

Major Mistakes

by

Trinitarian Thinkers

Pastor R. Euresti Jr. M.ED

Scripture references are entirely from the *King James Version* of the bible. Quotes on the Apostolic Fathers are taken from the popular ten volume set of the Ante-Nicene Fathers by Hendrickson Publishers Inc. In order to combat the false presentation or trusted view of Triune history, it is strongly recommended that the reader compare what this book is stating with the exact quotations of the Ante-Nicene Fathers.

Instead of citations, this book is using the actual volume number and page number where the quote is found in the ten volume set. Example: 5.631

In this case, the 5 refers to volume five of the set.

The number 631 refers to page six hundred and thirty one.

When books are mentioned with the author, the information is included in the sources page at the back of this book.

Copyright © 2015 by Pastor R. Euresti Jr.

Major Mistakes by Trinitarian Thinkers

Printed in the United States of America

For more information, write to:

Highest Praise Church
P.O. Box 3242
McAllen, Texas 78502

All rights reserved solely by the author. No part of the book may be reproduced in any shape or form without the written permission of the author.

DEDICATION

*This Book is dedicated to Highest Praise
Church and to my wife Cecy, whose dedication
to Christ made this book possible*

Contents

Chapter One

True Biblical and Historical Christianity 1

Warnings of False Teachers 12

The Logos Protects Against Error 19

Infiltration 21

Chapter Two

Greek Philosophy Mingles With Christianity 31

Apostolic Forgeries 33

Alexandrian Philosophy 37

A New Hellenized Gospel 40

Christian Philosophers and Deception 45

Chapter Three

*The Struggle For Supremacy, Christian Philosophy
Versus Biblical Christianity* 59

The Catechetical School of Alexandria 59

The Monarchian or Oneness School of Rome 68

The Battle Over Baptism 75

Chapter Four

Christian Philosophy Becomes Dogmatic Theology 85

What Happened to the Monarchian Majority? 86

The Woman Sits On the Beast 92

The Evolution of Catholicism 94

Researching the Protestant Reformation 98

What Side Are You On? 105

Chapter Five

The Trinitarian Thinkers 114

First Century 116

Second Century 120

Third Century 125

Fourth Century 133

Catholic Doctrines in the Apocrypha 137

Chapter Six

Modern Trinitarian Thinkers 140

The Trinity Defenders 142

Chapter Seven

A Major Contradiction 182

Creedal Mistakes 190

Worship of the Father 195

Who Do You Worship? 199

Notes

Chapter One 212

Sources

A 218

Introduction

Most likely, the person who is reading this book would want to go directly to chapter six, the section on modern thinkers. It is advisable to read from the beginning chapters, for it is within these first pages that a strong foundation is established against the doctrine of the Trinity. The reason why this book was written is not to provide more information for a debate, but rather, it is historical evidence that will expose the falsehood of a Triune Godhead. Though historical aspects of the Trinity have been shared previously with the world, it is the strong contention of this research that only minimal information has been provided. The entire and true history of the Trinity has never been told by Trinitarian Thinkers.

Heresy is the label that has been placed on anyone who dares to believe in God in any other way than God being a triune being who has existed throughout eternity as three coequal, coeternal persons. Those that are certain that the Trinity doctrine is biblical, have been taught to label all other views as erroneous. Others, move in the self-same spirit of persecution as that of the ancient Roman Catholic Church.

This is wrong! To better understand the major blunders committed by Trinitarian Thinkers, including the lie that the early church was Trinitarian, this book has been divided into seven chapters. The first four relate to the first four centuries. In other words, what really happened after the death of the apostles? Of the countless books that have been studied, none

have explained in detail what happened in the first three centuries of Christian religious history that led up to the main council of Nicaea. What is meant by blunders in this book, are the incredible mistakes committed by some well respected theologians whose multiple works continue to present the doctrine of the Trinity as a pure and biblical teaching. These treasured representations of so called orthodox theology are never challenged, and their grievous mistakes remain dormant to the simple believer, until now. This present work is not at all an attempt to attack or to ridicule Trinitarian Theologians. The sail that moves this boat is one of truth, sincerity, and a desire for righteousness.

Hundreds of hours of research have been poured into the writings of the Ante-Nicene Fathers. It is here that strong evidence against the Trinity takes place. Reading the entirety of what these men professed is crucial! They willingly have introduced philosophy, traditions of men, and Spirit-less ideas, that contradict the inspired writings given by the Holy Ghost. Orthodox Christianity has given the world "creeds" that have been raised to the level of Holy Scripture. This is one of the biggest blunders committed throughout the history of the Church. While they claim that creeds were simply put in place to protect the true gospel, the opposite of that is true.

The bible should be the only direct source of divine inspiration. Since orthodox Christianity uses some scripture along with most of their philosophical applications, many have accepted its teachings as correct. To combat such a defense coming from Trinitarian authors, this book will trace the true history of "dogmatic theology" and its major development. This kind of theology is based on the beliefs of a certain organization or church, and considered authoritative truth that

cannot be altered. In this case, it is the creeds of the Roman Catholic Church. What many call "orthodox" is really the Catholic way of seeing things. History reveals that the word "Catholic" or universal has never been independent from its traditions that sets this group apart from all others. It is a grave mistake to say that one is Catholic but not Roman Catholic. Those who practice Catholic dogma are in one way or other connected with Rome.

There is a strong reason why Trinitarian Thinkers have such a weak defense when referring to history. The origin of the Trinity is not what it appears to be. The information given to Christians who have accepted this doctrine is inaccurate. Most books on the origin of the Trinity do not even explain its true beginnings. Some go only as far back as Tertullian when discussing the foundation of this dogma. This is wrong because Tertullian's involvement with the Trinity appears in the third century. What happened in the centuries prior to this? Trinitarians make Tertullian and his fellow bishops appear as heroes of the faith when in reality they were not. They were not even good Catholics!

It must never be forgotten that the Trinity dogma was mandated by law, Roman law (the Theodosian code). Some Trinitarian Thinkers have the obstinacy of denying this simple information. They profess the doctrine to be able to defend itself with its arguments and scripture references. On the contrary, take away the name calling, disclose the true history, and the Trinity vanishes!

It is the fifth and sixth chapters that deal with the direct quotes of Trinitarian Thinkers, past and present. The mistakes are undeniable! The last chapter of this book reveals a major

contradiction along with credal mistakes in the Trinitarian way of thinking. If the person reading this book is honest and sincere, what is found within these pages will be priceless. The individual will also find that the contents revealed here, contradict the years and years of false propaganda given to the world by Trinitarian Thinkers. The truth must be told! For the Trinity doctrine to have survived this many years, many theologians and historians have had to omit extremely valuable information. This book will basically uncover four incredible and historical cover-ups:

- The Ante-Nicene Fathers were not biblical Christians
- The Second and Third Century majority of Believers were not Trinitarian
- The use of Dogmatic Theology is still in use today by modern Trinitarians
- The Protestant Reformation did not reform from all issues related to Catholicism

Chapter 1

First Century

True Biblical Historic Christianity
33-100 A.D.

The first century brought us the one true gospel. After Christ's ascension to heaven, the apostles would be left with the responsibility of proclaiming the doctrine of Christ. Their message was simple. It was to teach and preach the words of Jesus, and nothing more (Mat. 28:20, Acts 5:20). The Lord had taught his disciples the story of a wise man whose house was built upon *the rock*. The man was wise as a result of hearing and obeying Christ's words. This is recorded in the book of Matthew, chapter seven, verse 24. He explicitly taught that not hearing and obeying Christ's words would result in devastation. This type of disobedience would classify the man as "foolish" and as one who built his house upon the sand.

The apostles learned this lesson well, for the evidence is clear. The New Testament writings are filled with the words of Jesus. The apostles did not veer to the left nor to the right. The doctrine of Christ was the apostle's doctrine. To teach anything apart from this would be deception and betrayal. The bible clearly teaches, "For other foundation can no man lay than that is laid, which is Jesus Christ" (1 Cor 3:11). Jesus Christ is the rock or foundation of the Church!

The New Testament carefully teaches the principles (elementary, beginnings) of the doctrine of Christ. These were the foundational teachings that the apostles would leave with every new church community. After establishing the belief in the death, burial, and resurrection of Jesus (1 Cor 15:1-4), the

Major Mistakes

apostles would teach the first principles: "Therefore leaving the principles of the doctrine of Christ, let us go on unto perfection; not laying again the foundation of repentance from dead works, and of faith toward God, of the doctrine of baptisms, and of laying on of hands, and of resurrection of the dead, and of eternal judgment" (Heb 6:1-2).

Did the apostles and the early church believe in the resurrection of Christ? Yes. Did they believe in repentance and holy living? Yes. Did they believe in one God, the same as the Jews of their day? Yes. Were they receptive to water baptism (in the name of Jesus) and the baptism of the Holy Spirit? Yes. Did they practice the laying on of hands? Yes. They also proclaimed the resurrection of the just and unjust. They certainly publicized a day when Christ would judge the world, known as the eternal judgment.

The bible even tells us how we should build upon this foundation: "Now if any man build upon this foundation gold, silver, precious stones, wood, hay, stubble; Every man's work shall be made manifest: for the day shall declare it, because it shall be revealed by fire; and the fire shall try every man's work of what sort it is" (1 Cor 3:12-13). The apostles were a perfect example of the man who built his house upon the rock. They heard Jesus' words and they obeyed them. They were truly founded on the rock, a reference to Jesus Christ. See 1Co 10:4. The rock was Christ! The false foundation of Peter being the rock on which the church was founded, would not come into the church until many years later, and that only through the Catholic Fathers.

Some dare to assert a difference between the Apostle Paul's theology and that of the Apostle Peter. Many have build their foundation upon this false conclusion. The truth of the

matter is that all of the apostles held to the words of Christ, including Paul. All his teachings can be traced back to Christ. If any of his servants had taught anything differently, they would not (as Jude wrote) be contending for the faith once delivered to the saints. The New Testament records how the apostles handled any diversions from the gospel. This was done through direct confrontations or through the assembly of the brethren. Even Peter was questioned on his dealings with the Gentiles (Acts 11). The apostle found himself having to explain how the Holy Ghost directed him to the house of Cornelius.

When Paul and some of the brethren debated on the subject of the law of Moses (Acts 15), it was decided to take it personally to the elders of the Church. *Jerusalem* was the first church site established by Peter and the apostles, not Rome. There, in one accord, through the guidance of the Holy Spirit, an agreement was made on this subject matter. Peter never presided as the main leader or apostle in any of those meetings. The leaders of the church consisted not only of the apostles and prophets but of the *elders*. These were men filled with the wisdom of God through the Holy Spirit. The Church was functioning exactly as the Lord had prescribed.

Many of today's theologians, including Reformed ones, will tell you that the apostles did not understand the nature of the Godhead. Some even claim that because of persecution, the disciples of Christ had not really considered the subject of what God was really like. They claim that it would take the Council of Nicaea of 325 A.D. to sort things out. This is false! The New Testament Scriptures reveal that this was never the case. The apostles, prophets, and elders did examine all major problems ailing the church. The theme of who God was or

what his nature was like, was never brought up as a problem. ***They were unwavering monotheistic Jews!***

Yes, Jesus and the apostles were monotheistic Jews. This is the history and exclusive identity of the Jewish people! They strongly proclaimed, "The Lord God is one." The deity of Christ was not an issue with the early church. Their writings do not reveal any new revelation on the Jewish teaching of the singular Godhead. The Holy Spirit was known as the Spirit of Christ, or of the Father: "But ye are not in the flesh, but in the Spirit, if so be that the Spirit of God dwell in you. 'Now if any man have not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of his'" (Rom 8:9). Jesus was looked upon as the "Son of the living God" (Matthew 16:16). This, to all the Jews of the ***one God religion***, meant that Jesus claimed to be the God of the Hebrews.

After Jesus stated, "I and my Father are one," the Jews took up stones to stone him. The reason they angrily expressed "...because that thou being a man, makest thyself to be God" (John 10:33). They did not mean by this that Jesus was another God, but the very God of the Jewish people. It would be stated at the beginning of the same gospel: "He came unto his own, and his own received him not" (John 1:11). The verse prior to this one proclaimed, "He was in the world, and the world was made by him, and the world knew him not" (John 1:10). John states at the very beginning, "the Word was God." See verses that include the word "Creator." There is only one Creator in the entire bible.

What did Jesus indicate by saying "He that believeth on me, believeth not on me, but on him that sent me.' 'And he that seeth me seeth him that sent me" (John 12:44-45). Was he speaking of unity between the Father and the Son? This is

what historically, most Trinitarian Theologians claim was the significance of Christ's words. They rejected the Oneness view of God in order to uphold their plurality of persons. In the context of monotheism, this cannot be. What do you think monotheistic Jews understood by these words? Jesus was revealing something even more profound than going around saying "I and my Father are united."

When all the scriptures relating to Christ's revelation are placed together, the answer is clear. These verses are not speaking of unity between the Father and Son, but more incredibly so of "identity" as to who the Son of God is. When Jesus spoke of men "seeing the Father," he was calling attention to his status or position as to *the true God of Scripture*. This is the correct interpretation of these passages, simply, because the apostles who walked with Christ were in total agreement when they wrote their epistles years later. The Apostle Paul, who did not walk with Christ while he was on earth, wrote years later that the great God and our Savior is Jesus Christ." See Titus 2:13.

When a certain disciple asked "show us the Father, and it will be sufficient," Jesus gave an answer (John 14:8). Jesus said, "Have I been so long time with you, and yet hast thou not known me, Philip?" "He that hath seen me *hath seen the Father*; and how sayest thou then, shew us the Father?" (John 14:9). Paul accepted the revelation that Christ was the image of the invisible God: "Who is the image of the invisible God, the firstborn of every creature" (Col 1:15). The disciples did not throw Christ's words away as dogmatic theologians have done. They acknowledged them with joy. *Jesus is the visible image of the Father*. The writer of Hebrews understood the

Major Mistakes

Son of God to be the "express image of his person" (Hebrews 1:3).

Would it be correct to say that when the disciples saw Jesus, they saw the Father? If one were to say no, they would be disagreeing with the words of Jesus and the New Testament Church. They wrote about it and taught the early churches, *the mystery of Godliness* (1 Timothy 3:16). This is the teaching that "God was manifest in the flesh." The disciples taught the doctrine of Christ and explained that these were the sound principles that they were to follow. The Apostle John wrote that "if anyone does not have this doctrine, do not allow him into your home" (2 John 9, 10). The Apostle Paul warned Timothy, "As I besought thee to abide still at Ephesus, when I went into Macedonia, that thou mightest charge some that they teach no other doctrine" (1 Tim 1:3).

Paul's instruction to Timothy does not at all seem to imply that they were lacking in knowledge. He wrote, "Take heed unto thyself, and unto the doctrine; continue in them: for in doing this thou shalt both save thyself, and them that hear thee" (1 Tim 4:16). It is evident that the Holy Scriptures, comprised of the Old and New Testaments, would be enough to settle any disputes in doctrine. Paul wrote, "Study to shew thyself approved unto God, a workman that needeth not to be ashamed, rightly dividing the word of truth" (2 Tim 2:15). The early church was a defender of the doctrines and traditions already received from Christ and his apostles. They were not at liberty to invent their own teachings!

All this information on *true biblical and historic Christianity* is coming from the New Testament writings and especially from the "book of Acts." It is from these early writings that the true Church of Jesus Christ is revealed. It is

only through the book of Acts that we learn of the very first persecutions of the church. This incredible book is a historic account of what was happening in the church of the first century. Furthermore, these same documents are considered to be one of a kind. They are inspired by the Holy Ghost.

Ironically, it is this New Testament book that is probably the most neglected in today's lineup of Christian denominations. This includes churches that believe in the baptism of the Holy Spirit with the evidence of speaking with tongues! While many denominations claim that their origin stems from the early church, they are missing the most basic of instructions that were taught and practiced by the followers of Christ. Does this make these *Christian Churches* false? The answer is no. They are simply lacking in certain areas that can be corrected through those who hear the voice of the Holy Spirit. See Revelation, chapters 2 and 3.

The church grew through much persecution. With the exception of the apostles, the disciples of Christ would travel away from the first church of Jerusalem, preaching the gospel wherever they went. Sometimes, entire cities such as Samaria, would receive the gospel. Multitudes would believe in Christ, repent, and *be baptized in the wonderful name of Jesus*. Many verses can be offered up as proof texts. See Matthew 28:19, Mark 16:16, 17, Luke 24:47, Acts 2:38, 4:12, 8:16, 10:48, 19:5, Rom. 6:4, Gal. 3:27.

