

## The Scriptures and History Clearly Identify Who The Anti-Christ's Are

Bible studies talking about the coming Anti-Christ are very popular. Below is a compilation of historical and scriptural evidence, taken from many sources, which collectively demonstrate that the Anti-Christ is not singular, but is plural, and that the Anti-Christ is not a future evil man, but actually are those who teach the false Christian doctrines which have permeated western culture for around 1900 years.

This assertion has major ramifications to the Sabbath Keeping Churches of God, and should not be accepted as true, nor rejected as false, without serious study. If this assertion is true, then many of God's children are making a major error when they gather and participate with Catholics and Protestants to receive spiritual edification and insight.

Most of the evidence presented herein is a matter of historical record, and may be easily verified. Some of the evidence is the analysis of Greek grammar, and this analysis should be scrutinized before acceptance. The collection of the evidence into an overview of Christian history is mostly historical record. The association of the Sabbath Keeping Churches of God with the School of John (the apostle) is relatively new information, presented by the late Dr. Charles V. Dorothy in his cassette tape series on I John (circa 1991). Our succession from the early church bishops, and our traditional doctrines being derived directly from the disciples of John, is well established, one book in particular being "A History of the True Religion" by Dugger and Dodd.

Although the following material cannot be considered as "light reading", it none-the-less should be considered to be mandatory reading for all who confess that Jesus is the Christ.

## **The key to understanding the "Anti-Christ" is to come to understand Gnosticism:**

This article asserts that it is the Christian teachers of the doctrines of Gnosticism which are the "Anti-Christ's", as identified in the epistles of John. This assertion means that we living today must be able to recognize the difference between Gnostic teachings and Biblical teachings, so that we may avoid being deceived by this world's "Anti-Christ's".

Although the entire article is required for presenting a full understanding, it is Section V that is the most important for all to read. Please ensure that you at least read Section V.

As you learn about Gnosticism, be alert, as you may recognize some of its concepts being taught by Christian Churches you know. You may even find that some of their concepts are in your own ideas about God and His Son.

### **I. Understanding Gnosticism**

The word "Gnosticism" comes from the Greek word "Nosis" which means "knowledge". In the context of religion, the word means "revealed knowledge (from God to man)".

Gnosticism was a huge Christian religious moment in the 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> centuries AD. Hundreds of thousands of people worshipped Jesus Christ as Gnostics in hundreds (if not thousands) of congregations throughout Europe and Asia Minor. By the time of the Nicean Council in 325 AD, Gnostic doctrines were well represented in literature and philosophy. Gnosticism is a combination of philosophies taken from the New Testament, Persia, Babylon, Egypt, and Greece.

Gnosticism was condemned as heresy by the early church bishops, most of whom were taught directly by the apostle John, and their successors. The reason for their condemnation may be understood only after a review of the doctrines of Gnosticism. The following is a compilation of data taken from the Encyclopedia Britannica, 1988, provided in numerous articles on Gnosticism that are found listed in the index.

It is very important to read and comprehend the following summaries of Gnosticism, for without this comprehension the remaining sections and conclusions presented in this paper will not make sense.

- Gnosticism is knowledge from beyond the cosmos, given to a few initiates, or masters, and then passed onto others.
- Gnosticism is "Dualism", in that it emphasizes two opposites:
  - Good verses Evil
  - Purity verses Sin
  - Spirit verses Matter
  - Soul verses Flesh
- Gnosticism teaches that there are three primary realms, the superior world, the intermediate world, and the inferior world. Divine beings of pure light inhabit the superior world. Lesser beings having partial darkness, angels and demons called Demiurges, inhabit the intermediate world. The inferior world is everything physical (the universe with its stars, planets, earth, and flesh) and has both good and evil.
- Gnosticism teaches that the Divine Father, living in the superior world, radiated pure light, called "Aeons". As the aeons got farther and farther away from the superior world they became less and less pure, acquiring degrees of darkness. Eventually these aeons formed the intermediate world consisting of many "realms" where Demiurges lived, beings having both good and evil. One of these realms was called "Silence". One of the Demiurges eventually created the physical universe, which is a world of good and evil, having both light and darkness.

- Gnosticism teaches that The Divine Father is also called "The Creator" of the universe, since it was His radiated aeons which formed the intermediate and inferior worlds. Through the radiated aeons The Divine Father is also "The Creator" of all living beings, including the creation of the being YHWH (YHWH is a created Demiurge).
- Gnostic – “a believer in esoteric salvatory knowledge and the view that matter is evil and spirit is good. The universe was viewed as an elaborate mechanical cage in which a bit of the divine has been entrapped by the malevolent [wicked] creator of the universe, a deity believed to be in opposition to the good, true, and spiritual God, and subsequently divided into individual souls. The goal is to be emancipated from the astrological material world.”
- Gnosticism teaches that the soul is divine spirit, composed of the exact same substance as the Divinity, and is destined to free itself from the tyranny of the cosmic Demiurge [from YHWH the creator of the physical world].
- Gnosticism teaches that the law and order of the cosmos was not to be seen as the creative expression of limits and delineation of roles, but rather as an evil, perverse, confining structure from which man must escape.
- Gnosticism teaches that the soul (an immortal divine spirit) fell from the superior world into an evil body, and needs to return back to the superior world.
- Gnosticism teaches that to obtain salvation you must die to the world [matter is evil] so that the spirit is released at death.
- Gnosticism teaches that the entire physical world (this meant the flesh, earth, sun, planets, and stars) would eventually be completely destroyed.
- Gnosticism denied that there was going to be a resurrection of the dead. Since the body is flesh and evil, and since the spirit is good, and since the goal is to release the spirit from the body at death, it is completely irrational to place the spirit back into a body again in a resurrection. Therefore, to be resurrected is to return back to being pure light.
- Gnostic denial of the world took two extreme philosophies:
  1. Asceticism: where people hated the flesh, and engaged in brutalizing the flesh in order to demonstrate the degree to which they were denying the world. Thus, these Gnostics engaged in beating the body, celibacy, poverty, prolonged fasting, and the deliberate neglect for the body's needs, such as proper clothing, hygiene, and bathing.
  2. Epicurean: where people resigned themselves to the fact that their flesh was going to do evil, and that they could not stop their flesh from doing evil. Therefore, they allowed their flesh to go ahead and engage in whatever worldly evil was desired. However, they remained convinced that their spirit (the good part of them) was not participating in their flesh's evil, and was therefore exempt from any association with the evil. Their spirit remained good, regardless of what their body did. The world was being denied by the detachment of their intellect [spirit], not by attempting any physical abstinence.
- Gnosticism [as reincarnation] teaches that men were divine beings that had fallen from the superior world into this world. Clothed now with flesh, they are subject to transmigration through a series of vegetable, animal, and human bodies, as they attempt to be released back to the superior world.
- Gnosticism teaches that the snake is the symbol of divine knowledge being imparted into the chaos as the "Logos or Reason". The snake came to impart secret knowledge concerning the origin of the world, and the true nature of man, his vocation, and destiny. The Demiurge, YHWH which created the physical world, was hiding the truth from man, and became angry after the snake succeeded in imparting the truth to man.
- Gnosticism teaches that individuals were to perform rites and rituals prescribed by the initiates [psychics whom are given the revealed knowledge] in order to get salvation.
- Gnosticism teaches that men are alienated from God by their spiritual ignorance. Christ brought revealed knowledge to bring man into "gnosis" (knowledge) and union with the Divine God (which is not YHWH).
- Gnosticism teaches that there was a "cosmic accident" in the superior world, causing many divine beings to fall. Being expelled there was a creation of the inferior world by a Demiurge. This Demiurge was hiding the truth from mankind as to whom they really were. The superior world

- then sent Christ to teach the Gnostics the truth. The Holy Spirit is another Divine Being sent from the superior world which comes down to act as a "spark" within Gnostic members.
- Gnosticism teaches that all men come from God, but there are three types of men. First are the "psychic men" who periodically receive revealed knowledge from the superior world. They are the religious leaders. Second are the "spiritual men", who are members obeying and preparing for their salvation back to the superior world. Third are the "material men". These men do not have, or have lost, their divine spark, and are destined to oblivion, totally without any hope of salvation.
  - Gnosticism teaches that individuals are to learn secret lore and symbols. They teach that in order to ascend back to the superior world each man must speak the names of the hierarchy of demons which they will encounter [living in the intermediate world] on their journey. Failure to speak the correct name will result in being recast back to the inferior world to live another life as spirit and flesh. Thus, the way to salvation was to live as prescribed by the initiates, and to prepare the spirit with knowledge while denouncing the world as evil. Preparation was accomplished through the religious rites and magical incantations recited.
  - Gnosticism teaches that men must do three things to be saved:
    1. To completely denounce the world as evil.
    2. To accept the salvation offered through Christ.
    3. To live by pure ethics [the ethics as defined by the initiates], with love and compassion.
 Doing these three things would then identify a member with Jesus Christ. They would obtain salvation, becoming rays of the divine light [with no body] in the superior world.
  - Gnosticism teaches that God, the Divine Father in the superior world, is so purely good, and that men are so evil, that men cannot even pray directly to the Father. They must pray through someone else, who will then talk to God on their behalf. God is totally "Transcendent" from men.
  - Gnosticism teaches that Christ came from the superior world to bring secret knowledge, and to reveal to mankind The Divine Father of the superior world. The God of the Hebrews, YHWH which created the evil physical world and gave men laws, was only a Demiurge, inferior to Christ and The Divine Father.
  - Gnosticism was derived by Christian philosophers in order to explain the problem of: "How did a Divine Being [Christ], who is totally pure and cannot touch evil, come from the superior world to the physical world of evil, without touching evil?". For to touch the evil of flesh would mean that the pure Christ sinned.
  - Gnosticism teaches that Jesus and Christ were the dualism of flesh and spirit. Jesus was flesh, a man touching evil. While Christ is a Divine Being, sent by the Divine Father from the superior world. Being divine, Christ is composed of the same substance as the Father, and is pure light. As such Christ could never touch evil. Thus, they teach that Christ was embodied or wrapped with flesh, and thus became the man Jesus. But being wrapped with flesh the Christ did not "touch" the flesh, only used it. Jesus the flesh died, but Christ the Divine "only seemed to die". The risen Christ left Jesus prior to Jesus dying.
  - Epicurean Gnostics of the 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> centuries took the position that they were to flaunt their new freedom from the evil Demiurge's laws and limitations by flagrantly breaking them at every opportunity. Extreme sexual license became the primary manner in which a member would demonstrate their new freedom. Archaeology has uncovered textual descriptions from hundreds of different congregations, describing how these Gnostic Christians conducted their "Christian services". In such religious ceremonies they worshiped Jesus Christ by openly [in public] engaging in sexual intercourse with each other, drunkenness, and foaming at the mouth (in trances). Gnostic writings include the Gospel of Seth, the Gospel of Snakes, and "Noghomony".

