

To Him That Has An Ear Hear What The Bible Says Is The Christian Confession

The Biblical Confession Affirms That The 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 1-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, 1-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 (the author prefers the name Yahoshua) lived, and some will allow that he 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 even Moslems can pass this simple test. Many of the eastern religions also accept that Jesus lived as a spiritually enlightened man, that he was a great prophet, even a messiah, just like Buddha. So even those in the eastern religions can pass this simple test. It seems that this simple test is way too easy to pass.

But ask, 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? Well, 1-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 this 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 1-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.

**1-John 4:2 [whoever] Confesses That:
 "Jesus + Christ + in + flesh + is-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, is come".

But grammatically this sentence is far more exacting, a confession which most are completely unaware. There are just five (5) Greek words:

Jesus	Christ	in flesh	come
an, nn 2424 Anarthrous, Noun	an nn 5547 Anarthrous, Noun	"in" = pre 1722 and "flesh" = an, nn 4561 preposition plus is an Anarthrous, Noun	pfp 2064 Verb
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 being in flesh – everything that being in flesh stands for)	is come (and the effect of all three objects coming is still here to this day)

The Greek word #2064 ("come") is in the "perfect participle active". In grammar this means that the condition, the lasting effects of the three objects – Jesus+Christ+Flesh, "is come" is both being stressed and has ongoing effect, even to this day, i.e. "most emphatically is come and these objects are still here now".

The Greek grammar term "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 and qualities of a person.

For example, the Greek word for “God”, when written in the anarthrous form, is not talking about “the deity God” Himself, but is talking about “the qualities of the deity God”, the “God-like-class/state/status”, everything that God stands for. In the anarthrous you do not translate the Greek word for “God” as “God”, but you 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 descriptive-nouns, the qualities of “the thing”, not “the thing” itself.

This sentence is not talking about the noun “Jesus (as a person)”, but about the qualities of “Jesus (what he did and stands for – His renown)”.

This sentence is not talking about the noun “Christ (as being a person, a place, or a thing)”, but about the qualities of “Christ (the promised Messiah and what Messiah-ship means)”.

This sentence is not talking about the noun “flesh (as a body)”, but about the qualities of “in flesh (as being fleshly in type, not a spirit, or just a thought, but what it means to be in flesh)”.

Thus, we confess:

- “Jesus”** - (what he did and stands for)
- “Christ”** - (the promised Messiah and what that means)
- “in flesh”** - (as being in the fleshly-state, and what that means)
- “is come”** - (most assuredly is come, plus the three objects
“ Jesus + Christ + in Flesh ” is still come to this day).

Understand now why this sentence is actually a very serious test. Can you confess that the promised seed of Abraham is come in the flesh, and is still in the flesh ?

The earliest writings so state:

"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. While making this point he writes, **'But I know that even after his resurrection he was in the flesh; and I believe that he still is so.'** "

Three Equally Valid Grammatical Constructs:

There is even more. Grammatically, the entire phrase, "Confesses + Jesus + Christ + in + flesh + is-come", has three equally valid constructs as shown below. It is the translator who 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:

(Source: The Net Bible footnote 17, which requires a half-page to explain)

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

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?

Look Seriously At These Three Options

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? After all, it is a very serious charge to make, to accuse someone of teaching in the spirit of antichrist. Likewise, the translation construct chosen must be a very serious test, one that can truly separate between God's Spirit and the deceiving spirit.

Option 1. Confessing that: "Jesus Christ in flesh is come": only asserts belief that Jesus Christ was a person that lived as a man in the flesh. This test does not even discriminate those of the New Age movement, who allow that Jesus was a man, even a great spiritual prophet, even "a Messiah or The 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 is come": likewise only asserts belief that Jesus Christ existed as a man in the flesh. This grammatical choice also allows anyone of other religions to pass the test. This choice 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 is come": is a serious test. This confession makes you say some important and controversial affirmations.

The first affirmation is that the primary focus is on the single entity "Jesus (Yahoshua)". It says that "Jesus is something", we confess the qualities/reown of Jesus. In this confession our belief is in what the man Yahoshua stands for.