They would also wait for the ministry of the "laying on of hands" so that new disciples could receive the "like gift" of the baptism of the Holy Spirit (Acts 8:15-17, 11:17). This is a key element that is missing in most of today's denominations. Contrary to what modern haters of the Church argue about money, large amounts were given for the exclusive needs of

Major Mistakes

the assembly. The bible records of the first century church: "Having land, sold it, and brought the money, and laid it at the apostles' feet" (Acts 4:37). The issue of **money** was important! Some who lied to the Holy Ghost on this issue, were literally cut off from membership. See Acts 5:5, 10.

The name of Jesus Christ was held in extremely high honor by the early church. They professed that the name of Jesus was above all other names: "Wherefore God also hath highly exalted him, and given him a name which is above every name" (Phil 2:9). The disciples of the Lord had great faith in that name: "Neither is there salvation in any other: for there is none other name under heaven given among men, whereby we must be saved" (Acts 4:12). They taught that forgiveness was in the name: "To him give all the prophets witness, that through his name whosoever believeth in him shall receive remission of sins" (Acts 10:43).

His disciples learned early on that devils would submit to his name: "And the seventy returned again with joy, saying, Lord, even the devils are subject unto us through thy name" (Luke 10:17). Jesus had taught them to pray in his name: "And whatsoever ye shall ask in my name, that will I do, that the Father may be glorified in the Son" (John 14:13). The apostle wrote as to their custom: "Unto the church of God which is at Corinth, to them that are sanctified in Christ Jesus, called to be saints, with all that in every place **call upon the name of Jesus Christ our Lord**, both theirs and ours" (1 Cor 1:2).

The gospel of John would make this remarkable statement: "But these are written, that ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God; and that believing ye might have **life through his name**" (John 20:31). Indeed, the early church did everything in the name of Jesus: "And

whatsoever ye do in word or deed, do all in the name of the Lord Jesus, giving thanks to God and the Father by him" (Col 3:17). This teaching of the "Name" was prohibited by religious men during the apostles time of ministry (Acts 5:40). The attack on the name of Jesus would continue even after the apostles were martyred. According to the book of Revelation, many would diminish the use of the Lord's name in the upcoming years. Many would deny his name, especially in water baptism.

The Apostle Paul would carry the gospel even further on his special "Holy Ghost guided" missionary trips. As a result, many church communities would be established. It is to most of these same Christian fellowships that the apostles wrote their letters, those that make up a major portion of the New Testament Scriptures. Names like Ephesians, Romans, Thessalonians, Corinthians, Galatians, etc., are the actual titles of these unique and sacred documents. Apostolic doctrine is clearly revealed within their letters. It is here that specifics are given on what Christians really believe. The Roman Church was just one of many (Peter had nothing to do with this church).

These and other churches is what Christ meant when he stated, "And I say also unto thee, That thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my church; and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it" (Matt 16:18). There was no one exclusive church that was above all others. Each group of believers in those different regions represented the Church of the Lord Jesus Christ. That is why each letter (epistle) is addressed appropriately to a particular church. For example, "Unto the church of God which is in Corinth." This city was not the main church, but one of many. Paul greets *all the*

churches of Galatia when writing his famous epistle to the Galatians. This is the same terminology used throughout all the epistles.

All these and other New Testament Churches together made up the church that Christ called "My Church." This is what the Apostle Paul called the body. "For as the body is one, and hath many members, and all the members of that one body, being many, are one body: so also is Christ" (1 Cor 12:12). All these early Christian communities in the different locations, were members of the body of Christ. Again, Paul wrote, "But now are they many members, yet but one body" (1 Cor 12:20). What Christ meant by Church or "ecclesia" was the assembly of the called out ones. To be a member of the Lord's Church, a person had to be "born again" of water and of the Spirit (John 3:5). Simply attending a church did not make one a Christian.

Christ had commanded in his great commission to make disciples, and indeed this was their agenda. Paul wrote to Timothy, "If any man teach otherwise, and consent not to wholesome words, even the words of our Lord Jesus Christ, and to the doctrine which is according to godliness; He is proud, knowing nothing..." (1 Tim 6:3-4). The Apostle Peter was in agreement with Paul: "Unto you therefore which believe he is precious: but unto them which be disobedient, **the stone** which the builders disallowed, the same is made the head of the corner, and a stone of stumbling, and a rock of offence, even to them **which stumble at the word**, being disobedient: whereunto also they were appointed" (1 Peter 2:7-8).

The book of Acts leaves off where Paul is living in Rome (Acts 28:30). History tells us that the apostle was

martyred there as a testimony against Rome. Jerusalem was destroyed in 70 A.D. by Roman armies. Some believe this is where and when the Apostle Peter was martyred. The first historical and biblical Church where the apostles, prophets, and elders would meet to discuss ecclesiastical matters, was struck down by evil forces. By destroying Jerusalem, Satan thought that he had put an end to the early church. He did not get rid of the New Testament Church, for the Church that Christ spoke about would not be limited to one exclusive location.

Incredibly, Rome, the greatest persecutor of Christians, and the main culprit in the death of the apostles, would later proclaim its place as *the main center of Christianity*. It would falsely claim as to the founders of the Roman Catholic Church, two of the apostles, Paul and Peter. This unique city would be at liberty to develop its own version of the gospel, including having an unscriptural priesthood never seen before in the earlier Christian communities. Rome would also give to the world its own religion with its own version of Christianity combined with its own pagan traditions and Roman customs. Its apostolic succession would be riddled from the start with countless contradictions.

How would Rome accomplish this? It would be those same men, the ones supposedly coming after the apostles, that would provide the connection with Rome. The *Ante-Nicene Fathers*, the men whose writings would lead up to the Council of Nicaea, 325 A.D., would be the ones to supply the main source of information. It is their writings that provide much of what is known today. They would promote an allegiance to the "fourth beast" described in the book of Daniel. Promoting Rome as the one universal church to be followed would come

as early as the second century. This beast is unique. The book of Revelation records the same beast as making a comeback, and dominating in the last days.

Warnings of False Teachers in the Church

When it comes to the bible and the first century, men wrote as they were moved by the Spirit: "For the prophecy came not in old time by the will of man: but holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost" (2 Peter 1:21). It is extremely interesting that Peter followed up this truth with the warning of false teachers. He wrote, "But there were false prophets also among the people, even as there shall be *false teachers among you*, who privily shall bring in damnable heresies, even denying the Lord that bought them, and bring upon themselves swift destruction" (2 Peter 2:1).

The teaching that men inside the Christian Church would privately or secretly bring in such false doctrine is unavoidable information. Peter's instructions were not for some far off distant future, but for the church communities directly related to the apostles in the first century. Peter's second epistle is believed to have been written at around 66 A.D. Was the Apostle Peter the only one to mention such a secret betrayal of the gospel coming from within the communities of believers? Several apostles would reveal the same exact information.

The Apostle Paul wrote, "For I know this, that after my departing shall grievous wolves enter in among you, not sparing the flock.' 'Also of *your own selves* shall men arise, speaking perverse things, to draw away disciples after them" (Acts 20:29-30). Paul's departure was at Rome in 67 A.D.

When the writing of Jude comes around (67-68 A.D.), evil men were already in the church (verse 4). Jude expressed this in the present tense: "For there are certain ***men crept in unawares***, who were before of old ordained to this condemnation, ungodly men, turning the grace of our God into lasciviousness, and ***denying the only Lord God***, and our Lord Jesus Christ." This was a denial that the Son was and is the true image of the invisible God (Col 1:15).

To deny the only Lord God is exactly what happened with the infiltration of evil men. This is incredible information that does not appear in today's historical and theological books that defend the Trinity. The issue of the sole nature of God and Christ would be attacked from the very beginning. Most *bible commentaries* agree that this verse, in any way you look at it, is referring either to God as one, or Jesus Christ as the only Sovereign Ruler or Lord. All bible manuscripts support the notion that ***one only Sovereign*** is intended. Jude was strongly affirming that Jesus Christ is the only God.

Understanding the meaning of *monon* or *monos* for the word ***only*** is crucial. If Jesus Christ is the only Sovereign Ruler or God as some versions allude to, then teaching that Christ is anything less is a major mistake. Other verses with a similar statement include Titus 2:13, Revelation 1:8, 19:17, 21:7, 1 Timothy 1:17, 6:15, and Jude 25. Jude ends his letter with, "To the only wise God our Saviour, be glory and majesty, dominion and power, both now and ever. Amen" (Jude 25). Is there historical evidence that proves that men would assert that God was more than one being or person? The answer to this is yes. M.M. Arnold wrote, "St. Jude saw the early ROOTS of CATHOLICISM!"¹

Major Mistakes

The epistle writings of the Apostle John record how Christians were being cast out of church. John wrote, "Wherefore, if I come, I will remember his deeds which he doeth, prating against us with malicious words: and not content therewith, neither doth he himself receive the brethren, and forbiddeth them that would, and casteth them out of the church" (3 John 10). The practice of taking advantage or control over the members of the church is recorded in Revelation, chapters 2 and 3. These were men of extreme arrogance that would impose their will, or control over the people.

The name *Nicolaitans* (Nico-laitans) describes a group of men who would come into the church as Christians. They would attempt to come in as early as the church of Ephesus, but would not succeed until the church of Pergamos. See Revelation, chapter 2. They would assume a major role in the suppression and governing of the people (laity). Along with the doctrine of Balaam, they would contaminate the church with sins such as idolatry and fornication. Some well known historians point to one of "the original seven deacons" as having formed this group that infiltrated the church. They point to this Nicolas, the proselyte of Antioch, as being responsible. It must be mentioned that not all theologians and historians believe this.

Indeed, as research indicates, *Antioch* would be one of the main places where false doctrine in the guise of Christianity would appear for the first time. First century spurious documents claiming to have been written by the apostles, would also describe a similar group of people with their own traditions, claiming to be part of the New Testament Christian Church. These *Apocrypha writings* believed to have

appeared sometime after the book of Matthew, would indeed present a different gospel than what had already been received by the earliest Christians.

The messages to the seven churches of Revelation are a direct disclosure to what really started happening in the last part of the first century. It was made known to the Apostle John that false doctrine would come into many of the church communities. Chapters 2 and 3 of Revelation mention: "the Doctrine of the Nicolaitans," "Non-Jews, as the Synagogue of Satan," "Dwelling where Satan's Seat is." There is mention of the "doctrine of Balaam, those who fornicate and sacrifice unto idols," and the "teaching and seducing from the wicked Jezebel." See (I Kings 11:33, and I Kings 16:31) for ***Goddess worship***. Most religious historians, for some strange reason, leave out the connection with this most horrific of pagan practices.

These pagan doctrines and sins coming into the church communities are never really examined by theologians that teach a limited history of the Trinity. ***Satan's Seat*** is never explained or discussed. Was there ever a time when Satan controlled a certain region, and did that region include social and religious control? History reveals that it did happen! Rome was the place! This ruling controlling power would be seen infiltrating and invading from the first, second, and third centuries. It would completely dominate in the fourth and fifth. It is agreed, as stated by Tim LaHaye, "We have already seen the evil nature of this city where Satan made his headquarters." "This headquarter was moved to Rome near the close of the first century."²

Needless to say, the condition of the church towards the end of the first century was intense. There was no smooth

Major Mistakes

transition between the apostles and those who followed after. The Church was under physical and spiritual attack. This included the false teachings and practices that deeply affected some of its members. Persecution was ever constant. If there is anything that exposes Satan's activity, it is the killing of true Christians. "The thief cometh not, but for to steal, and to kill, and to destroy" (John 10:10). According to scripture, the first thing that the thief (Satan) steals, is the logos or **Word of God**. See the parable of the sower (Mark 4:15).

What was the historical significance of such doctrines? What has happened since? Where are the records of such things? Has there been a cover-up of false teachers that came right after the death of the apostles? The answer to the last question is yes. Can the Nicolaitans and their doctrine be identified or compared with modern churches? Definitely. Is there any modern doctrine that identifies with pagan goddess worship? The answer is in the affirmative. Key words to better understand those teachers that came and infiltrated the earliest communities are "false apostles, Jewish imitators, persecutors, lovers of money, fornicators, idol worshippers, spiritually blind, and promoters of false gods and goddesses.

The corrupt fruit of Satan's Seat should have never been ignored by Trinitarian historians and theologians! This precise information was so important it was placed in the beginning chapters of the book of Revelation (2 and 3). The Lord warned about this infiltration! Yet, when a person picks up a book that defends the historical origin of the Trinity doctrine, the data on Satan's Seat in the first four centuries is never disclosed. Revelation 2:9 points to a group of "Jewish imitators" as the "synagogue of Satan." Most commentators claim that Jesus was alluding to his own people, the Jewish

nation. Wrong! The Lord was referring to a group of people operating within Satan's Seat. They were Roman!

There are far too many historical implications as to why it could not be natural Jews that Jesus refers to. Some have used this false conclusion to hate and persecute these particular people of the Old Testament. Besides, the word synagogue can also mean church. It was false teachers that silently came into the New Testament Church that is now a determining factor in what some churches believe today. The best theological books written are not free from this blunder. It is because of this infiltration of false teachers that believers today must research and sort out which doctrines are really coming from God. All churches and their leaders are obligated to do this!

Consistently throughout the past, theologians without this knowledge, have misrepresented certain post-apostolic men as having the same teachings as those of the early believers. Never do they explain what was really happening inside the church. No mention is ever made of controlling leaders, secret fornicators, and the practice of *idolatry* inside the fellowship of believers. Neither do they identify these men as building up the Roman empire, the fourth kingdom described by Daniel, as the most terrible beast of all. Prophecy dictates that the final battle involves the rise of a spiritual Roman Empire.

They instead claim a sort of apostolic succession that is never mentioned in the bible. All threats against Christianity such as the earliest *Gnosticism*, are placed on the outside as wanting to come into the church. The real evidence places Gnosticism inside many of these churches. They claim to be defenders of the faith, while at the same time denying the most

important tenets of that faith. These Trinitarian Thinkers never expose the Ante-Nicene Fathers for who they were. They were ***Christian philosophers*** who disregarded the simple words of Christ. They built upon a wrong or false foundation. The evidence will be revealed from their writings!

It is of special interest that the mention of Catholic popes and bishops starts immediately after both apostles, Paul and Peter were martyred. It is believed that the Apostle John lived up until 100 A.D. So clearly, the apostle was around when these men of a special tradition came into office in A.D. 67. John never extols or praises any of these special bishops, the priesthood, or the importance of the church of Rome. His letters date from 90 to 95 A.D. There is no mention of the apostles Peter and Paul, as organizing a special priesthood at Rome. There is certainly no mention of such men as "Linus," "Anacletus," "Clement," or "Evaristus," who according to the pope's of Rome, had already been in office. See list of popes, the New American Bible.³

The only thing that John mentions about his days is that there were many ***antichrists***: "Little children, it is the last time: and as ye have heard that antichrist shall come, even now are there many antichrists; whereby we know that it is the last time" (1 John 2:18). What does he mean by "antichrists?" He alludes in the following verse (19) that a certain group would take a place along with the early church: "They went out from us, but they were not of us; for if they had been of us, they would no doubt have continued with us: but they went out, that they might be made manifest that they were not all of us" (1 John 2:19). This is a revealing of a different church! Certain men that had started among the church communities of that time, were now separated.

John was alluding to "antichrist" as being against Christ by taking the place of Christ. It would be a clever substitution for the only true church of the New Testament. The Christian communities would now be divided as to what the Church believed and practiced. Again, John wrote, "Beloved, believe not every spirit, but try the spirits whether they are of God: because many false prophets are gone out into the world" (1 John 4:1). One can see from what has been mentioned, that there would be a real danger to the Christian churches. There was a category of men that did not follow the exact teachings of Christ. They would claim to be Christian, but not be true to the teachings of the gospel.

The authentic Church which consists of many church communities was now being called upon to discern all who spoke for God. It would not be enough to say that a person is Christian. More so, for those who professed to be leaders in the church, discernment and observance of their fruit would be a requirement. Jesus himself had warned, "Wherefore by their fruits ye shall know them" (Matt 7:20). He also said, "Beware of false prophets, which come to you in sheep's clothing, but inwardly they are ravening wolves" (Matt 7:15). Peter wrote, "Which have forsaken the right way, and are gone astray, following the way of Balaam the son of Bosor, who loved the wages of unrighteousness" (2 Peter 2:15). The love of money is still the root of all evil!