Gnosticism is not a single Christian philosophy or a single set of Christian doctrines. Gnostic thought has many shades and variants. Rather it is best described as a foundational set of premises which foster many similar heresies.

What is most important is that the modern Christian be able to discern a Gnostic doctrine when they encounter one. Whatever variation of Gnosticism it may be, Gnostic doctrines may be recognized by their reliance upon one or more of these premises:

1. The New Testament terms "God", "The Father", "Christ", "Jesus", "Son", and "Holy Spirit" are redefined in terms consistent with Gnostic philosophy.  
These terms are not consistent with the Bible's definitions that follows  

"God"	The God of Abraham, the Lord (YHWH) God of Israel
"The Father"	the God of Abraham being a loving "parent" to His children,
"Christ"	the anointed one, the Holy One of Israel, the promised Seed through Abraham,
"Jesus"	a man, the only begotten son of YHWH through Mary. The human being Jesus: is the Christ, the promised Seed of Abraham, the Messiah of mankind, the 2 <sup>nd</sup> Adam, our Lord, our brother, and our mediator,
"Son"	offspring of the God of Abraham. Christians are also adopted Sons of God,
"Holy Spirit"	the power and activity of God.
2. There is a superior world of pure light, and the evil universe created by a Demiurge. Divine Beings were cast down from the superior world as spirits (or souls), and are now trapped in flesh, and are trying to get back.
3. The spirit (or soul) is good, and is not part of the flesh. The flesh sins and will be destroyed. The flesh may sin, but the good spirit is released at death. Thus, a Christian does not have to practice the Laws of YHWH, but rather may be a good Christian even while practicing otherwise.
4. The deliberate confusion of the title "Christ". Gnosticism wants the title "Christ" to be referring to a Being, rather than used as a title which is bestowed upon Jesus.

This is very important. Did "Christ" exist before Jesus ? The answer is **YES**, but not as a Divine Being. The promised Messiah has been a prophecy since the garden of Eden. The title of "Christ" then is a noun to which a writer may refer even before Jesus. But the noun itself is not a Being, the noun is a promised prophecy of a future savior. A Gnostic will use the title of "Christ" as a noun, defining it to be a Being alive before Jesus was born. However, Jesus would talk about Himself as being the promised "Christ", and from that perspective Jesus (as he was fulfilling the promised Seed) was a noun which existed before Abraham was. Once this distinction is understood, nearly all of the King James translated verses which imply that Jesus preexisted are understood differently. The few remaining scriptures, like John 1:1, must be studied in the Greek text to be understood.

**The seriousness of Christian Gnostic heresy is that it teaches Christians not to regard the YHWH God of the Old Testament anymore.** It teaches that Christ was a preexistent God, and came to free men from the oppression of the old Testament God, laws, roles, and limitations. Salvation is obtained by the confession of the spirit that Jesus is Christ. But by saying this, they redefine the terms to mean that you believe that Jesus was only a fleshly-wrapper around the incarnated Divine Being, Christ, for about 33 years.

**Listen to the magnitude of the Heresy, and why John the apostle called it the spirit of Satan:** In this, the man Jesus, the Son born by God's Holy Spirit through Mary, the man God declared to be His only begotten Son, the man whom God resurrected and made higher than the angels, the glorified Being whom now sits at the right hand of God, that Being is reduced to the role of little more than a discarded container. Further, Christian members are told not to be "legalistic" and follow the laws of YHWH, but must only follow love and compassion in the manner defined by "Their Church". Christians are told that God will forgive all their sins, totally, no matter what they do. There is no accountability for the evil deeds of their flesh. So therefore, the Christian can practice sins against YHWH, and still be told they are a good Christian.

## II. Evidence Of The Early Christian Church's Very First Split

Following is taken from: "Proceedings of The Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities". Copyright 1968. Volume Two. AS 591 I812. v.2. Article by S. Pines, "The Jewish Christians of the Early Centuries of Christianity According to a New Source", pages 237 - 310. [Quoting Hereafter . . . ]

"The Subject of this lecture is an Arabic manuscript text which is not what it purports to be. Ostensibly, it is a chapter of Moslem anti-Christian polemics which forms a part of a lengthy work first described by Ritter. This work is entitled 'The Establishment of Proofs for the Prophethood of Our Master Mohammed' [footnote specifies written near 995/6 AD] and was written by the well-known tenth century Mu'tazilite author 'Abd al-Jabbar. However, in reality, this Moslem theologian adapted for his own purposes - inserting numerous interpolations - writings reflecting the views and traditions of a Jewish Christian community, of which more hereafter." (Page 237).

"The first section is here translated in full:

(71a) 'After him [footnote 39: that is Christ] his disciples were with the Jews and the Children of Israel in the latter's synagogues and observed the prayers and the feasts of (the Jews) in the same place as the latter [*this places the story prior to 90 through 99 AD, which is before the Jews added the anti-Christian blessing to the "Blessings of Ezra", which was recited every Sabbath to force the Christians to leave the synagogues*]. (However) there was a disagreement between them and the Jews with regard to Christ.

The Romans reigned over them. The Christians (used to) complain to the Romans about the Jews, showed them their own weakness [footnote 41: weakness of the Christians] and appealed to their pity. And the Romans did pity them. This (used) to happen frequently. And the Romans said to the Christians: "Between us and the Jews there is a pact which (obliges us) not to change their religious laws [*Roman law allowed "Legal Religions" to exist in the empire. The Jewish religion was recognized as a legal religion. As long as a man belonged to a legal religion, he was left alone. If a man was cast out of his legal religion, he must either convert to worship Caesar, or be condemned to slavery or death. To be a Christian was eventually considered a capital offense, and many Christians were killed for sport in the arenas*]. **But if you would abandon their laws and separate yourselves from them, praying as we do (while facing) the East, eating (the things) we eat, and regarding as permissible that which we consider as such,** we should help you and make you powerful [*the Romans would then recognize them as a legal religion*], and the Jews would find no way (to harm you). On the contrary, you would be more powerful than they."

The Christians answered: "We will do this." (And the Romans) said: "Go, fetch your Book [*most probably the Gospel of John, perhaps Matthew*]." (The Christians) went to their companions, informed them of (what had taken place) between them and the Romans and said to them: "Bring the Gospel, and stand up so that we should go to them." But these (companions) said to them: "**You have done ill.** We are not permitted (to let) the Romans pollute the Gospel. (71b) In giving a favorable answer to the Romans, **you have accordingly departed from the religion.** We are (therefore) no longer permitted to associate with you; on the contrary, we are obliged [*in their Honor / Shame society, their own self integrity obligated them to publicly denounce anyone that departed from the group's leadership, beliefs, or conduct*] to declare that there is nothing in common between us and you;" and they prevented their (taking possession of) the Gospel or gaining access to it. In consequence a violent quarrel (broke out) between (the two groups). Those (mentioned in the first place) went back to the Romans and said to them: "Help us against these companions of ours before (helping us) against the Jews, and take away from them on our behalf our Book." Thereupon (the companions of whom they had spoken) fled the country. And the Romans wrote concerning them to their governors in the district of Mosul and in the Jazirat al-Arab [footnote 45: northern Syria, not Arabia]. Accordingly, a search was made for them; some were caught and burned, others were killed." Pages 250 - 251.

[End Quote]

- I John 2:18-19 many anti-Christ

### III. Jesus Prophesied About Falseness In Christianity

To most in the Church of God, this is not a startling premise. However, what is being presented by this paper is that the "Falseness" is an even more serious warning to us than we may have perceived before. It is not so much what is said about Jesus as being the way to salvation, but rather where the deceivers lead the people afterward. They lead people into very damaging errors. The body of Christ should be very careful not to participate with them as they error.

- Mt. 24:5, Mk. 13:6, Luke 21:8  
Many deceivers will come saying that: "I am the Christ", but do not go after them. The false teachers of Christianity will say that they are Christians. While teaching error they will continue to tell everyone that "Jesus is the Christ", but in fact they will be leading people into sin.
- Mt. 7:21-23  
Not every Christian is really a Christian. The text says that many will stand before the judgement seat, thinking they are Christians, did "Christ's service", but in fact they were not. It is nearly impossible to imagine the tremendous shock these Christians are going to feel when they hear these words coming from the throne of YHWH. The essential fact is that their deeds were considered by Jesus to be evil [the Greek word is 458, anti-law, or lawlessness].

The question this paper asks is: "Who is teaching Christians to disregard what the God of Abraham said was evil, and to go ahead and practice sin anyway". For example: "It's okay to eat ham during Easter dinner". Who says that is "okay"?