Secondly, this test confesses belief that Jesus is the promised Messiah, the promised seed of Abraham. But even more, this affirmation denies the possibility of a God-Being manifesting as "The Christ" and remaining a spirit-being separate from the flesh of Jesus. The Gnostic Christian Christ (fully God and fully Man) is excluded. **The Christ is in flesh, not in spirit.**

In English this distinction is not clear, but look again at the Greek grammar. The word "Christ" is not a personal-noun. The Greek text is talking about "the qualities of the Messiah, the promised Messiah-ship". The word "flesh" is in the anarthous, it is "the qualities of being in the flesh" - . . . who is the "Messiah-ship in fleshly-ness is come and still is"? **Capture this: the Messiah is come in flesh and is still in flesh.**

Putting both objects together: saying this confession means that you believe that Jesus is the Messiah is in flesh to this day.

This Confession Denies The "Gnostic Christ"

Christendom is taught that 'The Christ' preexisted with 'The Father' in heaven as 'God', and came down from heaven to manifest Himself as a man, Jesus, and then went back to heaven again as a spirit "God-being". But consider carefully: if this were in reality true, **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 of worship, it would have to focus on the spirit 'God-Being' that preexisted and went back to heaven. The confession would have to be written so that we affirm that a 'God-Being' came in spirit and became flesh for awhile, but now is spirit again. **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 spirit 'God-Being' who became "Jesus Christ in the flesh". But look again. This is not what this confession tells us to say. God coming in the flesh is not what we are to confess. What we are to confess is that the man born of Mary, the man Yahoshua, is "the Messiah-ship in fleshly-ness is most certainly come and still is".

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.”

The Point Is: It is the man Jesus who is the focal entity we are to worship as God’s Messiah. Revelation 1:18 tells us that it was the man Jesus who was resurrected, and He was resurrected as “flesh and bones” (Luke 24:39) and ate fish.

Also consider: 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 in the scriptures? But the scriptures do not talk about a ‘God-Being’ performing manifestations as a man. The scriptures use simple language to talk about a bloodline descendant of Abraham becoming God’s promised Messiah, who is the man Yahoshua whom God resurrected back to life again as flesh and bones (not flesh and blood as we are).

It does not really matter what we imagine this confession could mean. God The Father inspired the grammar of this 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 is most assuredly come, is fleshly rather than spiritual, and are still the qualities-attributes of the resurrected Yahoshua.

This Biblical confession does not say, “God (a noun) became flesh”. The confession is that, “Christ is a descriptive-adjective and is fleshly to this day”. This Biblical text denies that ‘Christ’ is a spiritual being, divine or otherwise.

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

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

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 Nicene Creed, which declared the Trinitarian confession to be the only test for true Christians.

Today, most of wider Christianity uses the Nicene Creed as their test for Christians. For example, in 1999 the Church of God 7th 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 1-John 4:2 effectively identifies wider Christianity as being those that are teaching the spirit of anti-Christ.

More Evidence:

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

1-John 4:3 and 2-John 7.

In 1-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 is come”. The man Yahoshua 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 2-John 7: the Greek words are again exactly the same words as used in verse 2, with two exceptions. The word “come” is listed in front of “in flesh”, and it is in the Present tense. Verse 7 confesses:

“Jesus” and confesses “Messiah-ship, IS NOW HERE, in fleshly-ness qualities”.

This confirms that the above analysis of option #3, that the Messiah is at this very time still in fleshly-ness, is the interpretation intended by the author.

Conclusion:

The Biblical confession of 1-John 4:2 is a very serious test which identifies the Gnostic teachings about the nature of Christ as being the emphatically condemned doctrines of Anti-Christ. Our confession is not to a Gnostic Christ. Our confession is our allegiance to our living hero, Yahoshua, who is the Messiah in flesh is come and still is.

The Biblical confession is the giving of our allegiance:

We Confess:

- (1) **“Jesus’ Renown”** (who is the)
- (2) **“Messiah-ship In Fleshly-ness”**
“Is Most Certainly Come and Still Is”