The Logos Protects Against Error

The Lord's people must instruct in righteousness, and this only by preaching and teaching *the logos of God*. Logos is the most common Greek word for *word*. This is the word used

Major Mistakes

to mean common usage of expression, act of speech, or utterance. It is incredible, that certain men that came into the Church would incorrectly interpret *logos* to also mean the divine pre-existence of *the second person* of the Trinity. These men would argue that the *logos* was not the spoken word. See **1.62** of the Ante-Nicene Fathers.⁴ There is no justification for this second definition. It is not consistent with the way *logos* is used throughout the New Testament. The number **3056** for *logos* is found in Strong's Greek Concordance.⁵

Jesus Christ instructed his followers as to the truth of Judgment Day: "He that rejecteth me, and receiveth not my words, hath one that judgeth him: *the word that I have spoken* (#3056), the same shall judge him in the last day" (John 12:48). If Christ is the preexistent *logos*, why does he speak of another? The bible points to the eternal word: "Being born again, not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, by the word of God (#3056), which liveth and abideth for ever" (1 Peter 1:23). Notice that the *logos* of God abideth forever. The word of the Lord endureth forever (1 Pe 1:25). This is what **John 1:1** was referring to as in the beginning. There is no Strong's Greek Concordance number or alternative definition of the word "*logos*" that means a second divine person. This was a second century hoax that was initiated by first century infiltrators.

At the beginning of this segment, "the warnings of false teachers in the church," Paul was quoted as alluding to "grievous wolves." These wolves, according to Paul, were not all coming from the outside. Some, he clearly stated, "would arise" from among the actual believers themselves. This is almost impossible to accept. How could disciples of Christ within the church, turn against the very gospel that placed

them there in the first place? It is called "the Judas Syndrome." It is the enemy's placing of *tares with the wheat* (Mat 13:28). It is Satan's activity of the endtimes. Incidentally, the ancient symbol of Rome was the wolf. Rome's foundation began *when two human infants were nursed by a she wolf*. See *Lupa Capitolina*.

Infiltration

Acronym: PIC

Now when one studies, for example, a certain *Ignatius of Antioch*, who was placed in office immediately after Paul was martyred in A.D. 67, it is clear to see that he was a breed of a different kind. It was Ignatius who first wrote that *the logos was not the spoken word*. **1.62**. Instead he introduced the begotten God or God the Word. **1.61, 1.82**. He combined John 1:1 with Proverbs 8:22 to explain that "word and wisdom" was a divine being created before the world. **1.108**. As noted in a commentary on Ignatius, "Rather different is the problem of the relation between Ignatius and Hellenistic Judaism.' 'Parallels involving Philo, Josephus, and others are frequently noted in the commentary.' 'Philo, of course, is particularly well represented."⁶

Who was this *Philo* that was so well represented in Ignatius' writings? See chapter two for further explanation. Sufficient to state here that this famous Philo of the first century, was instrumental in teaching the Greek Logos as opposed to the Jewish Old Testament "Memra." His *combined Divine Wisdom with Logos* teaching gave the Gnostics and those who practiced the Kabbalah, a similar connection. This same Wisdom/Logos application would show up in the writings of the Ante-Nicene Fathers.⁷ It is because of this

Major Mistakes

allegorical application, that the Apostolic and Ante-Nicene Fathers would come to believe that the "Son" was God the Word. See "The Works of Philo."⁸

Ignatius was the first to write and make mention of the ***Catholic Church*** before his death in 107 A.D. **1.39, 1.41, 1.90**. This makes Ignatius one of the earliest Catholics in history. According to scripture, it was the church of Antioch, where believers were first referred to as Christians, not Catholics (Acts 11:26). This is an extremely important point! His multiple letters to the Ephesians, Magnesians, Romans, Philadelphians, Smyrneans, etc., were written in the first part of the second century, right before his supposed martyrdom in the city of Rome.

He was the first in the writings of the Ante-Nicene Fathers to proclaim Mary as the virgin, even after she had given birth to the Messiah. **1.57**. This doctrine is known as ***perpetual virginity***. The Catholic teaching and belief in perpetual virginity would bring about a most idolatrous view of Mary. There is no such theology in all of scripture! This idea would not be rejected by any of the Ante-Nicene Fathers, but as history shows, would go on to make Mary much more than the simple handmaiden of the Lord. She would eventually become the ***Mother of God***, well-matched with the doctrines of ***Ancient Babylon***. See the fascinating book, "The Two Babylons."⁹

It is unbelievable that these anti-biblical doctrines have been overlooked for so many centuries. They made void the commandment of God by keeping their tradition (Mt 15:6). True bible believing Christians must be aware of the facts surrounding the development of a counter movement that would usher in many anti-biblical doctrines that had nothing to

do with the New Testament Believer. This is an extremely important point that indicates a separate group. Ignatius confirms this by stating of Mary, "She is the lady of our new religion." **1.124**. This bishop knew that his views were quite different than what was previously taught. It really was a *New Religion!*

He taught the modern view of Catholics as pertains to the *Eucharist*, **1.89**. Ignatius' view of the Eucharist is still rejected to this day by most modern Protestants. The literal transformation of the bread and wine to that of the body and blood of Christ was the application given by this so-called apostolic father. The *authority of a single bishop* as to that of Christ, gave way to a "new hierarchy" or order of ministry. **1.61, 1.83, 1.89, 1.90**. It was completely distinct from that of the early church. The bishop should be looked upon, according to Ignatius, as Christ himself.

He makes another surprising and interesting statement: "and the presbyters are the Sanhedrim of God, and assembly of the apostles of Christ. **1.67**. He then remarks, "Apart from these there is no elect Church." So from the beginning Ignatius insinuated that the Catholic Church was supreme. By referring to her bishops as the *Sanhedrim of God*, Ignatius was alluding to the *Jewish system* of 70 members who made up the Supreme Council. This explains why the Catholic Church started presiding over all ecclesiastical matters. They were imitating the highest court of the Jewish nation. The first Christians certainly knew nothing of monks, priests, cardinals, popes, and councils. These different types of ministries would eventually replace the biblical ones of Ephesians 4:11.

The ministries mentioned in Ephesians 4:11, those of the apostle, the prophet, the evangelist, pastor, and teacher are

exclusively from the New Testament. The list does not include the supreme council or Jewish Sanhedrim that included 24 priests, 24 elders, and 22 scribes. This was a judicial court that presided over all religious and political matters. The *apostle* instead, was called upon to lay the correct foundation of the church. This means that anyone who would lay a different foundation other than that of the apostles, is false. Knowing this information, the question should be asked, "Why would God-fearing, bible believing Christians even consider the non-biblical writings of Ignatius of Antioch?"

Ignatius' view of *water baptism* was a clear break from the New Testament writers and the original practice of the first century believers. He wrote, "Not unto one person having three names, nor into three persons that became incarnate, but into three possessed of equal honour" **1.116**. This bishop was promoting the idea that *God was three equal persons*. His error on baptism came because of his misuse of one single verse that was interpreted incorrectly to support his own views. He completely ignored the exaltation of the "Name of Jesus." See Philippians 2:9. It is a name above every other name! He rejected baptism as it truly is being buried with Christ (Rom 6:3, 4). His idea of God revealed a polytheistic mindset.

The error of using Matthew 28:19 alone as proof is called *C.O.S.A.* or *the Classical One Scripture Application*. This is the opposite of having multiple scriptures as proof, or that "Scripture interprets Scripture." The second century would see the start of a different and alternative gospel, one that would promote more than the one God of the bible. Ignatius' explanation of baptism into three "Persons" of equal honor, was not original. This was an allegorical (personified)

concept that was previously mentioned by Philo of Alexandria in several of his books. Philo actually used the word **Person** to describe God with his two equal and distinct beings.¹⁰

Clement of Rome (88-97) is mentioned as one of the earliest Apostolic Fathers. Rome claims him as one of their very **first popes**. Ignatius includes him in his list with Timothy, along with Linus, and Anencletus, as disciples of the apostles, Paul and Peter. **1.69**. According to Rome's list of popes, it would be Paul's disciple, **Linus**, who would be the first pope after Peter (67-76). The majority of scholars today, including Catholic ones, admit that this is a **forgery** or fabrication. See Hans Kung, and his "Short History of the Catholic Church."¹¹ Clement of Rome, according to these same writers (Ignatius, Irenaeus, Eusebius) would take over the bishopric of Rome sometime after *Anencletus*.

When it comes to Clement's first "Epistle to the Corinthians," Trinitarians have never revealed this bishop's biggest blunder. When most religious historians write about Clement, he is usually portrayed as a writer whose letter is closest to the actual writings of the New Testament. This is incorrect. His letter erroneously includes the subtle use of "mythology" which corresponds to his explanation of the "five hundred year life" of the **Phoenix Bird**. **1.12**. The Apostle Paul warned that a time would come when they would not endure sound doctrine: "And they shall turn away their ears from the truth, and shall be turned unto fables" (2 Tim 4:4).

Clement makes use of the Apocrypha **book of Judith**. **1.20**. This is something that is never mentioned by Trinitarian thinkers. Do biblical Christians quote from the Apocrypha? The answer is absolutely not. Clement's use of this material reveals him as a member of the Alexandrian "Hellenizing

Jews."¹² This was the group largely responsible for the false books of the Apocrypha. The bishop seems to be aware of such documents when he mentions the apostles receiving "their orders" and that being assured by the resurrection of Christ, they went "preaching through countries and cities."
1.16. Where did Clement get this information?

The main part of Clement's message was *apostolic succession*. It prepared the way for a selected order of bishops and *priests*. **1.17.** This was done, incredibly, by imitating the office of the Old Testament Priesthood and bringing this past dispensation into the New Testament church communities. Anencletus, prior to Clement, was known historically for ordaining priests and establishing 25 parishes.¹³ Where did Anencletus get the idea to ordain priests? This was a severe contradiction to the New Testament. Did not Christ ascend to heaven to give out gifts unto men such as the "apostle, prophet, evangelist, pastor, and teacher? Absolutely. These men were actually going against the ministries of Christ.

To promote the false priesthood of Rome, an ancient Syriac document would make its appearance. The title of this unsuspected forgery was *The Teaching of the Apostles*. It would promote the lie that an *invisible* Jesus Christ appeared to his disciples, and by laying hands on the eleven, would ordain them to the priesthood. **8.667.** According to this early church writing, the Old Testament *priesthood of Moses and Aaron* was conferred on the apostles. The priests who received their "orders" would then proceed to go out and preach in several countries. This is going backwards in dispensation and completely opposed to New Testament *Grace*.

The mysterious *Teaching of the Apostles* promoted the lie that the Apostle Peter was an ordained priest and also the

founder of the church of Rome: "The city of Rome, and all Italy, and Spain, and Britain, and Gaul, together with all the rest of the countries round about them, received the apostles' ordination to the priesthood from Simon Cephas, who went up from Antioch; and he was ruler and guide there, in the church which he had built there, and in the places round about it."

8.671. The Catholic priesthood to this day, is founded on this premise. There are far too many biblical and historical contradictions that make this letter a forged document.

PREVIEW

The Trinity doctrine did not come by itself. It came with *a cluster of false teaching*. Those men were not introducing what they thought to be a mystery or a revelation. They were asserting and changing the doctrines of the early church. These were not simple mistakes, but a well devised agenda that conflicted with that of the earliest followers of Christ. Revelation 2 and 3 would be extremely accurate in the revealing of infiltrators and idolaters within the first church communities. The producing of forgeries (Apocrypha) has a long history that began alongside of the Old Testament Greek translation of the Hebrew Scriptures. With the coming of the New Testament, forgeries would increase and multiply to deceive a greater number of people.

Religious men who professed to being true disciples would continue promoting the idea that God was not alone at creation. By borrowing from the concepts coming from Plato, the Stoics, and the already mentioned first century *Jewish philosopher, Philo of Alexandria*, these special bishops would build on Ignatius' doctrines. These included the teaching of the

"the Virgin Mother," "the Eucharist," "the Sovereign Bishop," "hierarchy of the universal church," the "Begotten God, who is wisdom (Sophia), word (logos), and God also acknowledged as "God in three Persons" in water baptism.

Not one of these teachings was derived from the bible. At first glance they appear biblical, but with careful scrutiny, they are found to be far-off from gospel truth. ***Technically, Ignatius of Antioch was the first to bring the concept of a trinity*** into the church communities of his time. So many modern religious authors and writers have missed this point! Although most historians, Catholic and Non-Catholic, refer to Ignatius as a faithful martyr for Christ, it is Ignatius' letters that expose his departure from biblical faith and the eventual forming of a new religion.

Correlating the works of the first century Philo of Alexandria, with those of the Ante-Nicene Fathers would reveal the truth as to this specific doctrine of God. To remain untouched for centuries, past and now modern theologians place Philo as far away from the church fathers as is humanly possible. Most books that defend the Trinity either deny or omit any connections between Philo's allegorical idea of the Greek logos, and that of the Ante-Nicene Fathers. Like a "crooked cop" alone in a crime scene, they have corrupted the evidence and have prevented millions from discovering the philosophical origin and most anti-biblical position that most modern churches mistakenly hold as the gospel truth. Only through the help of God could such trickery be exposed.

Chapter two is extremely important in the history or origin of the doctrine of the Trinity. Ignatius who lived well into the second century, as mentioned previously, brought in the concept of a baptism in three Persons. His disclosure did

not fully reveal how he came to believe in such a teaching. The connection with Philo is unquestionable since it was this Jewish Greek philosopher who first came up with God as three beings, persons, or Creators. His livelihood was in the first century, right along the time of the early church. None of the faithful disciples of Christ, including the main apostles, ever considered Philo's allegorical method. This was and is pagan philosophy at its best! His language or interpretation of scripture did not appear with the writings of the apostles, because Philo was never a Christian.

It must be clearly understood that prior to the second century, no such strange views were even considered among the church communities. It took a special type of men to apply such notions to the true and exclusive gospel of Jesus Christ. It would be men who were not in line with the apostles. Men who were following their own traditions instead of those of the apostolic church. Ignatius took Philo's previous hidden allegorical interpretations and applied them as his very own. Certain writers would further those ideas. They would borrow from Ignatius and Philo in their reasoning of God. The logos would be given a new meaning. Now certain individuals would teach that this logos was a divine being separate from the Father of creation.

It would be the latter part of the second century (180 A.D.) that another of *the bishops of Antioch* (Theophilus) would be noted as first using in his writings, the non-biblical term expressed as *the Trinity*. Theophilus would also make use of the allegorical "word and wisdom" in order to arrive at his conclusions of a Triune Being. Philo of Alexandria was the first to write that the three days before the sun were types of God and his two equal powers.¹⁴ Theophilus would connect

Major Mistakes

with Philo by teaching the very same idea. **2.101**. This was and is a strong contradiction to the words of Almighty God.

*Ye are my witnesses, saith the Lord, and my servant whom I have chosen: that ye may know and believe me, and **understand that I am he:** before me there was no God formed, **neither shall there be after me.** I, even I, am the Lord; and beside me there is no saviour. Isa 43:10-11*

In modern times, it is admitted that the word "Trinity" is not found anywhere in the entire bible. Trinitarian Thinkers defend this point by simply stating that while the word is not found in scripture, the concept of said doctrine is. So from the beginning, the word Trinity is not given any importance by these sneaky defenders. How interesting to find out that by reexamining the words "Trinity" and "Persons," the world would finally learn the entire truth. The second century would disclose exactly who these men were and how they went about presenting their philosophical ideas. ***Indeed, the true history of the Trinity reveals its falseness!***

Chapter 2

Second Century

Greek Philosophy Mingles With Christianity 100-200 A.D.

What really happened after the death of the apostles of Jesus Christ? In the last chapter it was revealed how the first century Christians were dealing with false doctrines, false leaders within the church, and much persecution. This might be shocking information for those who have been told otherwise! It was mentioned previously that the Apostle John died at Ephesus in 100 A.D., but not before presenting the "Book of Revelation" as the final book of the New Testament. This would be a "slap to the face" to those disobedient men who through secret agenda and forged documents would seek to change the everlasting gospel of our Lord.

Who were these evil and insubordinate men? In the first chapter of this book these verses were provided: 2 Peter 2:1, Acts 20:29, 30, and Jude 4. According to Jude, the reason to contend for the faith was because "there are certain *men crept in unawares*, who were before of old ordained to this condemnation, ungodly men, *turning the grace* of our God into lasciviousness, and *denying the only Lord God*, and our Lord Jesus Christ." According to Peter, Paul, and Jude who wrote to the churches of the New Testament, these were the identifying characteristics of these false brethren:

1. They would bring heresies (other teachings).
2. They would disobey the Lord.

Major Mistakes

3. They would hurt the believers.
4. They would twist the scriptures.
5. They would be ungodly, or without fear of God.
6. They would teach and practice a false grace.
7. They would deny the only Lord God.