- Acts 3:12-26  
12 And when Peter saw it, he answered unto the people, Ye men of Israel, why marvel ye at this? or why look ye so earnestly on us, as though by our own power or holiness we had made this man to walk?  
13 The God of Abraham, and of Isaac, and of Jacob, the God of our fathers, hath glorified His child Jesus; whom ye delivered up, and denied him in the presence of Pilate, when he was determined to let him go.  
14 But ye denied the Holy One and the Just, and desired a murderer to be granted unto you;  
15 And killed the Prince of life, whom God hath raised from the dead; whereof we are witnesses.  
25 Ye are the children of the prophets, and of the covenant which God made with our fathers, saying unto Abraham, "And in thy seed shall all the kindreds of the earth be blessed".  
26 Unto you first God, having raised up his Son Jesus, sent him to bless you, in turning away every one of you from his iniquities.

This dialogue makes it clear that the God of the Old Testament performed the actions of begetting Jesus and then resurrecting him. Jesus is the only begotten son of the God of Abraham, a man also of the seed of Abraham, the Holy and Anointed One of God. May it be stated: that the preaching of anything else is the preaching of: "another Jesus" ?

Certainly it is the false premise that Christ is God, that allows millions of Christians to entertain the deception that they no longer have to obey YHWH, the God of the Old Testament. They are told that now they only have to obey the commands of the New Testament.

IV. Linking The Apostle John With Those Who Opposed Gnosticism

- Evidence exists which demonstrates that during the lifetime of the apostle John, Gnostic Christians were promoting their new philosophies, and were being condemned as non-Christians. As one example, history records that a man named **Cerinthus**, living in Ephesus, taught Christians that: "the Christ did not die, but only seemed to die". One day the apostle John was entering a bathhouse in Ephesus. John was then told that Cerinthus was already in the bathhouse. The apostle John then responded: "Let us flee from this place before it collapses on us." (from Dr. Charles V. Dorothy's cassette tape series on I John, he was quoting Eusebius).

John's refusal to enter into the same bathhouse as Cerinthus demonstrates the apostle's public condemnation of Cerinthus, and his refusal to accept him as a fellow Christian. This example also demonstrates that the apostle John took Cerinthus' teachings very seriously, it was not a matter of allowing doctrinal tolerance.

V. Book of I John, Condemns This Split as Anti-Christ

- I John was written between 90 – 115 AD and contains about 2140 Greek words. It is not a letter, but is a plea by way of instruction. The book was written to the congregations in the Parthian empire. The book's entire purpose is to convince the readers not to listen to those that left the apostle John's fellowship. Those that left were trying to seduce them with false doctrines. The readers are instructed to stay firm to the original Gospel, which the writer's already taught them, and not to have anything to do with those that left teaching the doctrines of Anti-Christ.
  - I John 1:1 we have the credentials, we were first, and saw it all
  - I John 1:2 we write this letter so that you may have fellowship with us (and not with them that left us)
- Modern archaeology has uncovered enough evidence to demonstrate that the "us" in I John is "The School of John". The apostle John started a School in Ephesus. Ancient Schools had the primary purpose of teaching new disciples the philosophies of the founder. Over the course of years, additional Schools of John formed in other cities. It is this lineage of bishops, who were disciples from these Schools, which the Sabbath Keeping Churches of God cite as their authority to remain in direct opposition to the authority of the Roman bishops, which eventually formed the Roman Catholic Church.
- I John 2:18-19 many Anti-Christ's have left us (left the fellowship of the School of John). It must be emphasized that throughout the book the writers are not shy about calling these people Anti-Christ's. It is wondered if we living today are being far to shy about calling their modern disciples the same thing ?
  - I John 3:7 let no one deceive you, he that practices righteousness is righteous. Conversely then, the deceivers are telling them that:
    1. "he that practices righteousness is sinful" . . . You are denying Christ by keeping the law.
    2. "he that practices unrighteousness is righteous" . . . Your flesh will sin, so it is okay to allow the flesh to sin, because through Christ all your sins are forgiven, totally, so that your spirit is still righteous through Christ's grace, and so you will be saved.
  - I John 3:10 he that does not practice righteousness is of the devil. It is wondered if we living today are afraid to call those that do not practice righteousness as being "of the Devil" ? To publicly say this would probably result in being sued for slander. However, could it be that we have become so much "milquetoast", that we are giving tolerances to unrighteousness practices and doctrines within our congregations that the apostles would never allow ?

**The Biblical Confession Affirms That Christ Did Not Preexist**

In our society it is not politically correct to use the Bible to make judgments against people. Nevertheless, it is our duty to make judgements so that we may know the difference between right and wrong. We must make judgments, but only God has the right to make final eternal condemnations.

In I John 4:2 God provides His children with a test. We are to use this test to make a very serious judgement. The test tells how to discern between the spirit of God and the spirit of antichrist. Even without assigning condemnation, this is a very serious accusation to make against someone. Those that pass the test can be called very nice things. But those that do not pass the test are called antichrists. Certainly such an accusation must be backed up by a very clear test. Quoting the King James Bible, I John 4:2:

“Hereby, know ye the Spirit of God: Every spirit that confesseth that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh is of God: And every spirit that confesseth not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh is not of God: and this is that spirit of antichrist”

This test seems to be simple enough. Certainly all Christians can pass this test. But the trouble is that this test is too simple. Many people of other religions can also pass this test. Many Jews do not deny that Jesus lived and was anointed as a messiah, but only in the sense that King David was also an anointed messiah. The Moslems do not deny that Jesus lived as a prophet, a messiah to the Jews, so Moslems can pass this test. Many of the eastern religions also accept that Jesus lived as a man, that he was a great prophet, even a messiah, just like Buddha. So even those in the eastern religions can pass this test. It seems that this test is very easy to pass.

But is it prudent to believe that God provided His children with a worthless test? Why provide a test at all, if it is not really a good test? But I John 4:2 is a good test, the King James Bible does not have it translated correctly. Reading the test from the original Greek text reveals just how serious of a test it really is.

Grammatically, this verse forms a confession so serious, that the first reaction of most Christians is, “This cannot be true”. In this test is the affirmation against the Gnostic teachings of the nature of Christ. In this test is the affirmation that Christ is not a spirit being. The Trinity and other dualistic views of Christ are directly refuted by this Biblical confession. In this test the confessor affirms that the vast majority of modern Christianity is in serious doctrinal error.

The following Grammatical Analysis of the Greek Text of I John 4:2 is taken from:

1. "The Complete Word Study New Testament with Parallel Greek" © 1992 Spiros Zodhiates and AMG International, Inc. AMG Publishers.
2. "Analytical Greek New Testament" © 1981 Baker Book House Company.
3. "Net Bible, New Testament Clarified and Explained in 15,950 Footnotes" © 1998 Biblical Studies Press, L.L.C.
4. "Thayer Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament" (Lexicon) © 1977 Baker Book House Company, Twelfth printing March 1986.

**I John 4:2 [whoever] Confesses That:  
"Jesus + Christ + in + flesh + has-come"**

It is hard to remember, but the word "Christ" is not the last name of Jesus. The word “Christ” is a title, a designation, a concept. The word means: "the one who has been anointed". We confess: "Jesus, the one who has been anointed, in flesh, has come".

Jesus	Christ	in flesh	has come
an, nn <b>2424</b> Anarthrous, Noun	an nn <b>5547</b> Anarthrous, Noun	"in" = pre 1722 and "flesh" = an, nn 4561	pfp <b>2064</b> Verb

		preposition plus Anarthrous, Noun	
N-AM-S Noun, accusative, masculine, singular	N-AM-S Noun, accusative, masculine, singular	PD and N-DF-S Preposition, dative plus noun, dative, feminine, singular	VPRAAM-S Verb, participle, perfect, active, accusative, masculine, singular
Anarthrous: Expresses the qualities of the noun, the noun's attributes, classification	Anarthrous: Expresses the qualities or attributes of the noun	Anarthrous: Expresses the qualities or attributes of the noun	Perfect: Stresses that the state brought about by the verb, is still present
Jesus (the qualities of Jesus – everything that Jesus stands for)	Christ (the qualities of Christ – everything that the Messiah stands for)	in flesh (the qualities of flesh – everything that being in flesh stands for)	has come (and the effect of coming is still with us to this day)

The Greek word #2064 ("has come") is in the "perfect participle active". This means that the condition of "come" is both being stressed and has ongoing effect, i.e. "most emphatically has come and is still here now".

The Greek grammar "Anarthrous" is very important to understand. It makes a noun into an adjective being used as a noun. Anarthrous is similar to the difference between "the President" and "the Presidency". One is talking about a person, the other is talking about the office and duties of a person. For example, the Greek word for God, when written in the anarthrous form, is not talking about the deity God, but is talking about "God's qualities", the "God-class", everything that God stands for. In the anarthrous you do not translate the Greek word for "God" as "God", but translate it as "Divine" or "God-like" or "God's Majesty".

Likewise, in this verse there are three nouns written in the anarthrous: "Jesus", "Christ", and "flesh". These words are therefore descriptives being used as nouns. The sentence is not talking about the noun "Jesus (as a person)", but about the qualities of "Jesus (what he did and stands for)". The sentence is not talking about the noun "Christ (as being a person, place, or thing)", but about the qualities of "Christ (the promised Messiah and what that means)". The sentence is not talking about the noun "flesh (as a body)", but about the qualities of "flesh (as being fleshly in type and what that means)". Thus, we confess: "Jesus (what he did and stands for)" "Christ (the promised Messiah and what that means)" "in" "flesh (as being fleshly and what that means)" "has come" (most assuredly and is still here today).

