding which is kissing, and the hidden understanding or the deeper understanding, hidden treasure of this issue would be just thinking about kissing, right? So, if you ask most Christians, most Adventists this question about what a surface understanding would be or a hidden or deeper understanding of the subject of adultery they would say, like my brother did, the surface understanding is you touch someone, the deeper hidden understanding is you just think about it. And Jesus is saying touching and thinking of the same thing. So, as a number of people have already said, I would suggest that the hidden truth or the hidden treasure of adultery is not that you look upon a person in fact whether you touch or whether you look is all surface understanding. If we're willing to follow these guidelines: rule #2 - diligent effort, common-sense, hard work you're able to understand, you don't need the Holy Spirit for that. We know it's true, Ellen White says it's true, you've said it here it's a true statement, you don't need the Holy Spirit, just diligent effort. So, who's that applicable to? - Everybody, the whole world can understand things, because most of the world is not being led or guided by the Holy Spirit, so they're going to understand things through **diligent effort or common sense**, depending how complex the subject is, then there's another set of truths or information: rule #3: that you need faith, and I'm saying the synonym of that or another way to express it is that you need God to guide you, need the Holy Spirit in order to understand Scripture.

So, there's an exclusive way of understanding inspiration and there's a general way of understanding inspiration. Everyone in the world can understand certain portions, and only Christians, those who have faith and led by God, can understand other portions. That's what these rules say. When I say certain portions what I really mean is the same portion of inspiration same passage, but you just understand it in a different way. If we say that the definition of the surface understanding is that you don't need the Holy Spirit, anyone can do that. Then if you go to a love story, I'll go with Shakespeare, "Romeo and Juliet". It's a secular story, everyone knows about it. It's probably I'm going to say it's the most famous love story in the English language. So, Romeo and Juliet are talking to each other and what did they like to do? - Kiss, yeah? They like to touch each other. Now do you need to tell either one of them let us say Romeo, "By the way, Romeo, there's a rule in the book of Exodus, and it says don't touch other women." What would he say to you? He would say "I don't want to touch another woman, I don't have anyone else." You say: "Good. You won't be committing adultery, then." And then you say: "By the way there's hidden treasure in this that you're not allowed think about another women." And what would he say to you? He would say: "I don't think about another women. I don't need that rule to guide me." It's already built into his heart; he doesn't need a commandment to tell him not to look at other women. Why? Because he's in love with her the only reason people look at other people is because they're not in love. **That rule is for people who are not in love, because if you're in love, you don't**

need that rule. That's why the whole world is filled with love stories. Everyone understands how love works everyone understands how adultery works. These rules are for people who are sinners, who want to break the rules, and the only reason they want to break the rules is because they're not in love. When you're in love all you can see is the person, you want to touch them, you would never want to touch another person, and you don't think about other people, and I would venture to say I know it's fictitious, **but Romeo is not a Seventh day Adventist Christian. He didn't pray about that he just knows it innately. It's obvious to him that he would not look at another woman. Based upon that logic this instruction that we get in Matthew 5 is not hidden treasure, it's not a deeper revelation of what adultery is.** It can't be a deeper revelation, because even Romeo knows that, and if he knows that, that means Shakespeare knew it, and if Shakespeare knew it, everyone knows it. Can we see that logic? So, the only people who can dig the hidden treasure out are Christians. Even that, in some ways, can be surface understanding. But when you start looking at their implications and the ramifications of that you really do need to be guided and directed by the Holy Spirit to understand who the church is, what adultery looks like, how it operates. That's why Christians fight.

The moral perspective of inspiration anyone can understand, and that's why people when they look at religions, what do they tend to say? They're all similar, they all have similar characteristics, and what makes religions similar? What is a similar theme or characteristic you get from all of them? It's the moral concept. That's why religion doesn't have anything to teach people. In the olden days people were scared of the unknown, so they would be afraid to fight against someone of religion in case their crops would get flooded or burnt, and they'd say "see, that was the supernatural power. But now with science all of those things are explainable. They're not scared of Christians, or people of religion anymore. They don't have that fear. That fear has been taken away, so that's why you see so many atheists are bold in the 20th, 21st century or even into the 19th, you could even go to the 18th. When you start thinking about the Age of Enlightenment, in that framework, the reason why they have boldness it's because they've worked through the logic and the philosophical arguments about how life operates, the rights and wrongs of how things work. Science has caught up so they can explain certain phenomena, and when you have all of that you do not need God. **The problem is Christians argue with people of the world, with atheist in the wrong framework, because we always argue on morality: "without God you would be immoral". Then all the Atheist come back and say, actually, you folks are the most immoral, because you kill more people. Then we say: "No, those is atheistic governments twenty years killed more people."** So it's all about how many people everyone killed, this a silly argument. Then we say Christians are better than the Muslims because Muslims are angry people, killing everyone, if you don't agree with them, **they're all moral arguments and morality will never get you anywhere except into an argument.** But, fundamentally, most people agree with the basic tenets of