Biblical followers of Christ and their congregations as is expected, would continue to uphold the faith once delivered to the saints (Jude 3). This was done in the face of religious men who did not practice completely or in part, the true gospel message of Jesus Christ. For biblical Christians, their faith would stand on ***apostolic doctrine***, and nothing more. This is how the early church began: "And they continued stedfastly in the apostles' doctrine and fellowship, and in breaking of bread, and in prayers" (Acts 2:42). Now with Revelation 22:18, 19, this is how the early church would be guaranteed to continue:

For I testify unto every man that heareth the words of the prophecy of this book, If any man shall add unto these things, God shall add unto him the plagues that are written in this book: And if any man shall take away from the words of the book of this prophecy, God shall take away his part out of the book of life, and out of the holy city, and from the things which are written in this book (Rev 22:18-19).

Previously, it was mentioned how the prophetic book of Revelation described the infiltration of certain men within the church. Historically, two such men among many, were Ignatius of Antioch and Clement of Rome. Close inspection of their letters reveal a strong connection with a false grace and a denial of the only Lord God of the Jewish people. A false

grace because they resorted back to the O.T. Moses/Aaron priesthood. They would deny the only Lord God because they introduced a different "logos" that would perceive God as a plurality of Persons.

Ignatius and Clement, unlike the true apostles, were bringing in a different gospel than the one already given by Christ and his faithful followers. This can readily be seen when comparison is made between the writings of the apostles, and those who claimed a false apostolic authority. **1.61, 1.67.** Differences in the most fundamental of doctrines can be seen with these men. Teachings such as: Apostolic Succession, Ordained Priests, the Eucharist, Three Persons Baptism, the Phoenix Bird, use of the Apocrypha, and the Virgin Mother would within time change the simple message of the gospel. It would give the world a "universal" religion.

Apostolic Forgeries

The activity of spreading many false books or forgeries during the second century, as predicted by the Lord, would reveal exactly the type of men that the gospel warned about. Paul wrote "But though we, or an angel from heaven, preach any other gospel unto you than that which we have preached unto you, let him be accursed" (Gal 1:8). Any other gospel than the original one would contribute to another form of Christianity unlike that of the biblical one. False books such as "the Pseudo-Gospel of Matthew, Gospel of Thomas, Infancy Gospel of Thomas, the Gospel of Peter, Acts of Peter, Proto-Gospel of James, the Secret Book of John, the Shepherd of

Hermas, Origin of the World, and many more, would circulate among the early Christian communities.¹

Regardless of what some Trinitarians are saying these days, these were not harmless or innocent books! There are many Church leaders who will give an account on "Judgment Day" for presenting these and other Apocryphal writings as "pure and healthy" early church representations. See chapter six. There are certain Christian denominational leaders who are comparing these books to modern Christian books. This is the furthest thing from reality! Christian books are not saying that they were written by the apostles! The end of chapter five provides a snapshot of the main content of these dangerous forgeries.

The multiple letters of Ignatius would be no exception. His writings, similar to Clement's letter to the Corinthians, laid claim to a sort of apostolic succession, but in the process, revealed much error in doctrine. It is amazing that the majority of *Apocrypha books* written in the second century reflect the very ideas that Ignatius, Clement, and others were promoting among Christian circles. What became of the teaching of the "Virgin Mother" as presented by Ignatius? The Proto-Gospel of James for example, taught that a certain woman by the name of Salome made a "finger inspection" of the mother of Jesus to verify whether she was still a virgin. The book claims that Salome affirmed it!² See also Ante-Nicene Fathers **8.365**.

Where did all of this take place? According to this false gospel, Mary and the mid-wife, along with Salome were inside a cave. Joseph was asked by the mid-wife, "Is she not your wife?" To which incredibly, he replied that she was not! What on earth is going on here? This is a fabrication of biblical truth. These were tenacious lies to confirm previous

teachings brought into the church by certain men. In this particular case, it was Ignatius, the bishop of Antioch. Rome still promotes this fictitious event in modern times by placing a statue of Mary within a cave.

One of the first non-biblical books, the *Didache* called the "teaching of the twelve" appears in circulation at about 80-120 A.D. Where did this book come from? Many historians assess that it either came from Alexandria, Egypt or Antioch. Since the churches of that time were separated into many church communities, and the true apostles had since died, there was little that could be done to confront such false teachings. While faithful Christians held exclusively to the writings of the apostles, others now accepted different writings that appeared to be apostolic. The *Didache* taught among other things, pouring water on a candidate to be baptized. The *triune formula* used would again connect directly with that of Ignatius of Antioch. **7.379**.

Not only was their content spurious, but the unknown authors were pretending to be the apostles that had died in the first century. These works carry the name of one specific apostle, or all of the apostles combined. Known as members of the Apocrypha, these lost books were written by unknown authors who deceitfully presented pagan traditions, mythical, and philosophical notions in the name of the true apostles. The content of these books would adhere to Alexandrian doctrine, fables, myths, and Gnostic practices that would eventually become *Roman Catholic beliefs*. There are still a good amount of these forgeries that are accessible today. This is why Rome to this day, defends these books. There are Christians that see no danger in the use of such material. Some

Major Mistakes

are quoted in chapter six under the title of "Modern Trinitarian Thinkers."

The Didache was one such book. It was and is a forgery. It was never written by the apostles. The teachings that made up this manual of religious instruction did not conform to biblical standards. That is why this book was never included into the canon of the bible. The Didache reveals a group of people who were following their own traditions apart from biblical revelation. This group held certain practices that were different than the biblical ones held in scripture. It even warns its leaders not to engage in "pederasty," sexual relations between a man and a boy. **7.377**. This would prove to be a major problem for this group since the beginning.

The *Epistle of Barnabas* already mentioned, made its appearance in and about 100-130 A.D. This book was not written by Barnabas, but by an unknown individual. The doctrines revealed in this forged writing are compatible with those teachings that were coming from Alexandria, Egypt, the second province of the Roman government. This was the place where the best schools of philosophy had enjoyed their existence and dominance. This was the home of the first century *Philo of Alexandria*, "the greatest Jewish theologian and philosopher to develop the biblical teachings concerning Sophia ..."³ According to Philo Judaeus, Sophia (wisdom) existed alongside of God. She was an intermediate being between God and the world.

This would be the same Philo that the Catholic Church would later allude to as meeting the Apostle Peter in Rome. Present day Catholics also claim that from no one else but Philo could the teaching of the Word or "Logos" be so well represented. In other words, the Roman Church readily admits

to following the Greek Logos (or Wisdom) that was promoted and expanded by the most influential Jewish philosopher of his time. The evidence is there for the wise to behold. This is the same Philo that at the same time, has been rejected by well respected theologians as having anything to do with the Trinity. How embarrassing!

Alexandrian Philosophy

Second century Egypt would also be known for its Gnostic Christianity, especially that of *Valentinus*. How close was this Gnosticism to some of the developing church communities of this era? Several sources reveal that this same Valentinus would have been a bishop (pope) of Rome, if not for the lack of a few decisive votes.⁴ The influence exerted by Alexandria on Rome cannot be underestimated. The teaching of divine wisdom or *Sophia* as a member of the Godhead would be instrumental in the doctrines of that time. Hoeller explains in his book, "The concept of the Trinity is thus clearly present in this early Gnostic myth."⁵

Some within the Jewish community of Alexandria practiced the beginnings of the *Kabbalah* due to the mystical beliefs acquired from *Babylon* during their historical captivity. Jewish history reveals that there was a time when their people were taken captive by the armies of Babylon. The book of Daniel records this important event. It is also significant information that Philo of Alexandria's teaching of God, the Logos and Wisdom is identical to the Kabbalah's "En-Soph and Sephiroth." See "Life and Times of Jesus, the Messiah" by Alfred Edersheim.⁶ It was this formula that would influence

not only those who practiced the Kabbalah, but the Gnostics, and of course, the Anti-Nicene Fathers.⁷

Faith in the bible alone exclusively cancels out any pagan belief held previously by Non-Christians. An important point that stands out about the earliest of these times, is that there was a general worldwide belief in a trinity of gods. The bible makes mention of "Baal, Astarte, and Tammuz" as the downfall of many Jews. See the story of Jezebel (1Kings 16:31). She was the pagan high priestess of these gods (and goddess). Also important is the fact that this same trinity brought the world the worship of the "Mother and her Son." The Old Testament mentions this mother as *the Queen of Heaven*. See Jeremiah 7:18 and 44:17. Contrary to popular belief, this idolatrous practice was an abomination to God. It is a serious contradiction to the gospel.

The trinity of "Isis, Osiris, and Horus" was first spread throughout Egypt. This mixed concept of three divine entities, remarkably, did not get its origin from this particular location. History has it that *Babylon* was the first place where the trinity of "Semiramis, Nimrod, and Ninus" was introduced, better known as the Father, the Mother, and the Son. It made a transition throughout the world taking on different names, including the "Sun, Moon, and Stars." Even India with its millions of gods, would not be spared from believing in the three combined gods of the "Trimurti."

Pagan Rome and its national creed of *Stoic Philosophy* would be no stranger to this concept either. Along with its pantheon of gods, the trinity of "Jupiter, Juno, and Minerva" would be noted as having a special place. Why would it be any surprise to understand that Catholic Rome would later adopt its Tri-unity of the "Father, Son, and Holy Spirit," with the

"Virgin Mary" assuming a special place within the Godhead? There would be no shortage of men and women within this institution who would proudly advocate Mary as the "spouse of the Holy Spirit." See the book "the True Devotion of Mary" (Montfort,).⁸ To those who understand, this is the real agenda of the Catholic Trinity.

From the many schools of Alexandria came the varied teachings of "geometry, astronomy, eclectic philosophy, etc." This type of mixture included that of Buddhism, Hinduism, and the Oriental schools of thought. Geometry would bring into view numbers and shapes, such as the famed *Babylonian triangle*. Who would foresee that this pyramid figure would prove to be the most widely used occult symbol throughout the world? After the legendary martyrdom of Mark in the 60's, Alexandria would form a different kind of Christianity. This would be a belief system that would incorporate apart from scripture, other spiritual dangers such as mysticism, and occult symbolism that would play a major part in its rituals and ceremonies.

It was a kind of *Gnostic Christianity* that "emanated" into several groups, some more vastly different than the others. From Alexandria, the secret "monastery" lifestyle of the Egyptian people would be accepted as a more dedicated spiritual movement. The Catholic Eusebius claims that it was *Philo of Alexandria* who described the beginnings of an ascetic group who lived a philosophical life separately from other religious groups. Philo in his "On a Contemplative Life" wrote that those people spent their days discussing scripture with the use of *allegory*. Eusebius himself identifying with that group, inferred through his writings, that they were not

called Christians because that name had not yet spread to all places. See "Eusebius Ecclesiastical History" by Eusebius.⁹

Neo-Platonism would be another further development from the mixture of Greek philosophy which included the teachings of Plato. Some would advocate that in order to fully understand the scriptures, a knowledge of Plato, Aristotle, and others was indispensable. This is a view that is held even to this day by Rome and other religious organizations. The triangle symbol would come to be accepted by Alexandrian and Roman Catholics, as *the main symbol of their God*. For biblical Christians, this is a major contradiction. How did the original gospel given by the apostles of our Lord Jesus Christ, come to be mixed with such delusions of men?

A New Hellenized Gospel

When Trinitarians present their history of the Trinity, they begin by stating that it was the *Apostolic Fathers* who were the ones that came after the apostles. These men are said to be direct successors to the apostles who were personally trained under them. Who were these men, really? Why would they come into the church communities with a different agenda? If they knew the apostles, why didn't they protect early church teachings? The answer is in their background. They were representatives of Rome's eclecticism. In truth their true identity has been hid from modern day Christianity. These Apostolic Fathers have been portrayed falsely as successors of the apostles of Jesus Christ. To this day, Catholics insist that these men were true disciples!

These infiltrators claimed a simple veneration of the mother of Jesus, when in fact, every single notion of goddess

and idol worship would be applied to their traditional faith. This seemingly innocent but false distinction of being a virgin after she had given birth to Christ, would within time create a most serious of abominations. While people today are blinded to that particular angelic light, God's word warns humanity that only God is to be worshipped (Ex 20:3-5). The bible states, "And no marvel; for Satan himself is transformed into an angel of light" (2 Cor 11:14). It is the enemy who desires to be worshipped the same as the Creator God. Historically, the enemy has always been worshipped as male and female divinities in all pagan religions.

True Believers, on the other hand, were insistent on keeping the gospel by rejecting all new traditions and practices that were completely unfounded in scripture. Unfortunately, for modern Christianity, books written by these great men have been destroyed. There is no trace of any writings that disapproved of a philosophical Christianity; that advocated a clear, clean, and unpolluted presentation of biblical truth. Thank God for the bible! Jesus stated, "heaven and earth will pass away, but my words will not pass away." It has always been the bible alone that has preserved *the Christian witness* throughout the centuries! True Believers can be shown to have existed in every period of history, always apart from Catholic Rome.

If one is to take note of what really happened in the second century, it would have to be the subtle corruption of Christianity by certain men through the mingling of pagan sources. Deception came through false books (forgeries) that circulated under the name or names of the apostles. Accepted by some but not all of the Christian communities, was the introducing of philosophical thought mixed with scripture.

Major Mistakes

Instead of Christians following exclusively after the teachings of the apostles, there would now be some who would advocate a reliance on Greek philosophy as a much better method to understand the bible. There is no excuse for this, Christians had the Old Testament Scriptures, and the New Testament writings of the apostles.

Clearly, there are real enemies that will stop at nothing to hinder the gospel of Jesus Christ. The earliest biblical manuscripts would be confiscated and burned at different intervals of history. While all this would be happening to the letters, books, bibles, and the memoirs of biblical Christians, others would be conserved at the same time to present a philosophical Christianity that appears to be biblical. The writings of the Ante-Nicene Fathers have been carefully set aside for all people to read, along with bible manuscripts of the Alexandrian version. One of the main arguments of today's theologians is that the bible versions, "the Vaticanus," and "Sinaiticus," are much better preserved than the "Textus Receptus."

It is an interesting fact that all of the *first century major works of Philo of Alexandria* have also been perfectly preserved by members of the Church. It would be these same writings that would influence certain men to bring in Greek philosophy along with allegorical applications of scripture. As the second century writers are examined, the role that Philo would play in their understanding of certain biblical passages is undeniable. This is *one of the best kept secrets* in the origin and later formulation of the Trinity. It wasn't just the "Logos" teaching of Philo, but his interpretation of key words and verses that were visibly used by most of the Ante-Nicene

Fathers. It only gets worse for those who have lied about Philo!

Theologians who deny Philo's influence, while Rome admits to it, are simply lying to their people. See "New Advent Catholic Encyclopedia."¹⁰ *The Christianity of Alexandria*, with its mixture of allegory and mysticism would fail to heed the warnings placed in scripture by Christ and his faithful followers. From *Antioch*, the third province of Rome, *the bishops of Antioch*, the ones coming after Ignatius, would also contribute to the changing of the original gospel. This would include Theophilus of Antioch, the first recorded user of the word *Trinity*. Researching Theophilus' background reveals his prior involvement in Stoic philosophy.

The main *province of Rome* in providing a well defined ecclesiastical system, would see a group of Jewish imitators or none Jews with a different kind of religion, unlike that of the Christian Church communities. It would proudly claim to be the one and only church founded by Christ. Yet, it would be vastly different with its hierarchy of priests ruling over entire churches. While many thought they were receiving the authentic gospel of Jesus Christ, they were accepting men whose conscience was seared with a hot iron, and that spoke lies in hypocrisy (1 Tim 4:2). The Apostle Paul warned that taking heed to one's spiritual life and continuing in true apostolic doctrine would protect against this error (1 Tim 4:16).

Some historians claim that as early as 127 A.D., some of these changes could already be seen. They write that there is an unaccounted space of sixty years between the death of the apostles and the forming of an exclusive ecclesiastical system. These same historians overlook the fact that Catholic

Major Mistakes

Ignatius and his followers were promoting these changes. His influence greatly contributed to the unaccounted sixty years of unbiblical innovations within the church. His ideas, similar to the Nicolaitans, brought a clear division between the clergy and the laity. His willingness to teach and believe apart from Holy Scripture cannot be denied.

The second century writers were a different breed of Christian, they were Christian philosophers. This would open the door to the beginnings of a *Hellenized gospel*. They believed, as revealed in their personal archives, that there was "some truth in pagan thinkers." They were a product of their time. Rome for centuries had held Stoic philosophy as its highest representation. Even some of her emperors were noted philosophers. See *Marcus Aurelius*. These were the type of men that came into the Christian communities. Their writings reflect this very thing. For hundreds of years, Trinitarian Theologians (Catholic or Protestant) have withheld this vital information not only from the world, but from their own people.