**Three Equally Valid Constructs:**

Grammatically, the entire phrase, "Confesses + Jesus + Christ + in + flesh + has-come", has three equally valid constructs as shown below. It is the translator whom makes the choice about which construct to use. There is no grammatical reason to choose one construct over the other. Each of the following three constructs have equal translation validity:

1. The entire phrase is a single object of the verb "to confess".  
We confess "Jesus Christ in flesh has come".
2. The verb "to confess" may be followed by a double accusative, so that both "Jesus Christ" and "in flesh has come" are objects of the verb.  
We confess "Jesus Christ" and we confess "in flesh has come".
3. The same double accusative as #2, except that the objects are "Jesus" and "Christ has come in flesh".  
We confess "Jesus" and we confess "Christ in flesh has come".

Each of these three choices are equally valid, each derived directly from the text's grammatical structure. So the question is, which translation option forms a serious test?

For each translation choice consider what is being confessed, and ask if the confession is really a serious test. Which of these three choices can be decidedly used to discern between God's and the deceiver's spirit? It is a very serious charge to accuse someone of teaching in the spirit of antichrist. Likewise, the

translation construct chosen must be a very serious test that can truly separate between God's Spirit and the deceiving spirit.

Option 1. Confessing that: "Jesus Christ in flesh has come": only asserts belief that Jesus Christ was a person that lived as a man. This test does not even discriminate those of the New Age movement, whom allow that Jesus was a man, even a great prophet, even "a Messiah or Christ", but only in the sense of also allowing Mohammed and Buddha to be similar examples. This grammatical choice does not provide a serious test.

Option 2. Confessing that: "Jesus Christ" and "in flesh has come": likewise only asserts belief that Jesus Christ existed as a man. This grammatical choice allows people of other religions to pass, and does not discern anything controversial about the confessor. This choice likewise does not construct a serious test.

Option 3. Confessing that: "Jesus" and "Christ in flesh has come": is a serious test. This confession makes important and controversial affirmations.

First, the primary focus of this confession is on the single entity "Jesus". It says that "Jesus is something", Jesus has "these qualities". In this confession our belief is in what the man Jesus stands for. Without including a title, like "Christ", the focus of the confession is on the attributes of Jesus the man, and what he did as a man: his life, what he taught, and what he did during his ministry. This test is an allegiance to the man Jesus, first. It is he, Jesus, that has the qualities of being the only begotten Son of God, that lived, died, and was raised from the dead. It is he, Jesus, that now lives, and it is he that will return to rule the earth. All of these qualities and thoughts are in this confession.

Secondly, this test confesses belief that Jesus is the promised Messiah. But more, this affirmation denies the possibility of a God-Being manifesting as "The Christ". In English this distinction is not clear, but look again at the Greek grammar. The word "Christ" is not a noun. The Greek text is talking about "the qualities of the Messiah, the promised Messiah-ship". The word "flesh" is not a noun, it is "the qualities of being in the flesh". Who is the "Messiah-ship now come in fleshly attributes"? It is Jesus. It cannot be a preexisting spirit entity.

If it were in reality true that it was a God-Being (or an archangel) who came from heaven and became "Jesus Christ in the flesh", then John could not have written the confession as he did. The confession could not focus on the son of Mary as the primary entity, it would have to focus on the God-Being as the primary entity. The confession would have to be written so that we affirm that a God-Being became Jesus. But it does not.

You need to think deeply about this. This sentence is only confusing because we have been trained from birth to think that "God became flesh". The Trinity, and the other preexistence scenarios, tell us to believe that it is a God-Being who became "Jesus Christ in the flesh". But look again. This is not what the confession tells us to affirm. God coming in the flesh is not what we are to confess. What we are to confess is that the man Jesus is "the Messiah-ship in fleshly attributes has most certainly come".

Consider how simple the Gospel really is by reading Acts 3:13-21:

"The God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, the God of our forefathers, has glorified His servant-child Jesus" . . . "You killed the founding-leader of life whom God raised from the dead" . . . "And on the basis of faith in Jesus name" . . . "The faith that is through Jesus" . . . "God foretold long ago . . . that His Messiah would suffer" . . . "so that He may send the Messiah appointed for you – that is Jesus."

It is the man Jesus who is the focal entity we are to worship as God's Son.

Consider how simple these scriptures are to understand when Jesus is a man that is the long awaited promised Messiah. Consider how confused these scriptures are if it were true that a God-Being became Jesus. The God-Being could not be the YHWH of the Old Testament, so now you have more than one

God-Being? The God-Being did not become “Christ”, the God-Being becomes “Jesus”. The God-Being becoming a man makes a paradox, both the divine God-Being and the physical man Jesus must share chemical electrical mental processes. If the God-Being died you now have a God-Being who is not eternal. More, the original God-Being is now gone, as Revelation 1 tells us that it was the man Jesus who was resurrected. It is in Jesus’ name we are to believe. Also consider that the scriptures are being very deceitful, telling us only the half truth that the son of Mary is the Messiah, when it should tell us the whole truth that it was really a second God-Being who became Mary’s son Jesus.

Also, If it were true that the Jews and Romans had just killed a divine God-Being on the cross, do you think that such a grave sin would not be a major point to be revealed to everyone? But the scriptures do not talk about a God-Being performing manifestations. The scriptures use simple language to talk about a bloodline descendant of Abraham becoming God’s promised Messiah, the man Jesus who God resurrected to life again.

Confusion is not caused by reading the scriptures. The scriptures are written in simple text. Confusion is caused by trying to force what we read, so that the Gnostic-Christ teachings we are taught are retained. We are taught that “The Christ” is a preexisting divine (triune) God-Being that came down from heaven to manifest Himself as a man. But in I-John the word “Christ” is not a spirit being, it is a fleshly entity and a quality of Jesus. The word “Christ” is not referring to a spiritual component apart from Jesus, but is defined as being a fleshly component of Jesus. The Biblical test is our belief that the qualities of “the promised Messiah-ship” includes being fleshly in its very composition. The word “Christ” is not a word that refers to “The Divine God”, but is a word that describes a fleshly entity. **There is no confusion when we allow the scriptures to talk about Jesus, as a man, who is the promised Messiah.**

Remember that it does not really matter what we can imagine the confession might mean. God inspired the grammar of the text. So what matters is understanding how the ancient reader would interpret what is written in the Greek language. What is written is that the promised Messiah has most assuredly come, is fleshly rather than spiritual, and is one of the qualities of the man Jesus. The Biblical confession does not say, “God (a noun) became flesh”. The confession is, “Christ is an adjective and is fleshly in characteristics”. The Biblical test denies that Christ is a spiritual component, divine or otherwise.

**You cannot say: “(the entity) Christ became Jesus”,**

**You must say: “(the entity) Jesus is Christ”.**

Option #3 is the only translation choice that actually provides a serious test. Almost any religion can pass the other two options. But the third option is historically accurate and identifies the deceivers, that the Biblical author was warning against, as being the Gnostic-Christ heretics having the spirit of Satan. Please notice, and with great concern, that these deceivers are called the antichrists (plural). This means that the antichrists have been working their doctrinal deceit ever since the book of I-John was written. Now, which teaching: “Christ is the Divine God” or “Christ is the resurrected man Jesus” has been taught as “Christian” since about 100 AD?

Observe that the Trinitarian doctrine does not pass this Biblical test. The Trinitarian doctrine is Gnostic. The Nicean Creed asserts that:

“. . . And in one Lord, Jesus Christ, the Son of God, Only begotten of the Father, God of God, Light of Light, true God of true God, begotten, not made, being of one substance with the Father . . .”

The pure Gnostic teaching is that Jesus was a man of flesh, and that "The Christ" is not a title, but is a preexistent and Divine Being come from heaven, and is made of the exact same substance as “The Divine Father”. The Nicean Creed presumes that Christ only used Jesus' body, and somehow never actually touched Jesus' carnal sinful flesh. The Gnostic teaching is that Jesus, the flesh, died on the cross, but The Christ, being eternal and divine, was risen from Jesus' body just moments prior to death. In this manner

"The Christ was risen from the dead [Jesus]". Therefore, "The Christ" was not flesh, never touched sin, and being eternal only "seemed to die". The words "seemed to die" is a key Gnostic phrase found in history.

The Gnostic teaching is that Jesus was dead in the grave, but The Christ was not dead. The Gnostic teaching allows that The Christ performed other tasks during the three days that Jesus' body was dead in the grave. For example, The Christ visited fallen spirits in hell, or announced himself to the Indians in America.

The Gnostic teaching will not allow that "The Christ" was flesh, and really did actually die. This would mean, to them, that God died. The Gnostic teaching will not allow that "The Christ" could become the same substance as a man's carnal sweaty vile body. This would mean, to them, that "The Divine" touched sin. **The Biblical confession is a fully discerning test which denies the world's popular teaching that Jesus Christ was a being that some how lived as both "fully Man and fully Divine".**

Historically, we know that those bishops that left the School of John (the apostle) circa 100 AD eventually became the bishops that formed the Roman Catholic Church. In 325 AD the Roman bishops expelled the bishops which still adhered to the theology taught by the apostle John. Although expelled from the Roman Church, the bishops of John, usually referred to as "Arian", continued to thrive. Later entire empires became "Arian" in their Christian confession, contrary to the will of the bishops of Rome. Meanwhile the Roman bishops adopted the Nicean Creed, which declared the Trinitarian confession to be the only test for true Christians.

Today, most of wider Christianity uses the Nicean Creed as their test for Christians. For example, in 1999 the Church of God 7<sup>th</sup> Day was denied radio time in Bend Oregon solely because the denomination is not Trinitarian. The Christian radio station did not consider anyone who did not confess the Trinity to be a real Christian. It is interesting that it seems to be acceptable for wider Christianity to use the man devised Trinitarian doctrine as the only test for a true Christian, but I John 4:2 effectively identifies wider Christianity as being those that are seriously deceived.

#### **More Evidence:**

And there is more. This same test is repeated in two other places:

I John 4:3 and II John 7.