morality, we call the basic tenets of Christianity. I think we could call them just common sense. You don't need to be Christians to work those things out. The way the Constitution was framed, was it framed from a Christian perspective or a commonsense perspective? I think we're mature enough to know that. They add a little bit in the documentation "In God We Trust" and why they put that there? It doesn't serve anything, when you think about, it except to say God put us here on the earth. But even if he has and it wouldn't make any difference the document doesn't change whether God did something, or he didn't do something.

So, **morality is a surface understanding. What we need to understand is hidden treasure which I'm saying is a prophetic understanding the problem is Adventists have taken huge portions of scriptures, just like the Jews had done, and relegated them to either moral portions or prophetic portions. And when you do that, prophetic portions, basically, serve no purpose, they don't make any sense.** So you get to a place where we don't even understand what the number of the beast 666 means. What does it even mean? How do we even go about decoding and unlocking that information? The reason we're not sure is because we seem to approach not only that portion, but many other portions of scriptures from a moralistic fashion, and we're not familiar with approaching inspiration prophetically. So, we struggle how to read. That's the point I want us to see. It is easy to do morality, it's impossible to do prophecy. But you need to understand morality first, in order to understand prophecy. You need to have an intellectual assent to the truth before that truth can sink into your heart.

Q: Ellen White says we should pray before we open the Bible, so what does that mean for us now? Are we saying that we don't pray? Are we saying there's no point in praying, it serves no purpose?

Should we pray when we open the Bible, and if we should, what purposes it serve? We should? Why? You need the Holy Spirit to guide you to do or understand what? If you want to approach the Bible with a prophetic study, then you should pray. What about if we want to do a devotional study, and we say we don't want to do a prophetic study today, we just want to do a devotional study? Why do we pray then? What we are praying for? What do we want to understand? How bad adultery is? We want to do a devotional on adultery, what would we pray for? I don't want to do a prophetic study on it, there are people in this room who are committing adultery, and I want to discuss that with them. I don't to do one about the church and Christ. I want to talk firmly about the rights and wrongs of adultery, why would we pray?

Audience: We were instructed to pray, so we should do it.

I like that answer, we were instructed to pray, so we should just do it. When I was growing up even if you don't understand why you eat your vegetables, because it's good for you. So, we just followed the rules, because they're the rules. Why do we pray? Can't we just do like scratch the surface study?

Audience: We look for guidance from the Holy Spirit.

I like that answer.

I'm going to suggest that Nathan prays. What is Nathan going to pray about? I want us to think through the story: it is morning, Nathan is praying in his room, what's David doing in his room? What's going through David's mind? Guilt. David is feeling guilty, and Nathan's praying. What's Nathan praying about he's going to go and see him in the in an hour what's Nathan going to pray? If we are doing a moralistic study, people will have an impression, I would suggest, there's different reasons why we pray, and **what we tend to do is use prayer as a magic charm.** We say as long as we go on our knees, because you have to go on your knees, if you don't, it's all bad, because if you stand up or sit down and pray it doesn't work the same. We have turned prayer into a tool to control God, or we think he's a tool that he's used to control us, and if we just followed the rules it all works, but that's not what prayer is about. I'm not going to do a study on prayer, but we pray for different things, the different reasons. So, if you're doing a moral study, and I want to talk to you about your behavior. The behavior here in this school is not good, I know it's not good people can sense it's not good here, now, if I come and say, half of you people are really badly behaved, you're uncaring you see problems and you don't help, you're selfish, what would I be praying about? That you understand the hidden treasure in the story about Lucifer and Christ or would I be praying that God brings conviction to your heart, and when I say you're bad, you know I'm talking about you. And not only you bring conviction, but that you begin to act upon that conviction. So, I think we should always pray when we open scriptures, but when we pray there should be a definite objective and direction to that prayer. Because if you don't know your subject, you don't know what to pray about. You need to know what you're praying about. If it is a moral study, I get the point, but we're here at this school and we've already had moral studies, haven't we? There is a time and a place for that, we could go to a portion of Scripture and we could say look at the ants, the ants can teach us a moral lesson. I'd want to pray as the person was bringing forward that's a concept what would I be praying about? I'd want to pray not that people can understand the relationship between ants and you, because we all know what that story's teaching. But what I want to pray is that you come under conviction sufficient to change your behavior in a class like this. I wouldn't point out the individual, so the Holy Spirit would have to do that, what story is that? Joshua's not going to point out the individual. It is the story of Achan,