Within the second century, other writings available today, are those of such men as *Justin Martyr*, *Irenaeus*, and *Theophilus of Antioch*. Even some of the writings of the Gnostics, such as those of Valentinus (died in Rome about 160 A.D.) can be acquired presently. See "Dead Sea Scrolls." The following information, similar to Ignatius and Clement of the first century, will reveal how the first writers of Catholicism took pagan philosophical ideas and mixed these with the bible. They were never really biblical Christians. Just ahead is the revealing fact of how the Trinity was formulated and proclaimed. Much data on these men has been intentionally omitted so as to bring special attention to the Trinity.

Christian Philosophers and Deception

Acronym: JIT

In today's society, Catholic Theologians proclaim that out of the three standards by which *the Catholic Church was founded*, the first standard was and is *the formulation of the baptismal creed*. See "A Short History of the Catholic Church" by Hans Kung.¹¹ They were the first to introduce water baptism in the "names" of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit by using one single misused verse in the New Testament. This interpretation necessitates a belief in a plurality of divine persons in the Godhead. How did the Catholic Church come to believe in such a notion when the bible does not teach such a thing? Chapter one revealed that it was first seen in the writings of Ignatius, who was inspired by none other than Philo of Alexandria.

Justin Martyr (100-165) was one of the earliest of these second century writers. It is believed that Justin traveled to Rome to establish his school of the new philosophy. Some quote his major activity at about 150 A.D. Did this Christian philosopher succeed in turning all of Rome towards Ignatius' teaching of God the Word **1.61** or the begotten God? **1.82**. History provides the information that there were groups such as the "Alogi" that formed against this particular doctrine. Justin succeeded in convincing a group of people, but not the majority. This is known because later on in the third century, a bishop by the name of Hippolytus would continue with Justin's philosophical Logos. Hippolytus' writings reveal much more of what took place at that time, and the outcome was not favorable.

Some of Justin's quotes in the second century, are very revealing. His "Dialogue With Trypho" begins with a lengthy

discussion of philosophy. He revealed in his conversation that he was a philosopher. His definition that philosophy is a "clear perception of the truth," was wrong. The apostles of the Lord, including the Apostle Paul, would strongly disagree with Justin. Paul wrote, "Beware lest any man spoil you through philosophy and vain deceit, after the tradition of men, after the rudiments of the world, and not after Christ" (Col 2:8).

The meaning of the Eucharist was a direct connection between Justin and Ignatius when he wrote, "...so likewise we have been taught that the food that is blessed by the prayer of His word, and from which our blood and flesh by transmutation are nourished, is the flesh and blood of that Jesus who was made flesh." **1.185**. Notice the words, "we have been taught" reveal a particular group of people that were teaching the doctrines of Ignatius. Included also was the doctrine of *water baptism* in three names, because according to Justin, "no one can utter the name of the ineffable God." Claiming one name in baptism was hopeless madness! **1.183**.

Justin's argument in favor of a Three Persons baptism was ridiculous! The name given to the early church for baptism and everything else, was the name of Jesus Christ. Refer back to chapter one: "Wherefore God also hath highly exalted him, and given him a name which is above every name" (Phil 2:9). Why would God reward Jesus by exalting his name, and then bypass his name in baptism? By saying that no one can utter the name of the ineffable God, Justin was denying the name above all other names. Jesus is God! He was disobeying the true meaning of biblical baptism. An ignorance that is seen today with those who affirm this Catholic ritual.

Identifying with the doctrines of Philo, the first century Jewish philosopher, Justin wrote, "...that God begat before all

creates a Beginning, a certain **rational power** from Himself, who is called by the Holy Spirit, now the Glory of the Lord, now the Son, again **Wisdom**, again an angel, then God, and then Lord and **Logos**." 1.227. The rational power along with all other descriptions used by Justin, can be traced to the writings of Philo of Alexandria. To understand Justin's beliefs, it is necessary to first examine Philo, the **Jewish Hellenistic philosopher** of the first century. Where did this man get notions so contrary to his own religion?

Philo of Alexandria (20 B.C. - 50 A.D.) acquired his ideas in a strange and unusual way. He wrote about hearing a certain voice: "It told me that in the one living and true God there were two supreme and primary powers."¹² These **powers** he would later define as distinct and equal! Most incredible is the fact that Philo reveals the "It told me" to be his own soul, not the Spirit of God. *On the Cherubim*, page 83, Philo explains how his soul was "frequently seized with a certain divine inspiration, even concerning matters which it could not explain even to itself." He was referring to meditation and mysticism.

How could Philo, who was Jewish, come up with such a teaching? Philo was not only a Greek philosopher who followed Plato, but a **mystic**. This Greek philosopher also practiced the occult! Several sources point this out in their books, including the already mentioned "The Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah." The **Satanist** H.P. Blavatsky wrote about Philo, "in esoteric knowledge he had no rival for several ages among the best writers."¹³ If Philo was meddling with the occult, is it any wonder that Trinitarian theologians would not want to be associated with Philo's Logos? This would also be a logical conclusion to why Philo's trinity is denied by many.

Major Mistakes

Philo's Wisdom and Logos theory was a mixture of philosophy with "Babylonian Mysticism." His theories line up perfectly with what is known as the Kabbalah. A connection that would establish Philo and the Catholic Church as Mystery Babylon. The Trinity is the result of an ungodly merger between an Alexandrian mystic and the so-called Christian philosophers of the second century. This would include Ignatius, Clement, Justin, and the rest of the fathers. The conclusion is indisputably established that the Apostolic and Ante-Nicene Fathers were involved with mysticism. This is the reason why the Apostle John saw a Mystery Babylon!

It gets worse. As a result of Philo's mystical revelation, the Jewish Pagan philosopher was the first to give **Genesis 1:26**, an Old Testament passage, a polytheistic interpretation. According to Philo, "Let us make man in our image" was God speaking to other **Creators** who were divine beings like himself.¹⁴ Most Christians who claim to be biblically sound, use the same exact interpretation and explanation of Genesis 1:26 when defending the Trinity. These poor Christians were told that this verse provides a strong defense for their doctrine. They are sadly mistaken!

The information that Philo was the originator of this application is never mentioned in any books on the Trinity. Theologians bypass this most important data. Some defenders even go as far as saying that Philo had no trinity. Is this an honest mistake, or a cover up? If not a cover up, then, the most incredible ignorance from Historians and Theologians! To disprove Philo, some even claim that his logos theory was too abstract (figurative, theoretical). They do this of course, without considering how the Ante-Nicene Fathers borrowed his ideas. The fact remains that many Trinitarian Theologians

have denied Philo's Trinity, even though the Catholic Church places him and his own brand of "logos" at the center of Catholic Theology.

Roman Catholicism later hid the fact that Philo at one time was presented as being a disciple of Christ, and a bishop of the church. His views on the Trinity were not only accepted, but recognized as essential. His teaching on the Logos and Wisdom paved the way for the *Persons theory in the Godhead* that was used in baptism. This information on Philo is crucial for understanding the mind of Justin Martyr. Without it there is a missing link as to where these teachings came from. The reader from this point on, should gain an insight into Justin's theology which includes mysticism.

Justin Martyr would not only agree with Philo, but would proceed to attack those who interpreted "let us" a reference to God and his angels, as being heretical. **1.228**. This was the historical interpretation that Jews gave to those verses found in Genesis. Instead, Justin preferred the teaching of Philo which gave Genesis 1:26 the interpretation that there were "other beings to himself as assistants."¹⁵ According to Justin, the Creator was speaking to *Wisdom*. **1.228**. This is nothing more than an allegorical interpretation, the method mainly used by Philo. The connection with this Alexandrian philosopher is undeniable. It was this Philo who introduced "Heavenly or Divine Wisdom" as being with God in the beginning.

Again, Justin wrote, "The Word of Wisdom, who is Himself this God begotten of the Father of all things, and Word, and Wisdom, and Power, and the Glory of the Begetter, will bear evidence to me, when He speaks by Solomon the following: ...The Lord made me the beginning of His ways

for His works." **1.227.** *Proverbs 8:22* was misinterpreted by Justin as to meaning the begotten God who is Word and Wisdom. Justin goes on to explain further that at the beginning of creation God spoke to another divine being: "...from which we can indisputably learn that [God] conversed with someone who was numerically distinct from Himself, and also a *rational Being*." **1.228.**

Most Theologians throughout history have denied this stunning fact about the rational power perceived as a rational being. Trinitarian Apologists have lied about this matter. They state in their popular books that Philo's Logos did not allude to personal existence. See "The history of Christian doctrines, by Louis Berkhof." He wrote, "The Apologists did not have the biblical conception of the Logos, but one somewhat resembling that of Philo.' 'To them the Logos as He existed eternally in God, was simply the divine reason, without personal existence."¹⁶ He adds that "however" by viewing creation, God did give the Logos, personal existence! In other words, Berkhof claimed that personal existence of the Logos was derived from the bible, and not from Philo. This is a completely unsubstantiated statement!

Justin did perceive a personal existence of the logos from Philo's adapted allegorical interpretations: "...the Father communed with Him; even as the Scripture by Solomon has made clear, that He whom Solomon calls Wisdom, was begotten as a Beginning before all..." **1.228.** This mistake of calling the wisdom of Proverbs 8, the Logos or second God, would be repeated all the way to the council of Nicaea. It is well documented that "Divine Wisdom" was the instrument through which most of the Catholic bishops would arrive at a

"Preexistent Son." Again, most of the Trinitarian Theologians, including German ones, have denied this information.

It is unbelievable that Church Historians never reveal to their people the truth that *Philo's trinity* with all its allegorical notions, was received and accepted by all the Ante-Nicene Fathers. The argument can be made that the entire "Trinity" was devised by using terms that are not related to "personal existence." Their original formula for the trinity was ***God, Word, and Wisdom***. Word and wisdom are not persons. They are attributes that were personified. "Word" (logos) in the New Testament, is always in reference to God's spoken word or expression. Jesus is the Word made flesh!

This includes John 1:1, the most misused passage by Trinitarians to this day! ***Personification*** means the attributing of human nature or human characteristics to abstract notions or ideas. In this case, it is making those ideas into gods or divine beings. Trinitarian Thinkers never disclose the truth that the Trinity was first formulated by using the art of personification! The careful study of the writings of Justin, Irenaeus, and Theophilus will prove this. Personification and allegory are very similar methods. Philo of Alexandria used allegory throughout his studies of the Old Testament. Catholic and Protestant Apologists will be held accountable for the denial or omission of these revealing facts. They have covered up false theology.

Many religious organizations today advocate that the ***Apostles' Creed*** is to be upheld and practiced by all churches. Most major denominations advise their members to commit the confession to memory by the time they are being baptized. What leaders of these churches fail to tell their baptismal candidates is that the Apostles' Creed was drafted by Catholics

at about the same time that Justin Martyr was teaching the new philosophy in Rome. Before it was erroneously called the Apostles' Creed, it was known simply as the "Catholic Faith." The main function of the creed was to separate the Godhead into three sections in order to confess the Father, Son, and Spirit separately. The Apostles' Creed which had nothing to do with the apostles, was a forgery.

More enlightening information would come with the bishop who would be referred to as the "Bishop of Catholic Tradition," *Irenaeus* (125-190). This priest of the second century clearly upheld all the doctrines that were introduced by Ignatius, Clement of Rome, and Justin. He would go even further by promoting the *Universal Church of Rome* as the "preeminent authority" over all churches. **1.415**. He wrote that the church of Rome was "founded and organized" by the apostles Peter and Paul, and that "every church should agree with this church." Irenaeus like Ignatius, provides a list of the men that he claims succeeded "Linus" in the "office of the episcopate." **1.416**.

Why was this Catholic bishop promoting Rome and one primary office, when he should have been promoting the gospel that came from Jerusalem? Where is his defense of early, historical, and biblical Christianity? It never happened. He was really defending the universal church of Rome. His statement that both apostles, Peter and Paul founded and organized the church of Rome is completely bogus. There is no evidence that this ever took place; apart from the New Testament forgery previously mentioned as *the Teaching of the Apostles*. **8.671**. Even this false letter disagrees, for the Apostle Paul unlike the fictitious Peter, was never ordained to the Moses/Aaron priesthood. **8.667**.

Irenaeus' statements actually revealed the development of a different church other than the early church of the apostles. This second century faction of bishops sought to have control over all other churches. The bible warned about this! The Catholic bishop truly revealed the mentality of a certain group of religious men. In his deluded mind, the Roman Catholic Church was supposed to be the main leader of all other church communities. All other churches should follow the traditions and philosophical doctrines of this special priesthood. Unfortunately, this would become a reality in the fourth century, but certainly not before, and not without much persecution and government control of those who refused.

Continuing with the teachings of Philo, Ignatius, and Justin, *the bishop of Lyons* wrote, "For with Him were always present the Word and Wisdom, the Son and the Spirit, by whom and in whom freely and spontaneously, He made all things, to whom also He speaks, saying, "Let us make man after Our image and likeness" **1.488**. Note that this bishop applied Word to the Son. He separated Wisdom from Word, and made Wisdom, the Holy Spirit. Somehow the Ante-Nicene Fathers saw no contradictions with this application. Word and Wisdom was first applied to one person, the Son. Now this bishop was applying Wisdom to the Spirit.

Again, Irenaeus explains the formula of word and wisdom as being separate: "I have also largely demonstrated, that the Word, namely the Son, was always with the Father; and that Wisdom also, which is the Spirit, was present with Him, anterior to all creation, He declares by Solomon: "God by Wisdom founded the earth, and by understanding hath He established the heaven." **1.488**. Clearly, to the bishop of Lyons, both "word and wisdom" were divine members of the

Godhead! It would take a special type of men to willingly introduce such deceptions in the name of the gospel. It is prophecy fulfilled! Other Catholic men would follow with these same allegorical ideas.

In the exclusive history of Trinitarian dogma, it was *Theophilus of Antioch* (115-168-181), not Tertullian, who was the first to reveal in his writings the use of the word "Trinity." He connects with the priests before him: Ignatius, Clement, Justin, and Irenaeus, when he uses the allegorical formula of the Trinity as was taught by the already mentioned first century Jewish philosopher. Theophilus continues with the teaching of his predecessors by teaching that the Trinity was *God, Word, and Wisdom*. The context of his writings reveals something other than the bible as his source.

Repeating the teachings of Philo, he writes that the three days before the luminaries are "types of the Trinity, of God, and His Word, and His wisdom." He further confesses that in Genesis 1:26, where God states, "Let Us make man in Our image, after Our likeness," he was saying this to His own Word and wisdom. **2.101**. Where did Theophilus get the idea that the three days before the luminaries were types of the Trinity? What about his idea of "Word and Wisdom as being other divine members?" His teachings were an endorsement of Philo.

The book "Who is the Heir of Divine Things" was written many years before the New Testament writings. When Philo first wrote about the Trinity as "God allotting three days to eternity before the appearance of the sun,"¹⁷ the connection with Theophilus is beyond question. Theophilus used the same example that was given by Philo. Both were explaining the existence of a Trinity of God. Undisputedly, the first place in

the history of the church where the word "Trinity" appears for the first time, is in the writings of Theophilus. The idea of the three days before the sun or luminaries came from Philo, who also taught that God and his *two supreme powers* were well represented by the three days.

Modern defenders such as the author of "God in Three Persons" would have us believe of the New Testament, "The Church Fathers consistently turned to it to formulate their doctrines of the Trinity, and in this chapter we will try to trace for ourselves, in our own way, the clues which they thought led inexorably to a doctrine of the Trinity."¹⁸ Immediately after this statement, the author proceeds to define the Trinity by using the Nicene Creed. This is a prime example of how Trinitarian theology is a mixture of bible and other sources that include the creeds of the Catholic Church. This is not *Sola Scriptura*! It is not sound biblical teaching.

Although the author writes about *Persona* on page 98, he does not explain why the Latin Fathers used that specific term in the first place. As was revealed in this chapter, certain bishops took this and other words from Philo. It is interesting that even though the title of the book is *God in Three Persons*, the origin of the word *Persons* was never addressed. Research into this subject will yield incriminating evidence against the Trinity. The same thing applies to the word *Trinity*. Philo's allegorical applications were interpreted by Theophilus as the existence of a Triune God. Tracing the origin of how these words came into Catholic Theology will destroy the notion that the Trinity is a mystery and a revelation.

Many books defending the Trinity have misinformed the world about Philo. Take for example this statement: "Philo had no trinity and no personal Logos in reality."¹⁹ This is

simply not true! This is the kind of propaganda that has kept believers thinking that the Trinity is sound biblical doctrine. The attention is shifted away from the first century mystic philosopher and given to the Ante-Nicene Fathers, who in turn are defended as true followers of the early church. Not only is this not true, but because of their dependence upon Philo and Greek philosophy, they became part of the mystery religion, Mystery Babylon.