In I John 4:3 the same test of the previous sentence is repeated, but negated with the words "confesses not". In the Greek the confession words are exactly the same words as used in verse 2, with the single exception that the word "Jesus" is not in the anarthrous. This time in verse 3 the word "Jesus" is a normal noun in the sentence. This sentence unambiguously identifies "Jesus" as the person-entity having the adjectives "Christ in flesh has come". The man Jesus is being directly identified as the confessed noun having all of the other confessed attributes as previously discussed above. This confirms that translation option #3 is the grammatical construct intended by the author.

In II John 7 the Greek words are again exactly the same words as used in verse 2, with two exceptions. The word "has come" is listed in front of "in flesh", and is in the Present tense. Verse 7 confesses:

"Jesus" and confesses "Messiah-ship, IS NOW HERE, in fleshly attributes".

The Biblical confession of I John 4:2 identifies the Gnostic teachings about the nature of Christ as being the emphatically condemned doctrines of Anti-Christ. Our confession is not to the Gnostic Christ. Our confession is our allegiance to our living hero, Jesus.

**The Biblical confession is the giving of our allegiance to:**

**"The Man Jesus", who is:  
"The Promised Messiah-ship  
In Fleshly form  
Has Most Certainly Come and is Still Alive".**

## VI. Evidence Of The School Of John (the apostle) Through History

- I John 1:1 we have the credentials, we were first, and saw it all. The "we" is evidence that either the writers were the disciples of John, or, that the apostle John was the one writer and included his disciples as collaborators of the truth of the statements. Either way, we perceive a school of thought, having a single source of credentials for the doctrines expressed.
- Ignatius, bishop of Antioch, writing to the Smyrnians in Asia Minor toward the close of the first century, insists upon the reality of Jesus' physical resurrection from the dead. He writes, "But I know that even after his resurrection he was in the flesh; and I believe that he still is so." He denounced dualism and taught that the spirit is above the flesh, not against it.
- Passover – Easter Controversy: Circa 325 AD, Eusebius describes the controversy which shook the entire church:

"It was at that stage that a controversy of great significance took place, because all the Asian dioceses thought that in accordance with ancient tradition they ought to observe the fourteenth day of the lunar month as the beginning of the Paschal festival – the day on which the Jews had been commanded to sacrifice the lamb: on that day, no matter which day of the week it might be . . .

The Asian bishops who insisted that they must observe the custom transmitted to them long ago were headed by Polycrates, who in the letter he wrote to Victor and the Roman church sets out . . . the tradition that he had received:

(Eusebius, quoting the letter from Polycrates) "We for our part keep the day scrupulously, without addition or subtraction. For in Asia great luminaries sleep who shall rise again on the day of the Lord's advent, when He is coming with glory from heaven and shall search out all His saints – such as Philip, one of the twelve apostles, who sleeps in Hierapolis with two of his daughters, who remained unmarried to the end of their days, while his other daughter lived in the Holy Spirit and rests in Ephesus. Again there is John, who lent back on the Lord's breast, and who became a priest wearing the mitre, a martyr, and a teacher; he too sleeps in Ephesus. Then in Smyrna there is Polycarp, bishop and martyr; and Thraseus, the bishop and martyr from Eumenia, who also sleeps in Smyrna. Need I mention Sagaris, bishop and martyr, who sleeps in Laodicea, or blessed Papius, or Melito the eunuch . . . ? All these kept the fourteenth day of the month as the beginning of the Paschal Festival, in accordance with the Gospel, not deviating in the least but following the rule of the Faith. Last of all, I too, Polycrates, the least of you all, act according to the tradition of my family, some members of which I have actually followed; for seven of them were bishops and I am the eighth, and my family has always kept the day when the people put away the leaven. So I, my friends, after spending sixty-five years in the Lord's service and conversing with Christians from all parts of the world, and going carefully through all Holy Scripture, and not scared of threats. Better people than I have said: 'We must obey God rather than men' ." (From Eusebius' The History of the Church from Christ to Constantine, p. 231)

This quote demonstrates the strict adherence of many Bishops and congregations "from all parts of the world" to the original teachings of the apostles. For at least eight generations they did not deviate. This adherence was important to them, and they then became in direct conflict with the Bishop of Rome. How important is this adherence to us today ? Our we willing to stand up to the Bishop of Rome ?

- Communities holding the traditions of the School of John still existed after the Council of Nicea. The Encyclopedia Britannica, 11<sup>th</sup> edition, Vol. 19 has the following:  
 "Nazarenes, an obscure Jewish-Christian sect, existing at the time of Epiphanius (AD 370) in [Asia Minor]. According to that authority, they dated their settlement in Pella from the time of the flight of the Jewish Christians from Jerusalem, immediately before the siege in AD 70; he characterizes them as neither more or less than Jews pure and simple, but adds that they recognized the new covenant as well as the old, and believed in the resurrection, and in the one God and His Son Jesus Christ. He cannot say whether their Christological views were identical with those of Cerinthus and his School, . . . that they believed in Christ the Son of God, born of the Virgin Mary, who suffered under Pontius Pilate, and rose again, but adds that, 'desiring to be both Jews and Christians, they are neither the one nor the other.' They use the Aramaic recension of the Gospel to Matthew, which they called the Gospel to the Hebrews, but while adhering as far as possible to the Mosaic economy as regarded . . . sabbaths, foods, and the like, they did not refuse to recognize the apostolicity of Paul or the rights of (Gentile) Christians."
- The Debates of St. Augustine and Plagius, circa 400 AD: Gnostic thought versus Biblical thought:  
 St. Augustine: For now our body-of-sin rules our lifestyle, but later our intellect will still be saved by God's grace. [Christians can continue to sin, and are still good Christians.]  
 Vs.  
 Plagius: Our body-of-sin is to be suppressed by our intellect, so that when, by God's grace, we are given a new body, both body and intellect will be a fit vessel, being saved for all eternity. [Christians should not continue to sin, Christians overcome the flesh.]
- 'Hypsistarians', that is, worshippers of the most high God, whom they worship as the Jews only in one person. And they observed their Sabbaths, and used distinction of their meats, clean and unclean, though they did not regard circumcision, as Gregory Nazianzen whose father was one of this sect, gives account of them." --- Antiquities of the Christian Church, book 16, chapter 6, section 2.
- "He lays it down also as one of their opinions, 'that the law of Moses is to be kept according to the letter, and that the keeping of the Sabbath . . . and other legal observances, ought to take place. They hold also that Christ, the Son of God, is not equal with the Father, and that the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, these three . . . are not one God and one substance; and as a surplus, to these errors, they judge and condemn all the doctors of the church and university and the whole Roman church.' " --- Ecclesiastical. History of the Ancient Churches of Piedmont, pp. 168, 169, Boston.
- "Some of the popish writers themselves own that this people never submitted to the church of Rome. One of the popish writers, speaking of the Waldenses, says, 'The heresy of the Waldenses is the oldest heresy in the world. It is supposed that they first betook themselves to this place among the mountains, there they existed before Constantine the Great'. The people being settled there, their posterity continued (there) from age to age; and being, as it were, by natural walls, as well as by God's grace, separated from the rest of the world, they never partook of the overflowing corruption." --- Edward's History of Redemption, period 3, part 4 section 2.

## VII. The Council at Nicea, Foundation of the Roman Catholic Church

- Council was convened by the Roman Emperor Constantine in 325 AD:
  - He was the sole ruler of the Roman Empire.
  - Himself was not a Christian, by his own admission. Lived a traditional debauched Roman Emperor's lifestyle. Was later baptized just one week before he died.
  - Presided over the Christian meeting, making his own comments, judgements, and policies as things progressed.
  - Every word was recorded, and is today available for reading.
  - 18,000 Bishops were invited, only 318 Bishops actually attended (296 against 22). Constantine paid for the expenses of the meeting, and for the travel expenses for those that arrived. Some were killed as they traveled to the meeting.
- Up until about 315 AD, the Christian community was under direct persecution by Roman law: to be a Christian was a capital offense because it was not a "legal religion". After this meeting Constantine would make Christianity "legal".
- Beginning around 319, riots began to occur throughout the Roman empire between Christian communities, especially in Alexandria. The Roman-Western Bishops were attempting to halt the teachings of Dr. Arius, resulting in major riots in protest. People were getting killed, and Constantine viewed this as a threat to the empire. Further, by this date there were so many Christians having high social status that killing them was no longer considered an option. Politically, Constantine needed to do something about Christianity.
- Similar to Acts 15, a Council was held to discuss and to formalize a unified doctrinal position on the three major issues of the day:
  1. The primary issue debated was regarding the Preexistence of Jesus Christ, was he God, or was he a man?
  2. Another issue was regarding the day of worship, should it remain to be on Saturday, or should it be moved to Sunday?
  3. Another issue was regarding the yearly Lord's Supper, should it remain to be on the Passover, or should it be moved to be after the Passover on the next Sunday?
- In the year of Our Lord 325, only twelve years after the Age of the Catacombs, an age that was made glorious by the blood of at least eleven million Christians. So recent had the last persecution been that many of the 318 bishops attending the synod bore on their bodies testimony of the tortures they had undergone for the Faith. In fact, so disfigured were they, that the Fathers of the Council broke into tears of love and veneration at the sight of them.
- May 20, 325 AD: "When all the bishops had entered the place appointed for their session, the sides of which were filled by a great number of seats, each took his place, and awaited in silence the arrival of the Emperor. Ere long the functionaries of the court entered, but only those who were Christians; and when the arrival of the Emperor was announced, all those present rose. He appeared as a messenger from God, covered with gold and precious stones - a magnificent figure, tall and slender, and full of grace and majesty. To his majesty he united a great modesty and devout humility, so that he kept his eyes reverently bent upon the golden seat which had been prepared for him when the bishops gave him the signal to do so."
- The entrance of Constantine into the assembly is recorded as follows: "His presence was dazzling, a towering man, in his royal garment emblazoned with precious jewels and gold embroidery. The bishops looked gratefully upon this one, used by God to bring peace to the church."
- Dr. Arius, with 21 other Bishops, lead the debate on the side of:
  1. Jesus Christ was a man, the only begotten Son of God, and was created at birth.
  2. The day of worship should remain on Saturday.
  3. The yearly Lord's Supper should remain on the Passover.
- The Bishop of Rome, with 295 other Bishops, lead the debate on the side of:
  1. Jesus Christ was both man and God.
  2. The day of worship should be moved to Sunday.
  3. The yearly Lord's Supper should be moved to the first Sunday after the Passover.