he could have pointed him out straight away, but he doesn't, what does he want to do? It is a moral story and he wants to bring conviction upon this person, so that he stands up and said it was me, by the time he does it it's too late. Prayer works on a spiritual level not on an intellectual level that's why if you're clever and you're a secular person you can reach to the highest levels of society without any prayer. And we could pray all we want, and we still would not be as clever as them, as strong as them, as fast as them, as famous as them, we'll always be less than them just because their capability. So, the story that we always go to we always teach our children this is if you follow God what will happen compared to those who don't follow God? You'll be better than them. How much better will you be (quantity)? Ten times better, yeah? If you're faithful to God and you're ten times better, what book is that, what chapter, what story? Daniel 1. If we all believe if you follow a vegan diet, and you don't eat the King's food, that you'll be 10 times cleverer than your professors, does anyone believe that? It is not true, in fact, how do you even know that you're ten times better? Who makes the assessment? The professor would have to make the assessment of someone whose 10 times cleverer than the professor, and who was making the assessment? **The king, and where was the king eating from? The king's table.** So, how does the King who's eating from the king's table understand that you are cleverer than the other people because he must be as clever as well? So, this is illogical. I don't want to tell people how to educate, especially their children, but it's this kind of indoctrination that I think begins to erode common sense and the deeper appreciation of God's Word in children when we frame these stories in these moralistic fashions. We promise them things that are not true, if you do something you'll be like Daniel, really super clever because he was a vegan or wherever he did. These are not even moral stories, they're not even real-life scenarios, but we use them that way, and we should be extremely careful about doing so. If you go to the book of Esther you can see how immoral that story is, and yet we teach these stories as though they're in a moral framework and they really not fit for purpose when you do that. We should always pray. That was the question. But the prayer would be different depending on what the objective is, if we're doing a prophetic study like we always should be, we should be praying "Lord, I understand the surface reading, tell me what is the hidden treasure is, the deeper meaning on that."

Luke chapter 10's surface reading is the Ten Commandments, then what we're asking God to do is for people to come under conviction, and to understand what is going on and what is happening. And that essentially is what public evangelism is. It's very difficult for people in the world to understand the hidden treasure of what we're doing. So, what we ask is, that we give them sort of odd Bible verses and say "Lord bring them under conviction so they can join us", and when they join us, they realize it's a lot more complex, a lot more difficult, than people realize. And that's why many people can come up to speed can learn things really quickly, you can see people who are Christians one

year and you think wow they know so much, and actually, they know very little, what they know is a lot of surface information. When you know a lot of surface information, it gives the appearance that a person understands a lot of hidden issues, but often that's not the case.

So, we looked at Luke chapter 10, we also looked at John 6 and John 13. All these examples to see how we read inspiration; we've looked at the rules. We have looked at rule number one, we looked at rule number two and three, and we've mentioned rule number five.

Let's have a quick look at rule#5. When we first looked at these rules someone said the reason why Ellen White mentions the first five is because it's repeat and large of the remaining nine, and we didn't ask the brother who said that to prove why he said that. I think there is some merit to that position. Rule#5: Scripture must be its own expositor, since it is a rule of itself. If I depend on a teacher to expound it to me, and he should guess at its meaning, or desire to have it so on account of his sectarian creed, or to be thought wise, then his guessing, desire, creed, or wisdom is my rule, not the Bible." And it's that last bit that is similar to what rule? Rule#14. Rule#14 talks about bigotry, and bigotry in the context is, basically, you are following a sectarian creed, or following your teacher without thinking through the issues yourself. They say we believe things this way, you just believe it because that you are told. What's rule#5 saying, paraphrase, please? "Scripture must be its own expositor since these since it is a rule of itself."

Audience: Through plain reading, through proof texting. The Bible will explain itself.