PREVIEW

By separating the earliest centuries into chapters, it becomes apparent that the Trinity doctrine was never a part of the New Testament Church. It can clearly be seen that certain men within the early church communities would introduce philosophical applications that would change the true meaning of the bible. They want you to believe that the men who brought us the Trinity were biblical Christians. They would also deny any connection between Philo and the logos of the Trinity. The naked reality is that monotheism, or the belief in one divine being would be altered or changed to that of a plurality of beings or persons in the Godhead. In other words, Jewish faith would be replaced with Greek philosophy.

Men would arise from the true fellowship of believers to teach doctrines that were never authorized by the "Head of the Church," Jesus Christ. The true apostles and prophets had clearly warned the churches that these wolves were coming. Given a totally different application would be the verse "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God" (John 1:1). The Ante-Nicene Fathers, including Tertullian, would read into this passage that the

Word (logos) was a second God existing separately from the God of creation. **3.607, 610**. This new idea of God as existing as three divine persons would not be easily accepted.

Tertullian would confirm in the third century, "They are constantly throwing out against us that we are preachers of two gods and three gods, while they take to themselves pre-eminently the credit of being worshippers of the One God." **3.599**. While modern day Apologists and writers are claiming that the Trinity doctrine came with the early church, the ancient fathers were saying something quite different. "The simple, indeed," Tertullian wrote, "who always constitute the majority of believers, are startled at the dispensation (of the Three in One) ..." **3.599**. They were "startled" because no one had ever insisted on contradicting the Hebrew Scriptures in such a way. Tertullian was indeed pushing a new doctrine.

According to the earliest church communities, which held to the bible alone, the *three in one* teaching contradicted the "rule of faith" of the scriptures. **3.599**. It did not matter that the proponents of such a doctrine were stating that they still believed in one God by referring to it as *God's Economy*. The simpleminded believers, as referred to by Tertullian, stood their ground by pointing to such verses as Deuteronomy 6:4. They argued against Tertullian that the Lord God Almighty could not be divided or placed in a numerical order. **3.599**. They were alluding to the second and third persons of the Trinity. In their view, it was the God of the scriptures who against the multiple gods of all the pagan nations, remained exclusively and numerically one.

There would also be some terrible schisms between the Catholics themselves. There would be a fall-out (leaving the church) of bishops, including Tertullian. So heated became the

Major Mistakes

arguments of that time, that the so-called heroes of Trinitarian thought would be the actual ones to leave the Catholic Church. Although, Trinitarians never discuss this part of their history, the third century would testify to this! This specific time frame would prove to be a most revealing chapter in the history of Trinitarian dogma. The majority of books, if not all, are missing a huge chunk of information. Modern day Christians are not aware of how problematic this teaching really is.

Most believers that follow modern Trinitarian leaders actually believe that the Trinity doctrine was loved and accepted by all. Included is the lie that the Trinity was the original view of God held by all Christians. They advocate falsely that it was certain men who veered away from the Trinity that started teaching heresy. The biblical and historic account is that it would be the complete opposite! The original teaching of the early church was *Monarchian*, the belief that God is one sovereign ruler. Instead of the Trinity idea being loved by all, it would be rejected by most Christians of the second and third centuries.

Chapter 3

Third Century

Christian Philosophy Versus Biblical Christianity
The Struggle For Supremacy
200-300 A.D.

The Catechetical School of Alexandria

At the turn of the third century, things would come to a climax between the majority of churches who rejected the Trinity and Catholics who advocated a Christian philosophy. In Alexandria, a school of theology was producing zealous disciples who were in turn, going throughout the three major provinces of Rome. These would be Rome, Alexandria, and Antioch. Its leaders starting with *Pantaenus* (145-200 A.D.), *Clement* (150-215 A.D.), and *Origen* (184-254 A.D.) would be most influential in promoting the Greek Logos, which Origen and the fathers called the Logos and Wisdom. **4.246, 4.541, 4.561**. History would consistently reveal that these men along with the aforementioned bishops of the second century, were ardent followers of Philo, the Jewish Greek Philosopher and Babylonian Mystic.

It is important to note that this information has been categorically denied by most Trinitarian Theologians. There is recommended reading of such books as "Philo in Early Christian Literature," by David T. Runia. Another excellent book would be "The Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah," by Alfred Edersheim. His section on Philo's Logos approximating more closely to the secret *Kabbalah* (occult) than to the Old Testament teaching of word, is most revealing.¹ Previously

mentioned, was the book "Eusebius Ecclesiastical History" where he admits to Philo's influence specifically within the Catholic Church. More on Eusebius in chapter four.

Ruckman's book, "The History of the New Testament Church" mentions the existence of the *Alexandrian Cult* as being composed of such men as "Plato, Philo, Pantaenus, Clement, and Origen."² This dangerous cult actually included earlier members starting with Ignatius of Antioch. Instead of "revelation" coming from the writings of the apostles, the doctrine of the Trinity would prove to be a formulation coming from the minds of Christian philosophers. As the message of a philosophical Christianity would spread throughout Rome, many Christians would object to this new philosophy that included a Triune God. Biblical Christians would not agree with such foolishness of making a trinity out of the God of the Hebrews.

Although, Justin Martyr had proclaimed the Logos theory of philosophy early in the second century along with a triune baptism, the majority of Christians in Rome and other parts of the empire advocated obedience to the simple gospel. Most Church communities practiced baptism in the name of Christ since this was the original formula given to the Church. See Matthew 28:19, Mark 16:16, 17, Luke 24:47, Acts 2:38, 4:12, 8:16, 10:48, 19:5, Rom. 6:4, Gal. 3:27. Stipulated in the book of Acts, the gospels, and the epistles, the name of Christ was held with high honor. It is important to understand that the message of Christ to the Jews did not alter what the Jewish Nation had believed for centuries.

Deuteronomy 6 was the driving force of the chosen Jews, and bible Christians fit that mold perfectly. Contrary to Trinitarian Theologians, this has nothing to do with a Trinity:

Hear, O Israel: The Lord our God is one Lord: And thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thine heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy might. And these words, which I command thee this day, shall be in thine heart: And thou shalt teach them diligently unto thy children, and shalt talk of them when thou sittest in thine house, and when thou walkest by the way, and when thou liest down, and when thou risest up. And thou shalt bind them for a sign upon thine hand, and they shall be as frontlets between thine eyes. And thou shalt write them upon the posts of thy house, and on thy gates (Deut 6:4-9).

Jesus had wholeheartedly agreed by confirming this very same passage: "And Jesus answered him, The first of all the commandments is, Hear, O Israel; ***The Lord our God is one Lord***: And thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind, and with all thy strength: this is the first commandment" (Mark 12:29-30). Christ's disciples would never contradict such a powerful message as this. How did the apostles reconcile the truth that the Lord God is one with the fact that Christ was the son of the living God? What the bible reveals in its actual writings is very clear.

They learned from Christ himself that he was ***the visible image of the Father***. While Christ was the son born in the flesh, his identity was directly connected with that of the Father. This is what the bible calls, "the mystery of godliness." While John 3:16 tells us that God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, another passage says, "And without controversy great is the mystery of godliness: God was manifest in the flesh, justified in the Spirit, seen of angels, preached unto the Gentiles, believed on in the world, received

up into glory" (1 Tim 3:16). When this verse says "God was manifest" it implies the only God of the bible. Again, it is of great importance to note that the apostles were exclusively monotheistic Jews.

When encountering the legalistic Pharisees and their search for the Father, an answer was given: "Then said they unto him, Where is thy Father? Jesus answered, Ye neither know me, nor my Father: if ye had known me, ye should have known my Father also" (John 8:19). Jesus told his disciples the same thing, "If ye had known me, ye should have known my Father also: and from henceforth ye know him, and **have seen him**" (John 14:7). Jesus cried out to all, "He that believeth on me, believeth not on me, but on him that sent me.' 'And he that seeth me seeth him that sent me.'" (John 12:44-45). These were powerful words spoken by Jesus on three separate occasions and to three different groups of people!

The Apostle Paul writes years later about Jesus, "Who is **the image of the invisible God**, the firstborn of every creature" (Col 1:15). Paul was not around at the time that Jesus revealed this matter! Jesus testified many times that the Father was in him, not the incarnate Son. See John 5:23, 10:30, 10:38, 14:10, 11. Paul, who did not walk with Christ like the other apostles, would later explain, "To wit, that God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto himself, not imputing their trespasses unto them; and hath committed unto us the word of reconciliation" (2 Cor 5:19). He explained that in Jesus dwelt all of the fullness of the Godhead bodily (Col 2:9).

The difference between biblical Christians and Jews was not their view of the Godhead, but that of the promise of the Messiah. Jews did not accept that Jesus Christ was the

Messiah of Israel. Those that did would become Christian, followers and worshippers of Christ. This was the historical situation, the battle, and the dividing of the people. The New Testament is filled with examples of this issue. The Jews' main argument was that they were teaching the people that Jesus was the one that the Old Testament predicted would come. All throughout the book of Acts, over and over, this subject would surface.

The leaders of Israel were not content: "Being grieved that they taught the people, and preached through Jesus the resurrection from the dead" (Acts 4:2). They would confer and decide to threaten the apostles and disciples: "And they called them, and commanded them not to speak at all nor teach in the name of Jesus" (Acts 4:18). This same spirit is evident even to this day. It is okay to mention God, but many will frown at the mention of the name of Jesus. It is amazing how certain Christians are scandalized when they hear of baptism in that *NAME*, especially, when it was Jesus who saved them! His name is Wonderful! See Isaiah 9:6.

Presenting the Messiah as God appears to have been a direct mission of the church. The apostles did not hold back in writing and teaching this biblical truth. Paul wrote his letter to Titus: "Looking for that blessed hope, and the glorious appearing of the great God and our Saviour Jesus Christ" (Titus 2:13). In Paul's letter to Timothy, he wrote; "According to the glorious gospel of the blessed God, which was committed to my trust" (1 Tim 1:11). He goes on to say that it was Jesus Christ who called and placed him in the ministry.

How did they distinguish the Father from the Son? The Apostle Paul would explain that it was the human part of Jesus that was the Son or mediator: "For there is one God, and one

mediator between God and men, *the man* Christ Jesus" (1 Tim 2:5). Study on the "veil" or flesh of Jesus is important in this case. It would be the Christian Philosophers of the second century who would devise the idea that the Father and the Son were two distinct persons. Some in the third century would continue with the idea that they were actually two Gods or Beings. Later with the adding of the Holy Spirit, it would be three.

Paul would explain again in his letter to the Romans: "Concerning his Son Jesus Christ our Lord, which was made of the seed of David according to the flesh" (Rom 1:3). Paul understood that the flesh was the Son: "Whose are the fathers, and of whom as concerning the flesh Christ came, who is over all, God blessed forever. Amen." (Rom 9:5). The mentioning that Jesus is God "over all" contradicts any attempts to theoretically make the Son subordinate in rank. The author of the book of Hebrews reiterates that the Father and Son are one: "Who being the brightness of his glory, and the express image of his person" (Heb 1:3).

In all of the bible, and especially the New Testament, there never was any mention of the "Eternal Son" or "Divine Son." Contrary to what modern Trinitarian Thinkers teach, these are expressions that would come with the new philosophy and the Greek Logos. As explained in the previous second century, the Fathers had written much on their philosophy of the Logos and Wisdom. The application of these concepts had given the fathers a "triune theology" that was different from what the early church had proclaimed. During the third century certain bishops would uphold and defend Alexandrian theology above and beyond the Holy Scriptures.

Some of the supposedly rising stars of this time were unique men such as; "Clement of Alexandria, Hippolytus, the famed Tertullian, Origen, Cyprian, Novatian, and Firmilian." *Hippolytus* would go on to separate the Catholic Church by becoming the first Anti-Pope in history. *Tertullian* would abandon the Catholic faith for that of the Montanists. *Origen* would be ex-communicated for his many strange and anti-biblical doctrines. *Novatian* would also become an Anti-Pope. *Cyprian, Firmilian* and over a hundred bishops from Africa would be ex-communicated by the Roman Pope, *Stephen I*. What Trinitarians refer to as heroes of the faith were really *schismatic teachers* of that time. None of these men were accepted by the majority of believers. This is a fact that has been quietly hidden from modern day Christians.

Clement, Hippolytus, Origen, Tertullian

Acronym: CHOT

Clement of Alexandria, the second head of the *Catechetical School of Alexandria* after Pantaenus, revealed much in his writings. Similar to Ignatius in the first, Justin in the second, Clement would set the tone for the rest of the third century writers. He wrote in reference to *Plato's Timaeus*, "I understand nothing else than the *Holy Trinity* to be meant;" **2.468**. He expressed his love for philosophy by saying, "Philosophy is not, then, the product of vice, since it makes men virtuous; it follows, then, that it is the work of God, whose work it is solely to do good.' 'And all things given by God are given and received well." **2.517**.

It is a fact that Clement quoted or used the writings of Philo of Alexandria, to the estimated count of **300 times**. To mix Greek philosophy with the Holy Scriptures would prove

to be the biggest blunder or mistake committed by some of the second and third century Christians. Even though they claimed to be believers, they were not biblical, nor were they following the specific teachings of Christ. Clement's record would later be shattered by the famed bishop Ambrose, who made use of Philo's works to the count of **600 times**.³

One of the strangest practices of the third century that clearly reveals Trinitarian errors, was **Baptism in the Nude**. It is recorded in the writings of **Hippolytus** and other Trinitarian bishops. See "The Apostolic Tradition" by Hippolytus of Rome.⁴ This was obviously an anti-biblical practice that was never condoned by the early biblical church of the first century. Christian communities outside of the already known Catholic Church did not employ the triune formula that was mentioned while performing baptism in the nude. It was the Trinitarian formula that was used to conduct nude baptism, and not that of the majority of believers who baptized in the name of Christ. Most Christians did not follow this perverted practice.

What is the theological defense of such a pagan doctrine? Some modern defenders of Trinitarian baptism claim that it has always been a biblical doctrine. The truth of this specific type of application was actually a disregard for Holy Scripture, and a reflection of those strange developing *Gnostic ideas* coming from corrupt unbiblical men. This is as far as one can fall from the true teachings of the apostles. Taking one verse from the bible and building an entire doctrine on such, has led many a professor of religion into falsehood.

This type of nude baptism appeared in some of the lost books of the Apocrypha such as the Coptic Gospel of Thomas, or the Gospel of Philip. It is there that these teachings are

found. Early Trinitarian and *Catholic theology is revealed in the lost books of the Apocrypha*. See the Apocrypha books known as: The Gospel of Pseudo-Matthew, The Gospel of the Nativity of Mary, Acts of the Holy Apostles Peter and Paul, The Falling Asleep of Mary, and so many others. There are so many it would take an entire book to describe them all. **8.368-8.598**.

The *Acts of Peter*, a second century forgery, has the Apostle Peter baptizing "Theon" in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. This was done of course, to deceive their followers into believing that the apostles baptized in a triune formula. Another attempt to teach false trinity notions came with the *Coptic Gospel of Thomas* which states, "Jesus said, "Where there are three gods, they are gods.' 'Where there are two or one, I am with him." The Gospel of Thomas was making Jesus out to be a polytheistic Jew! Read the interesting "Lost Scriptures, Books that did not make it into the New Testament."⁵ This puts the main emphasis of deception on Trinitarians not Oneness believers! There is a connection between Catholics and the majority of these forgeries.

Most writings, including those of *Tertullian*, reveal a different baptism that required baptizing the candidates, three successive times. On baptism he stated, "He commands them to baptize into the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit, not into a unipersonal God.' 'And indeed it is not once only, but three times, that we are immersed into the Three Persons, at each several mention of Their names." **3.623**. Tertullian had previously written, "For we,...do definitely declare that Two beings are God, the Father and the Son, and, with the addition of the Holy Spirit, even Three, according to the principle of the divine economy..." **3.608**. Incredibly, Tertullian believed

that the three persons of the Trinity were *three beings*. He also believed that God was *not a unipersonal God*.

Why has there been no explanation of the similarities between Catholic doctrine and the Apocrypha? Trinitarians have written many books, yet no one perceives Tertullian's remarks as polytheistic. Why has no one compared Tertullian's theory of Three Persons with that of Philo's? The pagan philosopher of Alexandria wrote, "Therefore, the middle person of the three, being attended by each of his powers as by body-guards, presents to the mind, which is endowed with the faculty of sight, a vision at one time of one being, and at another time of three.⁶ The statement, *middle person of the three*, implies that there were three persons.