- "The Emperor himself was so furious at Dr. Arius' sacrilegious opinions that it took all the influence of both Eusebius of Nicomedia and Eusebius of Caesarea to prevent him from chastising the monster, physically, on the spot. From this point onward no one dared to profess pure Arianism !"
- Constantine favored the Roman Bishops. During the proceedings he decreed that the unified church should " . . . have nothing to do with the Jewish rabble". Thus, the outcome of the final voting was sealed:
  1. Contrary to the Jewish concept of God, Jesus Christ was God, the third member of a Trinity.
  2. Contrary to the Jewish day of worship, the day of worship will be moved to Sunday.
  3. Contrary to the Jewish celebration of Passover, the yearly Lord's Supper will be the first Sunday after their Passover.
  4. All Christians must sign, or give allegiance to, the newly drafted "Nicean Creed", which was written expressly for the purpose of exposing those Christians which still agreed with Dr. Arius.
- At the general behest of the Assembly, Saint Athanasius, with the assistance for Hosius of Cordova, then drew up the celebrated Nicene Creed, which included the crucial and discriminating test word, "homooousios." The controversial section of the Creed reads: "I believe...in one Lord Jesus Christ, the only begotten Son of God... true God of true God. Begotten, not made, consubstantial with the Father...." The Nicene Creed was then presented to all the bishops to be signed. Failure to subscribe was now tantamount to automatic exclusion from the communion of the faithful. To bishops denying the Creed, it meant deposition and exile.

Two of the Eusebian bishops refused to sign. With Arius and a few priests who were supporting him, they were promptly sent into exile by Constantine's command. But Eusebius and some of his other followers, found a way out. Rather than suffer exile and lose all dignities, they subscribed to what appeared at first glance to be the Nicene Creed. What happened was that when the Creed was given to Eusebius and his colleagues to sign, they perceived that by inserting an "iota," the Greek letter corresponding to the English "I," in the middle of the word "homooousios," making it "homoiousios," the meaning of the word would be altered to say "of like substance." Having committed this forgery, they signed. But shortly thereafter the trickery was discovered, and the Emperor banished them also.

- Dr. Arius and all other Bishops that would not yield to the council's decision were declared to be heretics, and were outlawed by the authority of Constantine. Dr. Arius was banished to an island, and others were sent to Gaul.
  - Christians living in the Roman Empire who would not yield to the council's decision, and sign the Nicean Creed, were arrested, had their property seized, some were killed, most were sold as slaves.
  - Christians living in Jerusalem and outside of the Roman Empire were unaffected, living as they had lived prior to the decrees.
- Constantine later decreed that Saturday, the Jewish Sabbath, was to be the designated day for performing fasts. A later Council, at Laodicea, decreed that Sabbath keeping was a heresy, and that all Christians had to perform labor on Saturday.
- Unfortunately, Constantine, who started out by upholding the Creed of the Council and the cause of orthodoxy, was eventually prevailed upon, probably by his sister Constantina, to favor the Eusebian party. Thus, he not only recalled the heretics from the banishment he had put upon them after the great Council, but then, amazingly, sent into exile Saint Athanasius! So the Arian heresy, instead of diminishing, went on gathering in fury until Saint Jerome, thirty-four years after the Council.
- Arianism became so well established in the district of Constantinople that for fifty years, from the death of Constantine until the reign of Theodosius the Great, every bishop of Constantinople was Arian in beliefs.
- The Roman Bishops eventually formed the Roman Catholic Church, having the Bishop at Rome be "Pontiff Maximus".

- The persecutions against everyone not yielding to the Roman Catholic Church eventually lead to the establishment of three western Arian kingdoms, which favored Dr. Arius' position: Burgundia, Vandal, and Ostrogoth. These three kingdoms were later destroyed by the Roman Empire in 538 AD.
  - The overthrow of these three kingdoms resulted in the migrations of the "Waldenses" into northern Europe. These migrations established entire villages which collectively upheld the Sabbath and other teachings taught by the apostle John's disciples.
- Today's Protestant, Catholic, and Orthodox Christians still regard the Council's results at Nicea to be authoritative.
- Many migrations into Europe and Asia Minor because of the attacks by the Bishop of Rome.
- The history of "The Sabbath Keeping Churches of God" followed an independent path from that of the Catholics and Protestants. It is the "outcast Christians" which held the traditional doctrinal foundation. Throughout history the Sabbath Keeping Churches of God have upheld the same teachings that the earliest Christians believed were important enough to die for.

**VIII. The Nicea Creed**

For about 1600 years, this is the creed by which people were asked to sign or vow to believe. If they refused they were either banished, imprisoned, or killed. It must be emphasized that hundreds of thousands (if not millions) of people chose to die rather than to accept this creed.

It is not being suggested that the Nicene Creed is 100% Gnostic. Things are rarely that clear-cut. However, by a simple examination of the text it becomes clear that the Creed is highly infiltrated with Gnostic thought.

**The Full Text of the Nicene Creed Follows:**

I believe in one God, the Father Almighty, Maker of heaven and earth, and of all things visible and invisible; and in one Lord Jesus Christ, the only begotten Son of God, begotten of His Father before all worlds, God of God, Light of Light, very God of very God, begotten, not made, being of one substance with the Father; by whom all things were made; who for us men and for our salvation came down from Heaven, and was incarnate by the Holy Ghost of the virgin, Mary, and was made man; and was crucified also for us under Pontius Pilate; He suffered and was buried; and the third day He rose again according to the Scriptures, and ascended into Heaven, and sits on the right hand of the Father; and He shall come again, with glory, to judge both the living and the dead; whose kingdom shall have no end. And I believe in the Holy Ghost, the Lord, and Giver of Life, who proceeds from the Father and the Son; who with the Father and the Son together is worshiped and glorified; who spoke by the Prophets. And I believe in one holy catholic and apostolic Church; acknowledge one baptism for the remission of sins; and I look for the resurrection of the dead, and the life of the world to come. Amen.

THE CREED's TEXT	COMMENTS
I believe in one God, the Father Almighty, Maker of heaven and earth, and of all things visible and invisible;	Sounds like its talking about the one God of Israel, but it is not. Later the "God" confessed in this sentence is no longer one, but is three, and is thereby shown to be referring to the Gnostic's definition of the spiritual realm, from which all things are made via the emission of radiated pure light, called "Aeons".
and in one Lord Jesus Christ, the only begotten Son of God,	A quote from scripture . . .
begotten of His Father before all worlds,	Now the text has introduced "the Son of God" as a

	preexistent Being
God of God, Light of Light, very God of very God, begotten, not made,	Now we recognize the text as talking about the Gnostic philosophy of the superior world of pure light and The Divine Father (not YHWH)
being of one substance with the Father;	Two divine beings, made of the same substance of pure light. With this concept, all of the divine beings in the superior world are one "god". In this manner a Trinity (three in one) is understood
by whom all things were made; who for us men and for our salvation came down from Heaven,	Although paralleling scripture, this is also consistent with Gnosticism; The Divine Christ was sent by the Divine Father to reveal "Gnosis" (secret knowledge) to men
and was incarnate by the Holy Ghost of the virgin, Mary, and was made man;	The word "incarnate" means: "To cloth with flesh; to embody in flesh (Dictionary, Noah Webster, 1828) Thus we see Gnostic dualism: Jesus was flesh, but the preexistent Christ was spirit becoming wrapped in a body
" . . . "	Paralleling scripture
And I believe in the Holy Ghost, the Lord, and Giver of Life, who proceeds from the Father and the Son; who with the Father and the Son together is worshiped and glorified; who spoke by the Prophets.	Now a third divine Being is identified. Notice this Being is assigned the same authority and actions of the other two Beings, and is to also be worshipped as "God".

**IX. Technical Analysis Of The Greek Text of John 1:1**

One of the most disconcerting historical facts this author has had to cope, is the fact that God has allowed the King James Bible to be printed with blatant errors and obvious bias. For about 400 years good, honest, God fearing people have read the English translation and relied implicitly upon its accuracy. Many Christians become very angry when it is suggested that the King James Bible does not always accurately reflect the Hebrew and Greek manuscripts.

However, there is actually no doubt that the King James translation has a bias which leads the reader into believing the preexistence of Christ as a Divine Being. In this the author concedes that conducting a Bible study on the subject of the preexistence of Christ as a Divine Being, using only the King James version, will always result in the proving of the preexistence of Christ as a Divine Being. This is simply because the King James version was written to lead the reader into this conclusion.

In contrast, the author suggests that conducting a Bible study on the subject of Christ, but using only the Greek texts, will always result in the proving that Christ is a title bestowed upon the man Jesus, and is not a preexistent Being. The Greek texts do have Christ preexisting, but only in the sense of being the promised Anointed One, a title, that Jesus became and fulfilled. The promise did preexist Jesus.

This suggestion is supported historically. The early bishops adhered to the School of John (the apostle), and fought the Gnostic ideas about Jesus. Later the numerous Sabbath Keeping Churches of God also fought the Gnostic ideas about Jesus. The point is that these Christians read and memorized the Bible directly from the Greek text. They had no translation issues. They were able to read the Greek for what it said, not for what another man translated it to say. This point strongly suggests that it must be possible to read the Greek texts, and to interpret the Greek texts in such a manner, so that the idea that Christ preexisted as a Divine Being, is not found.