So, you've seen this first sentence that you go to a verse and you understand that before you go anywhere else.

Audience: You go to a verse, and the verse will explain itself before you go somewhere else.

Why is it that the Bible is the only thing that can explain itself? Why do you have to have the Bible explain itself? - "since it is the rule of itself", since means because. The Bible explains itself because it's a rule of itself. But that doesn't stop me go to another book, why can't I go to another book? The Scriptures must explain themselves, he says, because it is the rule of itself, it's a witness to itself, but so does something else. The rule says that something else could have the ability as well. I'll do the first bit "you can only use scripture to explain scripture," second part why? Why can you only use scripture to explain scripture? I will say the scripture itself *demand*s that. Why does the scripture itself *demand* that? Why does the scripture *demand* that only scripture can explain scripture? because what does scripture know? It knows **the**

rules and no one else knows the rules. **No one else knows what the rules are except Scripture. That's why Scripture is the only one that is authorized to explain itself.** So, if I had a verse and I read that and I said I want to explain that verse you can't go to another source, because the other source doesn't know what? It doesn't know the rules. **The only person (we can personify the Bible) that knows the rules is the Bible itself.**

Why is there no contradiction, why is there harmony? Because they're all living, or they all know the same rules, each of the verses each of the books each of the prophets they all work by the same rule. And if you go outside of that framework what is the problem? You're working by different rules which you can't trust. You only can trust the Bible, because all the Bible works by its own rules. The reason I wanted to point that out is because when we do this, we always focus on the first half of the sentence "the Bible will explain itself", and we call that proof text and that's all correct, but often we don't think about *why*. And it's the second part of the rule which I think is important, where it says "since this is the rule of itself", I'm saying since means because, the reason why that has to be done that way is because only the Bible will follow its own rules. So, then there's the explanation. Now, this is an explanation of how this will work, second part of the rule "if I depend on the teacher to expound it to me, which means explain, expositor = expounder, and he should guess at its meaning or desire to have it soon account of his sectarian creed or to be thought wise" so different reasons why he's going to give an explanation of what that verse means, then his guessing or desire or creed or wisdom is my rule, and not the Bible." So, this person is operating by what rules? his own rules. Now, I don't want to turn this person into someone evil or wicked he's guessing, or he desires it to be that way and reason he desires it is because he's got a sectarian creed which means his own his own agenda, his own opinion. So, he's got his own opinion, so he's either guessing, or he's got his own opinion or he wants you to think that he's clever, so he wants to show off, so they're the three things you either guess you've got your own agenda or you think you're clever. They're the examples that are given of why you cannot listen to the teacher to explain what the verse means, because each one of those are different rules, so if we were going to do a study on this you'd have to see how you could juxtapose those three concepts that the Bible is not failing you on. First, he's guessing, so if he's guessing, he's telling you that the other Bible verses not guessing, or the other prophet is not guessing. Second point, he's got a sectarian Creed, he's got his own agenda. Does Paul have his own agenda compared to Isaiah? No. So, the third one is he wants you to think that he's clever, obviously the Bible doesn't care because all these people are dead and they were all humble, so all three things you can juxtapose this person with the scriptures.

So, then he finishes there saying he' s guessing, his desire, his creed, or wisdom is my rule not the Bible, so the Bible isn' t my rule, his rule is my rule. What' s the fundamental thing that' s staring you in the face?

Audience: That you don' t need to believe a teacher

So, why do you pay your money to come here? see where the problem is? Say you can' t trust teachers or what we say we trust in the word, we don' t trust in a man, trust in God' s Word. We don' t trust in man' s word, yeah? So, that' s the problem or the Achilles heel in rule number five because we all read it, we all agree with it, will preach about it, and then what do we do? We will all go and follow a teacher, it is something that we have to consider, that we all do go to teachers. In fact, where did we get that concept from? Luke chapter 10.

Rich young ruler in Matthew 19, what is the person called Jesus? He calls Him "good master" , and let' s just say good, not master, master means teacher that' s not a problem you can call anyone a teacher, he calls him good. What does good mean? Matthew 19:17 "no one is good except God." If we can stretch that statement he doesn' t mean it this way, there is no one that' s good at explaining the Scriptures except God, so why are you calling me for, why are you even approaching me? So, if we can take that and see that' s rule number five that even Jesus says that the only person who can explain scripture is God, because he' s the only one that' s good. There' s no one else that' s good at explaining scripture, and yet the persons coming to ask for instruction from Jesus. Same thing problem in Luke chapter 10 that we read. People read, and they don' t understand. The Ethiopian eunuch was just another example that people are following human beings to have the Bible explained to them. Is that a problem? No. No because we all do it, if it' s not a problem we need to explain why it' s not a problem. Why it' s not a problem to follow a human being?