The Monarchian or Oneness School of Rome

Catholics calling Catholics "heretics" is not something you read about in today's books. Trinitarians do not tell their followers that another school of theology rose up in the third century. The founder is said to have been *Callistus*, a bishop under *Pope Zephyrinus* (199-217 A.D.). He was a staunch defender of the teaching of one God. **5.131**. His enemies referred to the Callistian School of Rome as heretical because of its opposition to the developing Trinitarianism. Callistus himself was referred to as the "Champion" of the doctrine of *Noetus*. **5.125**. This school was sponsored by Zephyrinus, the Roman Pope (bishop) of that time, so he became a prime target to those who represented the Alexandrian view. Callistus would later become the Roman (bishop) Pope after Zephyrinus (217-222 A.D.).

It is simply amazing, that in the third century, Catholic Bishops (Popes) would stand on the side of Oneness. The information on the overcrowded Callistian School was derived from the one and only Hippolytus, who was also Trinitarian (170-235). He called it the "school of these heretics." **5.125**. Accusations against those bishops were really an attack on all who rejected the Trinity doctrine. There was no **Official Church Ruling** at this time that declared which doctrine was correct! This evidence would indicate that the accusation of heresy by Hippolytus and others, was baseless. The word "heresy" appears in the New Testament, and it was once applied to the Apostle Paul and the entire gospel (Acts 24:14).

Hippolytus is recorded as making a statement against Noetus which questioned the man's sanity. He wrote that Noetus thought he was "Moses, and that Aaron was his brother." **5.223**. According to Hippolytus, when the presbyters heard this, Noetus was summoned before the church. Yet, nothing came of the issue. Instead, he was expelled on a second summons for other reasons not mentioned. Did Hippolytus prove that Noetus was insane? No. He made the accusation, but there was no proof. This is nothing more than "dirty journalism."

The art of mentioning certain allegations, even though not validated, brings doubt to the person being accused. This is using a form of trickery that attacks the integrity of an individual. This is the same line of attack that was used against Jesus by the Pharisees. Hippolytus also accused Noetus of following the philosopher "Heraclitus." **5.127**. This philosopher fits perfectly with all Greek renderings of the "Logos" which connects more with the Trinity than Oneness

doctrine. Study into the origin of the Greek Logos will shed much more light on this issue.

Hippolytus reveals that **Sabellius** (died 257 A.D.), a wrongly rejected historical figure, was a disciple in that school who was personally taught by Callistus. Hippolytus even claimed that Callistus was the one that perverted Sabellius as to his doctrine of the one God. **5.128**. Even though, the information is coming from Trinitarian sources, modern theologians do not share this history. It is because of this unknown history that Sabellius is hated and looked upon as a cult leader. Even though Trinitarians are presumed to be presenting a complete and true account of historical facts, this is not the case. If one is to accuse Sabellius of being a cult leader, then one has to do the same for the entire third century Catholic Church of Rome.

Bringing attention to the **Monarchian School of Rome** would certainly bring clarity to the one-sided reputation of Sabellius. Trinitarians state that Sabellianism is a modern day heresy. The truth is that Catholic Trinitarians were accusing Non-Trinitarian Catholics as being heretics long before the teaching became the law of the State/Religion. In other words, they were falsely accusing their own without any biblical or legal ground on which to stand on. The bishops who were the minority, were supposed to submit to Rome and their leaders. Instead they chose to rebel. These schismatic Trinitarians became enemies of their own people.

This includes Tertullian, the one who personally portrayed **Praxeas** as a deceiver. He was made to appear as someone on the outside of the church trying to come in. In reality, it was the Trinitarian faction that was trying to enforce their new doctrine. How much can be accepted from reports

coming from Hippolytus (the first antipope) and Tertullian (Montanist)? Can anyone trust the accusations coming from frustrated proponents that held to rejected views, including baptism in the nude? These are questions that must be considered when evaluating history that has been altered to present the Trinity as the original doctrine of the Church.

Tertullian attempts to discredit Oneness doctrine with his writing on Praxeas. In doing so, he makes one of the most outrageous statements. Immediately, at the start of his letter he says, "In various ways has the devil rivaled and resisted the truth.' 'Sometimes his aim has been to destroy the truth by defending it." **3.597**. How do you destroy truth by defending it? You cannot do it! The only conclusion an individual can reach when the bible affirms only one God, and that Jesus is God, is not that they are two different or distinct persons. The bible summarizes that Jesus is the image of the invisible God, making him identical to God the Father. There is only one "I Am" in the Old Testament, and Jesus claims the title (John 8:58).

For Trinitarians to say that "I Am" is really three persons, is frankly, one of the most embarrassing statements ever made. The self-revealing title of God existing as the ***all sufficient One*** that was revealed directly to the Jewish people, was never God's true intention, according to these Christian philosophers. Why would God hold back the most crucial information that in his Being there were three Persons? If "I Am" is three eternal divine persons, then Jews, including Jesus and the apostles, were totally mistaken about their view of God. Deuteronomy 6:4 states that God is one Lord, when it should have stated that there are three Lords that make up one

Lord. See chapter seven for comments on the Athanasian Creed.

By maintaining faith in the one only God, Tertullian argued that Praxeas fabricated a heresy. This is absurd! Satan defending the truth is speculation. Jesus in referring to the enemy, stated, "there is no truth in him." The Lord called him the "father of lies." Jesus also said that a "kingdom divided against itself, cannot stand." He stated, "And if Satan rise up against himself, and be divided, he cannot stand, but hath an end" (Mark 3:26). Satan came against this truth of one God by having men teach that God was not one being but three. Satan did not defend the truth, he attacked God's Word with false teachers and their pagan ideas.

As for Hippolytus' nude baptism, or Tertullian's belief that Satan defends the truth, their ideas were ridiculous, offensive, and bizarre! These individuals were far from being biblical. While modern Trinitarian Thinkers claim that the teachings of Noetus, Praxeas, and Sabellius were imported to Rome, it was really the heresy from Alexandria, that of the "three beings" of God, that came from outside anti-biblical sources to threaten the status of the true Church of God. For centuries this data has been covered up. Non-Trinitarian believers have been defrauded by Trinitarian Thinkers! Significant history has been tampered with and omitted. Believers, for years, have not been given the opportunity to view such incriminating facts.

One can perceive that in the third century it was the Trinitarians who were falsely condemning faithful believers as being heretics. This is interesting because Tertullian admits that the Oneness people, which he called *Monarchian*, were the majority. They upheld the "rule of faith" of the scriptures

that there is only one God contrary to the world's plurality of gods. **3.599**. It was these same believers who were accusing Tertullian and the rest of the philosophers as to believing in many gods. The Monarchians were correct! The group of bishops who were arguing for a Trinity, were completely wrong in their statements. They were adding to the scriptures!

Tertullian and the priests before him (Ignatius, Justin, etc.) had made reference to God the Father, and the Son, as two distinct and numerical beings. Indeed, many of the Ante-Nicene Fathers called the Logos, the second God. Tertullian revealed his doctrine of the Son of God as "God of God" identical to that of Philo of Alexandria. **3.610**. The famous example of the logos given by Tertullian as to the ray of the sun not being the actual sun, was first coined by Philo.⁷ Tertullian uses this example several times. **3.608**. Stating that the Father and Son were two distinct beings is a shocker! This is not what modern Trinitarians are stating today. They are saying that in the Trinity there are three persons, not three beings. It is a clever way of concealing the truth! Most modern Apologists have been caught up in this lie.

Most Trinitarian Thinkers promote the idea that those who first believed in the Trinity were the true "Historic Biblical Christians." It is a serious misrepresentation. The majority of believers who lived in Rome in the first, second, and third centuries did not accept Greek philosophy. Certain Catholic bishops called the majority of believers "heretics," even though, those who occupied the majority view were following scripture alone. Those in the minority, that were promoting their logos theory, were introducing a new understanding of God never before seen in the bible. The

Trinity doctrine would never be based on scripture alone. It would have for its origin, the Logos of pagan philosophy.

History reveals that the Monarchians reasoned from scripture, as admitted in the writings of Hippolytus and Tertullian. This is the same exact issue today! Trinitarians will never admit that the ones using the bible "only" to defend their doctrine are the Oneness believers. Through the centuries, men such as Hippolytus and Tertullian have somehow escaped higher criticism or disapproval. Yet, it is men such as these that have argued against scripture and defended their use of philosophical ideas in the face of an overwhelming majority.

This latter mentioned bishop resorted to calling all Christians "unwise and unlearned" because they did not embrace his philosophy. **3.598**. There was a "superior" type of mentality with those who advocated Greek philosophy and allegorical interpretation. This attitude can still be seen today with those who defend the Catholic Creeds. They can be quite antagonistic with Christians who uphold the bible as their only source. They attack by saying such things as "no creed but the bible is ridiculous." These same stubborn, deceitful men are going directly against the words of Christ. They have built their house on the sand, instead of on the rock!

Tertullian was even accused of using the same exact teachings of Valentinus, the greatest teacher of the Gnostics. **3.602**. His response was that "truth must not refrain from using a term such as "prolations" (emanations) just because heresy uses them." He was not really telling the truth! ***It was Philo and the Alexandrian Gnostics who first used emanations.*** If paganism uses a certain concept, word, or application, and someone in the church decides to use it, it is still pagan. It cannot be biblical truth. This is the history of the

Roman Catholic Church. It has always combined paganism with Christianity. There have been hundreds of books written to bring attention to this issue, yet millions walk ignorantly of such warnings!

As mentioned previously, the triunity of God was not original with the Ante-Nicene Fathers. The philosophy of the Trinity was coming from mystic ideas taught before with the Gnostics, and even with those who practiced the occult through the Kabbalah. This Philo of Alexandria taught and *combined all these ideas* in the first century. The Roman Empire believed in many gods, similar to Babylon, India, and Egypt, along with *the trinity of Jupiter, Juno, and Minerva*. Incredibly, this knowledge of a Trinitarian mindset was "before" Rome proclaimed itself Christian. These are facts conveniently omitted by today's modern Trinitarian Thinkers.

Even the name of Rome was derived from the *Goddess Roma*. See "The Goddess Roma" by Ronald Mellor.⁸ It is a fact that Rome has always been a worshipper of the gods, but especially the goddesses. This information makes it easier to understand why the Roman religion is so vastly different than the gospel of Jesus Christ. This is why it was so easy for them to accept a Christian concept of a trinity. It is also the reason they believe in a "Mother Goddess" and the "Queen of Heaven." The Lord taught, "A good tree cannot bring forth evil fruit, *neither can a corrupt tree* bring forth good fruit" (Matt 7:18).

The Battle Over Baptism

There was another incident of interest having to do with one of Tertullian's disciples. Towards the middle of the

third century, a situation arose where differing views on water baptism collided within the same church. *Cyprian* had a problem with those who were baptized outside of the Catholic Church, who for varied reasons, were returning to fellowship within the church. While the Roman Pope of that time, *Stephen I*, allowed them back into fellowship with a simple laying on of hands, Cyprian insisted that these same people must be rebaptized in the Trinitarian formula, also known as Catholic baptism (Ignatius).

A letter written about 257 A.D., responding to this matter by Pope Stephen, made it known that those who had been baptized in the name of Christ from the majority of Non-Catholic church communities were legitimate. This was unacceptable to Trinitarian Thinkers who taught that baptism was in the name of the Trinity. Baptizing in the singular name of Christ contradicted what these men were saying as to the correct interpretation of Matthew 28:19. It exposed their error! Pope Stephen I stated directly, "The name of Christ is of great advantage to faith and the sanctification of baptism." **5.395**. He acknowledged along with many third century believers, Catholic and Non-Catholic, that the most original baptism was in the name of Jesus Christ.

Another bishop wrote at this time that "they who have once been washed in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ, ought not to be re-baptized." **5.667**. Clearly, from the first to the third centuries, water baptism in the name of Jesus, was not heretical. Historically, it is in the third century where the *bishops of the African Synod* attacked biblical baptism as being wrong because it was not what they practiced within the Catholic Church. Cyprian was convinced that the Catholic Church in contrast to the other Christian Church Communities,

was the only one and true institution of the Lord. He was completely mistaken with his narcissistic adulations.

He wrote, "There is one God, and Christ is one, and there is one Church, and one chair founded upon the rock by the word of the Lord.' 'Another altar cannot be constituted nor a new priesthood be made, except the one altar and the one priesthood.' 'Whosoever gathereth elsewhere, scattereth." See **5.318**. Does this sound familiar? This lie, that one chair was founded upon the rock (alluding to Peter), has circulated for centuries. The *Teaching of the Apostles forgery* taught that Peter himself ordained a special priesthood in Rome. Cyprian, in promoting this lie, was completely in error. He represented extreme pride and arrogance. This attitude is reflected in modern day Trinitarian Thinkers. Pride is what caused Satan's downfall!

There is only one possible rock in the New Testament Church, Jesus Christ. Men such as Cyprian would substitute even that for their very own version. They would claim that Peter (Petros) was the rock (Petra), instead of Jesus. Petros is a piece of rock, while Petra is a mass of rock. How millions can be gullible to such a distortion of scripture is incredible! This would be such a betrayal to the Apostle Peter himself. It was he alone that was given the revelation that Christ is the Son of the living God (Matt 16:16). The New Testament is built on the very fact that Jesus is the foundation or rock that is laid (I Cor 3:11). There cannot be two rocks on which the Church of the New Testament was built.

Saying that Peter is the rock is one of the biggest errors ever committed by religious men. The Catholic Church stands or falls on this false premise. The bible teaches, "There is none holy as the Lord: for there is none beside thee: *neither is there*

any rock like our God" (1 Sam 2:2). "For who is God, save the Lord? and who is a rock, save our God" (2 Sam 22:32)? "For who is God save the Lord? or **who is a rock save our God**" (Ps 18:31)? "He only is my rock and my salvation; he is my defense; I shall not be greatly moved" (Ps 62:2). The "rock" has always been a title for God. The Church of Jesus Christ is founded on God alone, not earthly and frail humans such as Peter who did not understand the will of God at that time. As to the subject matter of which of the apostles was greater, see Luke 22:44, or Mark 9:34.

Cyprian and the group of bishops from the African synod came together and ruled that any other baptism outside of Catholic baptism in the Trinitarian formula, was heretical. **5.565**. They were rejecting and opposing their Church leaders. For that reason alone, Pope Stephen had no choice but to "excommunicate" Cyprian and all the bishops of Africa. **5.653**. What do Trinitarian Thinkers say about these facts. The answer is, nothing. This is yet another part of history that is never shared among Trinitarian circles. The reason is obvious. Their accusation of heresy does not hold up to historical facts. All modern Trinitarians oppose biblical water baptism while ignoring that schismatic Trinitarians were thrown out of the original Catholic Church.

Listen, will the real heretic please stand up! This information is shocking if you think about it. For centuries people have been told that Monarchian or Oneness people were members of a sect that was not even Christian. The lies have been continuous. Modern Christians that began with a Trinitarian background and foundation, have no clue to what really happened in the first three centuries. Many state with utmost confidence that their faith was the most original. Non-

Trinitarians can equally argue that Rome's Popes of the third century were opposed to Triune baptism as being the only one accepted by the Church.

Believing in one God and being baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ was not heresy, it was the majority view since the beginning. It was the view of the Biblical Christian. The continuous use of the term "heresy" by certain men, was not based on biblical controversy, but more as a weapon to attack anyone who did not agree with their own views. This is what is happening even in our most modern times. Most Christians when confronted in a loving way with the truth of scripture or history, react in a similar fashion to that of Cyprian. They blindly believe that they are correct, referring to all others as not being "orthodox." Christians today have been sold the story that Jesus name baptism is nothing more than the Sabellius cult.

According to Pope Stephen and many others, baptism in the name of Jesus Christ was of "great advantage to faith." It also sanctified baptism! It is 100% Biblical. Trinitarians have been misguided by rejecting the name above all other names. The apostle wrote, "Wherefore God also hath highly exalted him, and given him a name which is above every name" (Phil 2:9). Trinitarian baptism does not invoke the name of Jesus Christ. It is the only name to be used in baptism. Using the word "Son" in the triune formula does not accurately exalt the name above all other names. Demons do not flee at the mention of the word *Son*. Modern Trinitarian defenders say nothing about Pope Stephen and baptism in the name of Jesus Christ. How convenient!

The Trinitarian cause would have ended early if not for the placing of Hippolytus as the first Antipope in history. An

Major Mistakes

Antipope is one who challenges the reigning pope by taking up the same office, and declaring himself to be the true pope. In other words, Catholics previously to the situation with Cyprian and Pope Stephen, were faced with having two very different popes and two very conflicting churches altogether. Incredibly, the bishop that would become pope after Stephen, would choose the teachings of Hippolytus, the one who had caused division in the first church. *Dionysius of Rome* (259-68 A.D.) became pope after both Stephen I, and Sixtus II were murdered and the office of the bishop (pope) was vacant.