Further, in the great Disputations of the middle ages, the Catholic priests would debate the Jewish rabbis, each trying to convert the other. These Disputations were recorded by scribes, and we may read their arguments today. It is of primary importance to note that the Jewish Rabbis would use the Greek manuscripts for their New Testament debate. In this, the Rabbis claimed that nowhere in the Greek text does Jesus claim to be God, or to preexist. They debated scriptures like John 1:1 many times, but in the Greek language. This historical fact also suggests that it must then be possible to read the Greek texts, and to interpret the Greek texts in such a manner, so that the idea that Christ preexisted as a Divine Being, is not found.

The author here provides as an example the reading of the most often quoted proof scripture for the preexistence of Christ, John 1:1. Rendering John 1:1 from the Greek text demonstrates the absence of the idea that Christ preexisted, and demonstrates the bias of the King James translators. The few other, but often quoted, proof scriptures have the same conclusion.

Technical Analysis of the Greek Text, John 1:1, taken from:

1. "The Complete Word Study New Testament with Parallel Greek" © 1992 Spiros Zodhiates and AMG International, Inc. AMG Publishers.

2. "Analytical Greek New Testament" © 1981 Baker Book House Company.

Note: The technical meaning for each Greek word is only given once, and is not repeated when found again later in the text. When the same Greek word changes from its previous technical meaning, than the new meaning is provided.

Strong's Number	Technical Meaning	Rough English
1722	Preposition, dative: "In, On, At, During, With, By, Among"	In
746	Noun, dative, feminine, singular: "Beginning, or, Origin"	(a) beginning
2258 (1510)	verb, indicative, imperfect, active, third person, singular: "To exist, To be present, To be". Verb is active, so it is exist-ing. It is not past tense 'was'.	(it) existing
ο`	Definite article, nominative, masculine, singular	the
3056	Noun, nominative, masculine, singular: "A word; in the sense of spoken human language expressing thoughts and concepts."	(spoken) concepts.
Kai	Conjunction, coordinating	And
ο`		the
3056		(spoken) concepts
2258		(it) existing
4314	Preposition, accusative: "Towards" as expressing the direction of movement. "With regard to, Pertaining to". Moving towards plus accusing the destination (which is God).	with regard towards
το`ν	Definite article, accusative, masculine, singular	the
2316	Noun, accusative, masculine, singular	God,
kai		and
2316	Noun, nominative, masculine, singular. The nominative means that "God" is the noun of the verb "it existing". Thus, it is "God existing". The absence of a definite article means that the sentence is talking about the "qualities" or "attributes" of God.	God's qualities

2258	Verb is active, so it is exist-ing. It is not past tense 'was'. Nor is it an equivalency, so that The Word equals God.	(it) existing
o`		the
3056		(spoken) concepts.
3778	Adjective, pronominal, demonstrative, nominative, masculine, singular: "This or That" referring to the subject just mentioned. This word's gender follows the gender of the subject. In this case the subject (3056) has masculine gender, so then does this word. But for English translations, to use the word "he" may be improper, as "he" is used to reference a male-person. But in Greek this word does not imply a male-person. Thus, the translator has a choice which will skew the meaning: "He" if they believe the subject is referring to Jesus, and, "it" if they believe the subject is "spoken language".	It (the spoken concepts)
2258		(it) existing
1722		in
746		beginning
4314		with regard towards
to`n		the
2316	Noun, accusative, masculine, singular	God.
3956	Adjective, pronominal, nominative, neuter, plural: "Any and Every, All".	All
1223	Preposition, genitive: "Through" expressing motion and act.	through
846	Noun, pronoun, genitive, masculine, third person, singular: "Again" as in making reference to the subject. The subject may be either the subject just mentioned, or the greater subject of the discourse.	it (spoken concepts)
1096	Verb, indicative, aorist (equals past-tense), middle deponent, third person, singular: "To Become, To come into existence, Receive being". The middle deponent voice means that the subject is doing this verb to themselves.	became themself
kai		and
5565	Preposition, genitive: "Separately, Apart from, Without".	without
846		it (spoken concepts)
1096	Verb, indicative, aorist (equals past-tense), middle deponent, third person, singular	became themself
3761	Adjective, adverb: "But not" as in continuing a negation, in this case the word (5565) 'without'.	not
1520	Adjective, pronominal, cardinal, nominative, neuter, singular "The numeral '1' ".	one
o`	Adjective, pronominal, relative or demonstrative, nominative, neuter, singular	that
1096	Verb, indicative, perfect, active, third person, singular	has come to be.
1722		In

846	Noun, pronoun, dative, masculine, third person, singular	it (spoken concepts)
2222	Noun, nominative, feminine, singular: "Life vitality, Animate".	life vitality
2258		(it) existing
kai		and
m`	Definite article, nominative, feminine, singular	the
2222		life vitality
2258		it existing
to`	Definite article, nominative, neuter, singular	the
5457	Noun, nominative, neuter, singular: "Light" or the thing emitting the light (fire, star, torch).	light
tw~n	Definite article, genitive, masculine, plural	the
444	Noun, genitive, masculine, plural: "Human being, male or female". Genitive makes this "of human beings".	of mankind.

A Less Rough Translation:

In (a) beginning (*was*) existing the (spoken) concepts. And the (spoken) concepts (*were*) directed towards God, and God(*'s qualities*) (*is*) existing (*in*) the (spoken) concepts. The (spoken) concepts existing in (*the*) beginning (*were*) directed towards God. Everyone through (spoken) concepts became them self, and without (spoken) concepts became them self not one that has come to be. In (*the*) (spoken) concepts (*there is*) life's vitality existing, and life's vitality existing (*is*) the light of mankind.

A Close English Alternative Translation:

In a beginning was the plan. And the plan was about God, and God was known by the plan. The plan was from the beginning about God. Everyone through this plan came into existence, and without the plan came into existence not one that has come into existence. In the plan there is life, and that life is the light of all mankind.

X. Technical Analysis Of The Greek Text of John 17:5

The author here provides another example, the reading of the 2<sup>nd</sup> most often quoted proof scripture for the preexistence of Christ, John 17:5.

Analysis derived using:

- "The Complete Word Study New Testament"
- "The Analytical Greek New Testament"
- "Thayer Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament" (Lexicon)
- "Syntax of the Moods and Tenses in New Testament Greek"

The text as typically translated (Strong's Numbers, English, Greek Grammar):

Kai 3568 1392 3165 4771 3962 3844 4572  
 And now glorify me you, Father, with Yourself  
 CC AB VMAA--YS NPA-XS NPN-YS N-VM-S PD NPDMYS  
  
 tee 1391 3739 2192 4253 tou  
 the glory that (I-had) before the  
 DDFS N-DF-S APRDF-S VIIA--XS PG DGNS

ton 2889 1511 3844 4671  
 the world being with You  
 DAMS N-AM-S VNPAG PD NPD-YS

Strong's Number	Technical Meaning	Rough English
kai, CC = conjunction coordinating	is tied to previous thought	And therefore
3568, AB = adjective adverb	"now, or soon", is tied to "glorify"	now (at this time)
1392, VMAA--YS = verb imperative aorist active 2nd person singular	"to glorify / to honor", its imperative, now being done, and still doing it	its imperative that You keep on glorifying
3165, NPA-XS = noun pronoun accusative 1st person singular	the me	me
4771, NPN-YS = noun pronoun nominative 2nd person singular	you	You
3962, N-VM-S = noun vocative masculine singular	please Father	O' Father
3844, PD = preposition dative	Lexicon pg 477, 3844 "indicates that something is done either in the immediate vicinity of someone, or metaphysically in his mind" This sentence is not metaphysical, so the glory/honor is given in the immediate presence.	(glorified) in the immediate presence
4572, NPDMYS = noun pronoun dative masculine 2nd person singular	yourself	of Yourself
tee, DDFS = determiner dative feminine singular	tied to following noun which is feminine	the
1391, N-DF-S = noun dative feminine singular	its a noun: that status of having glory or honor	glorified status
3739, APRDF-S = adjective pronominal relative dative feminine singular	this word is a reference back to the noun (glorified status), but is also a conjunction to the next prepositional phrase. Lexicon pg 454-455 3739 II (when relative) means: "who , which, what" . . . #9 "joined to a preposition it forms a conjunction . . . because, for which reason".	so that (the glorified status)
2192, VIIA--XS = verb indicative imperfect active 1st person singular	indicative imperfect refers to continuous action in past time, so, "I had", but is also now active too, so, "I had and still have"	I had and still have

4253, PG = preposition genitive	Lexicon pg 536-537 4253 means "before", as in Place, Time, or <u>Superiority</u> . James 5:12 and I Pet. 4:8 are examples of translating 4253 as meaning "in superiority".	(is) superior (to)
tou, DGNS = determiner genitive neuter singular	tied to 4253, "the superiority"	
ton, DAMS = determiner accusative masculine singular	tied to next noun 2889	the
2889, N-AM-S = noun accusative masculine singular	this world (ordered society)	this world
1511, VNPAG = verb infinitive present active genitive	infinitive: "to exist", plus is present and is now active	now acting
3844, PD = preposition dative	same as #3844 above	(being) in the immediate presence
4671, NPD-YS = noun pronoun dative 2nd person singular	same as 4771 above	(of) You

kai 3568 1392 3165 4771 3962 3844 + 4572  
 And now honor me you, Father, in-Your-presence  
 CC AB VMAA--YS NPA-XS NPN-YS N-VM-S PD NPDMYS

tee 1391 3739 2192 4253 tou  
 the honor so that (I-have-had) is superior\_\_the  
 DDFS N-DF-S APRDF-S VIIA--XS PG DGNS

ton 2889 1511 3844 4671  
 the\_\_world acting in presence of You  
 DAMS N-AM-S VNPAG PD NPD-YS

Thus, an alternative translation would be:

"And therefore now at this time it is imperative that You keep on honoring me, please Father honor me in Your immediate presence so that the honorary status I have had is superior to this world now acting in the immediate presence of You."