We' re in the New Testament history named a teacher? Paul, Paul is the teacher, the person that' s going to explain the Old Testament the Scriptures. He' s the one that' s going to expound them and explain them. And what do people think? They think he' s following his own Creed, his own guesswork. In fact, they say he' s of this sect - Nazarene or Nazarite or the Christian sect. So, this issue is seen right here in the scripture as the very problem. So, why don' t we have that same problem? Who do we say Paul is? Paul is an apostle, he' s a priest, he' s been set by God, we have confidence in him that when he expounds, he' s not guessing, and he' s not showing off, and he hasn' t got his sectarian creed. Why does it look that he has got his sectarian creed? Why does it appear that way?

Audience: he' s against a prophet in their own eyes.

What is he actually doing? He's going to inspiration and doing what? Digging hidden treasure, **he's changing Scripture isn't he?** He's saying: "that statement means this," and everyone knows it doesn't mean that, we even know that today. If you go in to Paul's writings when he quotes scripture **it is his version, it means something different which is the exactly breaking this rule,** isn't it? He's got his own Creed, and he's saying according to my Creed, that statement means this, and everyone can realize and see that he has got his own agenda, his sectarian creed and we're not going to join it, they would say "we trust in the Bible, and the Bible only." So, what is your problem if you're living in that history? What problem are you confronted with? **You're going to have to follow the Bible, or you get have to follow man.** There is your choice, and this is so complex, it's not easy. When we say follow the Bible or follow man you said you have to follow the Bible or man who is the "you", is it a conference Jew or is it one of the followers of Christ? It's easy to see the conference church member, that they have to choose between Paul and the scripture, that's obvious. But he's got this problem internally hasn't he? so what does he have to say? what's his defense? He said "I was sent, I'm going to change that, I was authorized by Christ to do this job." How was he authorized on the road to Damascus? Jesus came down and he authorized him. There were people with him, but they weren't Christians, they were enemies. So, does he have any evidence that Jesus came down? No. Even the people that were there didn't even see anything, so they're not even aware of what's going on, so he doesn't actually really have any hard evidence. **People have to take his word that he's been sent by God and he's going to do his sectarian Creed and explain what the Old Testament means and not even his own brethren can see that.** This is the problem that's confronting this movement, we've had this issue for a long time, easy to see the difference between us and the church, that we have these crazy ideas, but now the problem is do we even trust those people who had an interaction with Jesus who were directly commissioned by him and nobody even knows that. That's what we need to understand when we start thinking about rule#5. It's one the most important rules that we have to grapple with. Someone asked the question earlier a couple of days ago about the relationship between the English and the Greek, or the original language and rule#5 deals with this thing, because when you say the Bible must mean it is how it's positive I'm sure many of you have seen the studies there or presentations that I've done on this that **when you're going to use rule number five, you can't cross languages the Bible is going to expose itself explain itself it has to be English to English or Greek - Greek Hebrew - Hebrew you can't cross languages.**

So, I focused in many presentations or many studies on the first part of that issue, about "the Bible explains itself," it's its own dictionary, we have to be cautious how we use Strong's, and Brown Driver Briggs, which are human dictionaries. The reason why we need to be cautious is which verse is the most problematic issue when it comes to dictionaries that we have to confront in our movement especially now? We are going to go

to a dictionary, problem with dictionaries is it's whose thoughts? man's thoughts. And now we're going to be confronted with this issue, that we're going to have to deal with man's thoughts, and its confronting the movement now, Dan 11:36, the issue is "the" vs "a". The subject matter - Islam. That is the reason it's confronting this movement is because now it's dealing with the subject of Islam. Smith says, "if we could trust this famous scholar, we could change "the" into "a". Is that what the rule number five says? It does not. In fact, we say, the reason that this is wrong is because it's breaking rule#5, because this person's got a sectarian creed. So, rule number five is important today, it's actually a present truth problem in our movement, in how we're going to deal with verse 36 when it comes to the issue of the Scriptures following its own rules, or the sectarian Creed.