**XI. Some Belief Statements About God, Jesus Christ, and the Holy Spirit**

The following excerpts of belief statements from differing perspectives on the Christology of Jesus Christ were copied from the internet.

Theology: Oneness:

We believe that the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit are the same God with no distinction in person or being. The one God simply manifests himself in these three ways an/or at different times.

Theology: Trinitarian:

We believe that there is one God made up of three separate and distinct persons of but one indivisible essence. These three persons existed from eternity, and are equal in power and substance. They are know as Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. The undivided essence of God belongs equally to each of the three persons. The Church confesses the Trinity to be a mystery beyond the comprehension of man. (Berkhof. pp 87-89)

Theology: Unitarian:

We believe that there is one God, the Father, and one Lord, Jesus Christ. Jesus became God's son at his birth on earth but did not exist previously. The Holy Spirit is God's power.

Theology: Arian:

We believe that there is one God, and that God is one. That God is called the Heavenly Father. That we have one Lord who is not God, Jesus Christ, who is the son of God. And we believe the Holy Spirit is the influence of God's power. The Father and Son are separate beings and the Father is superior in power, wisdom and authority. Jesus is God's express image and was given all power on heaven and earth. Every scriptural passage which names Jesus and God in the same context assigns the superior position to God and the inferior position to Jesus. The scriptures expressly and repeatedly affirm that God is the Father, and is the God of Jesus. God is one and not two, three, or any other number. Deut. 6:4, "Hear, O Israel! The LORD is our God, the LORD is one!"

**XII. What About All Those Christians Who Are Steeped In Gnostic Beliefs ?**

The author received the following comment: "The obvious conclusion to this is that God's true elect will be keeping the Holy Time he has designated as a sign of the true people of God, and they will not be keeping the sign of the sun god, Sunday, nor worship a Trinity. God's Spirit will lead them to do what is right in these critical issues. To deny that He will lead us into keeping the Sabbath at the right time, and to avoid idolatry through sun worship and a false Christ, is to deny the power of God's Spirit to work within His saints."

The Author's Reply: I submit that this conclusion is based upon a false premise. We are not denying the power of God's Spirit by suggesting: "not all members of the body of Christ will come to have the exact same high level of understanding as ourselves". I worded this purposefully to expose the obvious bias in the conclusion.

It seems most reasonable that come the day of my judgement before Christ, that I will then, and at that moment, learn of many things which I was expected to do, but because of ignorance, or very honest rejection of the idea, I did not do, and was in that sense practicing sin.

I submit that no where in the scripture does it promise me or anyone else, that God is duty-bound to fill our brains with all knowledge. God promises that the Spirit will lead us into "all truth", but the scope of that knowledge is within the context of that scripture. He did not mean mathematics, chemistry, physics, where water is on Mars, intuition, understanding of every single prophecy, nor every single nuance of sin.

I submit that in fact, God has allowed most of truth to be obscured by this world. It is very difficult for the average member of Christ's body to find the whole truth. Most of the books which we quote to substantiate the historical truths that we base our lives upon are now out of print. Not only is the truth obscured, people are overwhelmed by all of the misinformation being preached. It is very easy to be misled into believing and practicing lies, sins, including practicing things which we understand to be sun-worship, and wrong concepts about the Christology of Jesus.

My premise is as follows: "God will judge us in direct proportion to what we knew to be true or false, and what we did with that understanding." This is not to suggest a wide tolerance for sin or doctrine. I truly and emphatically uphold that the Sabbath Day (and by the way the Holy Days of Leviticus 23 too) is to be

kept by God's people everywhere, as a devoted Christian's practice. Doctrines are very important for obtaining good rewards, but only a few doctrines are relevant to salvation. That is, if God has called you for salvation, only a few doctrines and your own bad conduct can fester to prevent God from granting it. Otherwise, we are talking about the rewards given to us after we obtain God's gift of eternal life.

I also firmly impose on my premise that there are indeed absolutes, to which, there are no gray areas. For example, we must be fully persuaded that Jesus (or Yohoshua if you prefer) is the Messiah, the promised seed of Abraham, the only begotten of the Father, the only mechanism given to man to obtain salvation. And secondly, we must be trying to build our own integrity as we overcome sin, and live a righteous unhyprocritical life, as best we know how.

I also submit that **ignorance is part of the judgement equation**: For example: were we misled by our teachers, did we hide ourselves behind a self imposed ignorance, or did we try but very honestly were never convinced. Part of the question is: "**What would we have done if we did understand the whole truth?**" God knows our heart. In the Kingdom, God will provide us with all of the truth, plus a body that is no longer in the way. But, can He trust us? Do we have integrity?

Where we may differ is that I am willing to grant God the latitude to allow some members of the body of Christ to remain (for many reasons) within some of the trappings of the priests of Baal, if God so chooses. Here I speak of a relative few. If God has extended this latitude to allow millions of Baal infested people to be in the body of Christ, that is His decision. However, I will be surprised, and very attentive to hear, on that day when He explains to me, why the millions were also allowed.

### **XIII. Conclusion**

This article presents some very serious information for us living today. The evidence demonstrates that the very early Body of Christ was first split before 90 AD by Christians who wanted to leave the original traditions and collaborate with the Romans. In this split, it was the Christians who insisted on keeping the original doctrines who were declared to be the outlaws.

The evidence demonstrates that the very early Body of Christ was again split around 100 AD by Christians who left the original teachings of the apostle John, and went about claiming to be the enlightened Christians, teaching doctrines derived from gentile philosophies, generally called Gnosticism.

The book of I John demonstrates that we may identify those that left, as those that teach Christians that they may disregard the commandments of YHWH, may continue to sin, and yet still be God's children.

The Greek textual analysis of I John 4:2 demonstrates that the recited confession is a pivotal test, provided so that we may recognize the Gnostic teachers from the original teachers. This understanding allows us living 1900 years later to be able to emphatically link those who left, as being preachers teaching Gnostic ideas about the nature of the Messiah.

The book of I John demonstrates that we are to label Gnostic preachers as being Anti-Christ. We are not to be misled into believing or practicing Gnostic ideas.

The evidence demonstrates that the Body of Christ was again split around 325 AD after the Council of Nicea. Similar to the first split, this split separated those that wanted to leave the original doctrines, from those who insisted upon keeping the traditional doctrines of the disciples of John. Likewise in this split, it was the Christians who insisted on keeping the original doctrines who were declared to be the outlaws.

The evidence demonstrates that the Sabbath Keeping Churches of God are descendants of those that insisted upon keeping the traditional doctrines. This evidence shows the doctrinal lineage to be from the earliest times, up to our own modern history.

The evidence demonstrates that the Sabbath Keeping Churches of God have always been the targets for inquisition by the Roman legalized Catholic Church.

One Major Point: of all this evidence is that nothing has changed. The Sabbath Keeping Churches of God are still separated from the Churches of wider Christianity because we do not agree with the Gnostic teachings of the Nicean Creed, nor their Gnostic tolerances for sin. In essence, we obey different Gods. The Catholic and Protestants know this, and do not accept the Churches of God as being truly Christian. Only the members of the Churches of God seem to be dense on this distinction.

The book of I John identifies those that teach Gnostic doctrines as being Anti-Christ. It is manifest that we need to be very certain of our understanding of Gnosticism before we go about asserting that most of the Christian preachers throughout the world are actually priests of Baal and are Anti-Christ. Such bold assertion would not be understood by wider Christianity, would be emphatically condemned by everyone, and would make most people very upset.

However, if the evidence presented in this paper is convincing, then it may follow that the Sabbath Keeping Churches of God are required to become much more vocal in our disdain towards the teachings which the Bible so emphatically condemns.

From this would follow that we are required to voice a much harsher condemnation towards Christians in our congregations who are practicing Gnostic traditions and teachings. We may be required to voice a much harsher condemnation towards Christians in our congregations who are participating in the Roman traditions of Sunday worship, Christmas, Easter, and Halloween ["PRAY TOWARDS THE EAST"]. We may be required to voice a much harsher condemnation towards Christians in our congregations who are eating unclean foods ["EAT WHAT WE EAT"]. We may be required to voice a much harsher condemnation towards Christians in our congregations who are allowing sinful practices to continue, treating sin as having no consequences ["REGARDING AS PERMISSIBLE THAT WHICH WE CONSIDER AS SUCH"].

From this then comes another critical point. It is suggested by the author that the Sabbath Keeping Churches of God are now being so heavily infiltrated with Gnostic doctrines and tolerances, that our children are lacking the ability to discern the traditional doctrinal differences between the School of John (the apostle) and the opposing School of Rome. Often our children think nothing of attending the prayer meetings, Bible studies, and services of the Catholics and Protestants. What is the source of their spiritual food? Perhaps we need to be much more concerned.

The evidence demonstrates that throughout history there have been three (3) primary targets for doctrinal attack on God's children. One, the Trinity, which includes other similar Gnostic concepts about the nature of Jesus ["PRAY TOWARDS THE EAST"]. Two, the Sabbath day, which includes defilement issues, foods, and the how and when we physically worship God ["EAT WHAT WE EAT"]. Three, the commandments of the God of Abraham, which includes the practicing of righteousness ["REGARDING AS PERMISSIBLE THAT WHICH WE CONSIDER AS SUCH"].

The author concludes with a question: Since these three areas of attack have been the primary focus throughout history, is it possible that these same three areas will also be the primary focus of attack in our modern times?

If your answer is: "Yes", then perhaps our Bible studies and our sermons need to more strongly focus on these three areas, and thereby ensure that our children understand the doctrines which rightly separate us from those that left the Body of Christ.