Dionysius also sided with the Trinitarian pope of Alexandria, who also had a similar name. Did this bishop (of Rome) bring unity and peace among the two existing groups of Catholics? The new Pope of Rome would call a council together, the outcome of which would be the condemnation and persecution of the followers of Sabellius in 260 A.D. Other dates are given such as 261 all the way to 267. Dionysius was really attacking the Monarchian School of Rome and the majority of believers who rejected the Trinity. The Pope that was supposed to defend the majority, became their keen enemy. Pope Dionysius had chosen the side of the schismatic Trinitarians.

With this type of attacks, is it any wonder that the voice of the Monarchian majority would be silenced? This drastic turn of events would seal the fate for those who disagreed completely with the Trinity. It would also strengthen the Greek Logos teaching of the men who were now in control. This was a sad day in the history of Oneness believers. What this time period reveals is that because of persecution, the Trinity doctrine would prevail. Some modern theologians claim that the strength of orthodoxy alone, would

be enough to dispel any contrary views. This is speculation, and not the facts that are coming from history. Instead, the opposite of this is true. Without persecution, the Trinity would have continued to be widely rejected.

PREVIEW

Most Trinitarians now argue, "Then why is the Trinity considered orthodox?" The answer to that question would come not in the third century but the one following after. History would reveal that certain schismatic men originally from the Catholic Church would plot and conspire for all their future bishops and popes to represent solely their ideas pertaining to the Trinity. It would not be until the fourth century that Trinitarian Thinkers would assure that their philosophical tenets would become the only ones accepted by all of the Christian communities. All these activities that took place in the third century would prepare the way for the first historical ecumenical council that would bring a form of closure in the fourth.

As stated by one Trinitarian writer; "The labors of Hippolytus, Tertullian, Novatian, and Origen, however, had made their mark, and Monarchianism never again enjoyed the strength it had in the third century."⁹ The writer, although correct about these particular individuals, failed to mention their labors as church divisions, and Antipope activities that censored any opposition as nothing but heresy. All these men ended up on the opposite side of the Catholic Church. The author in praising these men, is admitting indirectly, that they were going against a much stronger movement. Monarchians had enjoyed being the majority for three centuries.

Major Mistakes

Before the Nicene Council would become a part of history, a most horrific persecution was still to come. This was the one that included burning the bibles and murdering Christians. Peace would arrive only after the "Edict of Milan" would be put in place. A man by the name of Constantine would later become sole emperor of Rome, and in contrast to all past emperors, somewhat conveniently favorable towards Christianity. After countless years of persecution, many would welcome this change, even if it meant accepting Rome with its other pagan beliefs and practices. Others would remain faithful and continue to suffer for the name of Jesus.

Christian philosophy would unite with pagan Rome to become the State/Religion of the Roman Empire. It would legalize Christianity, but somehow this particular brand would not liberate the people, it would steer them even further from the truth of God's Word. Contrary to this Church, biblical Christianity would not find any comfort, but rather continuous persecution by the mere exaltation of philosophy and the traditions of men. Freedom to believe the bible would be replaced with *dogmatic theology* (only what the controlling church says). This would set the stage for future years of persecution against biblical Christians.

This is the history of the Catholic Church. It would be apparent, as the fourth century would come around, that it was not a biblical Christianity that prevailed, but rather a more philosophical version. The people involved in the decision making were of that caliber. They would reflect the teachings and practices of the Alexandrian School of thought, and not that of the early church with its foundational teachings rooted in Christ (Col 2:7). It would have to be a Christianity that would accept compromise with the Roman government, and as

time would reveal, also one that would allow much more paganism to come into the church. There would be changes that would completely alter the true gospel of Jesus Christ. The fruit of all these things is known as the modern Roman Catholic Church.

A Christ centered faith would have never allowed paganism to be mixed with Holy Scripture. The meetings (not councils) that took place in apostolic times of the New Testament were marked with strong participation of the Holy Spirit. God's Spirit would dictate directly to those believers of the first century. For example, the meeting that took place in the fifteenth chapter of Acts states, "For it seemed good to the Holy Ghost, and to us, to lay upon you no greater burden than these necessary things;" (Acts 15:28). This was not a form of speech that acknowledged the Holy Spirit, but a real and direct relationship with God who participated openly in those special meetings.

This is how the early church conducted its assemblies. The Lord was in control! Many Trinitarians have lied about the fact that whenever the word "council" is mentioned in scripture, it is always something brought together by men who came after the true church. Bible Christians never conducted a single council throughout its first century existence. All seven major historic councils that would develop after, and that includes the first Council of Nicaea of 325, had a certain distinction. They were all organized under the same Catholic banner of Rome. Most of these participants were Christian philosophers, religious opportunists, and Roman politicians.

In the fourth century, it would be the pagan Roman Emperor who would oversee, control, and declare the outcome of their decisions. Catholics would argue shamelessly that the

Major Mistakes

Roman Emperor was a true Christian. These arguments are groundless when the correct facts of the emperor's life are examined. Such things as "Sun worship," "murder," and a "deathbed baptism" by an Arian bishop, stand in the way of a true biblical Christianity. His legendary vision of the cross would not be enough to convert the man. He was convinced of Christianity, but he was not ever converted to Christ. If it is accepted that Arians were and are heretics as in the writings of Athanasius, then, Constantine would also prove to be a double minded heretic.

Chapter 4

Fourth Century

Christian Philosophy Becomes Dogmatic Theology Roman Catholic Christianity Versus All Others 300-400 A.D.

It was the *Roman Emperor Diocletian* who persecuted Christians and burned their bibles at the beginning of the fourth century. Although it was considered somewhat of a general persecution, not all regions of his kingdom were affected. Nonetheless, it was considered to be, one of the worst persecutions in history. Diocletian, a man who was directly controlled by Satan, had sought to obliterate bible believing Christians. With the use of divination (oracles), he was led to believe that biblical Christians were a hindrance to his reign of power. Like the future Hitler of Germany, who sought to exterminate the Jews, Diocletian would not be completely successful. That is because the "gates of hell will not prevail against it" (the Church). See Matthew 16:18.

Bibles were confiscated and burned as Christians were martyred in large numbers. Then, the un-expectable occurs. The "Edict of Milan," becomes law, and temporary peace follows. Constantine's involvement in relation to the church would appear some 13 years later, when two bishops of Alexandria would quarrel over the issue of the Trinity. How did the Trinity become such an important doctrine when it had been rejected by the majority of Christians in the third century, including bishops and popes? Regardless of the steps taken previously by a persecuting Trinitarian mindset to dispel all

opposition, problems with the Trinity doctrine would surface once again.

What Happened to the Monarchian Majority?

When one considers the participants at the Council of Nicaea, 325 A.D., something becomes quite apparent. The Christian believers that formed the majority of members in the earliest church communities of the first, second, and third centuries were not represented at Nicaea. Instead the council was made up of two smaller groups of bishops. One, was the representation given by those bishops who identified with the schismatic Trinitarian view of the third century. These were men that agreed with the first Antipope, "Hippolytus." They were connected doctrinally with the school of Alexandria. The bishops that were on the side of Arius, who questioned certain aspects of the Trinity, made up the second group.

Before the Great Persecution of the fourth century, it was Dionysius of Rome and Dionysius of Alexandria, who had persecuted those who agreed with the Theological School of Rome. Since the Oneness Popes were no longer in office, they indeed attacked the majority of believers by accusing them of heresy. The question is raised, "What happened to the Monarchian Majority" since the take over? The Monarchian Theological School of Rome sponsored by the Roman Popes of the third century, would quietly slip into oblivion. The doors of that school would be closed forever. Trinitarian Thinkers would pretend that no such school in Rome ever existed. Oneness believers had been branded heretics by none other than the Trinitarian popes who took advantage of their office. Their aim had been to silence all opposition.

The coming of the Great Persecution by Diocletian would only make matters worse. It can be surmised that many biblical Oneness believers fell during this time of great testing. Monarchian or Oneness Christians who defended their stance from the scriptures alone, were heavily persecuted and their bibles burned. It is not assumed that they were the only ones being killed, but it can be deduced that large numbers of them perished during this perilous time. This is why at the time of the council of Nicaea, the division causing Trinity was such a prominent doctrine. The minority of Trinitarians were now in a controlling position of power.

Athanasius, Constantine, Eusebius

Acronym: ACE

While some historians inform about this council, they do not explain who the men involved represented. They fail to relate that a certain group of men who attended this meeting were defenders of the theological school of Alexandria. These men were followers of Clement of Alexandria, and Origen. They believed in the Trinity through the use of allegorical interpretation. The leader of the pack, *Athanasius*, although a deacon, was a representative of that school. He believed like the rest of his group, along with those bishops of the second and third centuries, that the Greek Logos was the preexistent Son. This was Philo's wisdom-logos application.

The logos of the bible and the logos of Philo were never the same! The Greek Logos according to Philo, was known by many names starting with "the divine mind," "God's transcendent power," "the reason of God," "God the word," "second God," "mediator," "the angel of the Lord," "image of God," "the ambassador," "second Person," "God from God,"

and "divine wisdom" among others.¹ This was exceedingly tempting for the Ante-Nicene Fathers! Jesus became God the word to Ignatius. Justin called the Son, God's power, angel, and the second God. The Son was identified as the reason of God by Athenagoras. Accordingly, Tertullian referred to the Son as God from God, and the second Person. **3.606.**

To Athanasius as with Origen, it was the Word and Wisdom! It is amazing how Trinitarian Theologians have bypassed this information throughout the centuries! They even deny that Philo had anything to do with this! How else would the fathers come up with such an anti-biblical doctrine that would make God into a plurality of persons? It came through Greek philosophy and Philo's God with his equal powers or *persons*. To Philo these powers were distinct and equal. The modern "New Advent Catholic Encyclopedia" reveals Philo as the exclusive authority when it comes to the study of the logos.²

According to Athanasius, Christ's preexistence could be proven from the theory of "Divine Wisdom" which they interpreted from Proverbs 8:22. This was the same identical application given by Philo Judaeus, Ignatius, Justin, Irenaeus, Theophilus, Origen, etc. In other words, there was a consistent line drawn by Christian philosophers that led up to the Council of Nicaea. Any sincere person who researches this matter will find the evidence to be overwhelming. Philo used Proverbs 8 in the same identical fashion to describe wisdom as "one of the beings of the divine company."³ There are far too many correlations between Philo and the fathers to disregard the connection! For any reader to deny at this point such conclusions, would be delusional.

Proverbs 8:22 speaks about wisdom as feminine, and as a defense against the evil woman of chapter seven. In other words, these verses "personify" wisdom to teach an important lesson. These men would follow earlier precedence and claim that although this wisdom was feminine, it was Christ. It is important to understand that in this same biblical passage other words were also personified. The words "understanding" and "prudence" were used in the exact same language as wisdom. Yet no claim to their preexistence as divine beings is seen in the bishop's writings. This is known as twisting or manipulation of scripture!

If personified, the same as Wisdom, these attributes would have given these philosophers, more than three persons in the Trinity. It is important to note that Gnostics and those who followed the secret "Kabbalah" did make use of all these personifications. Another example of the incredible mistake that Trinitarians commit in using personification can be found in the following verse. The bible states, "**righteousness and judgment** are the habitation of his throne" (Ps 97:2). One could easily access by using the same ridiculous application, that living with God throughout eternity are righteousness, judgment, understanding, prudence, and wisdom. This would be six persons or beings in the Godhead.

The other group at the Nicene Council had some bishops on the side of Arius. While Bishop Arius was known as a learned teacher, his doctrine was not comparable to that of the earliest biblical foundational teachings of the Monarchian Majority. The majority had defended their stance exclusively from scripture. For Arius to allude that Jesus was not the Almighty God, is to go against the entire New Testament. See Revelation 1:8. An analysis of each group, that of Arius and

Athanasius, reveals a lack of bible proficiency among both. They were adding and taking away from the words of Christ to prove their theories.

The men represented by Athanasius insisted God was never alone in creation. There were other divine beings by his side. This is where the wrong concept of a triune Godhead started. It began with men separating the reason (logos) of God from God. The phrases, "Light from Light, God from God, are philosophical terms. These well-known words can be found in Philo's "On Rewards and Punishment,"⁴ and also in the most celebrated fourth century *Nicene Creed*. How did Philo's words or ideas appear in the Nicene Creed?

Trinitarian thinkers have never explained the exact origin of these statements. A portion of this famous creed reads, "And in one Lord Jesus Christ, the only-begotten Son of God, begotten of the 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" (Nicene Creed). Authors of books on the Trinity that include the creeds, do not even come close to explaining where these phrases came from. Some of them do tell us that it was *Eusebius of Caesarea* who alone "proposed the creed that was accepted and later modified" by the same council.⁵

The interesting thing about Eusebius is the fact that he was a devoted follower of the allegorical teachings of Philo of Alexandria. The book "Ecclesiastical History" by Eusebius of Caesarea reveals all too well, the faith of this Catholic Bishop. He wrote about Philo, "During the reign of this emperor, Philo became noted, a man most distinguished for his learning, not only *among many of our own*, but of those who came from abroad."⁶ Apart from insisting that Philo met Peter at Rome,

and conversed with him, he stated that Philo's rendition of the monastery life of the Catholics of Alexandria was accurate. Eusebius wrote, "These declarations of Philo respecting those of our communion, we deem obvious and indisputable."

Eusebius can be included in the list of Catholic bishops that endorsed the teachings of Philo and who made Philo appear as a follower of Christ. Eusebius included in his history all of the major works of this famed philosopher, listing every single book by name. If not for Eusebius, Philo's literary works would be far less accessible. It was bishops such as this one, that are responsible for this type of philosophy to have entered in the guise of Christian doctrine. Some without reviewing these facts, strongly disagree that the "Catholic Trinity" is coming directly from pagan sources.

Although, the *Arians* at that convocation would lose to Athanasius and his group, they would continue fighting for many years. The *Emperor Constantine* who sided with Athanasius and his group, would later shift sides through the influence of an Arian Bishop. He would even reverse the decisions of Nicaea ten years later. Gaining ground through one of Constantine's sons, the Arians would be restored to power and influence. Arianism would be the faith of the Catholic Church for over forty years. Athanasius would be deposed many times and even accused of heinous crimes such as murder. This is the sad but true story of the man they would ultimately call, "The Father of Orthodoxy."

It is amazing how little Trinitarians know about such details in the history of their Trinity. Most Christians do not even have an understanding of how this doctrine developed through the years. Much less do they understand how the Trinity passed right through the Reformation. They mistakenly

claim the Trinity doctrine to be a revelation and a mystery. It has always been Catholic dogma. It silently persecutes in the present, but since its inception, for hundreds of years, this belief represents a constant barrage of lies, forgeries, hatred, and murders in the name of a Triune God. This is the corrupt fruit of a false gospel and the traditions of men.

The majority of modern day debates are seldom on the origin or history of the "word" Trinity. Trinitarian Thinkers make false claims as to "historical biblical Christianity" by giving this title to second and third century bishops who really had a different agenda. When confronted with the evidence of the first three centuries, misinformed Christians deny, argue, and attack with false accusations. The Council of Nicaea was not godly, but one of politics that swayed with those who were favored by Constantine.

To understand how deception has remained for so many years in Christian communities which are now called denominations, all one has to do is to inquire, "What happened in the first three centuries prior to the creation of a Catholic State/Religion?" Most Trinitarians will have no real answer for this! One can take the route of purchasing as many books on the Trinity as money will allow. Yet, the answer will not be found in any of those sources. Some authors of those books pretend to present the history and origin of the Trinity, but in the process omit all true and conflicting historical evidence.

The Woman Sits On the Beast

Years of research would prove that the establishment of the fourth century "Imperial" Catholic Church is what gave the world, the Trinity doctrine. The *Theodosian Code* of 381

A.D. would pick up where the council of 325 had left off. The second council of Constantinople would be extremely important to Christian philosophers, for it would reestablish the rulings of the council of Nicaea. It would make "Catholic Christians" the only members of the religion of the state, and all others would be condemned as heretics. Unfortunately, only one side would reap the benefits of so-called orthodoxy. The Trinity doctrine became the exclusive tool that would be used to persecute all bible believing Christians.

Welcome to dogmatic theology! This is the teaching that only the orthodox (Catholic view) is correct. The **Roman Beast** would continue to trample under foot all who stood in its way as it had always done in the past. The Old Testament documents the four beasts or world kingdoms in the book of Daniel: "Babylon, the Medes and Persians, Greeks, and the final beast as pagan Rome." Daniel reveals the fourth beast: "After this I saw in the night visions, and behold a fourth beast, dreadful and terrible, and strong exceedingly; and it had great iron teeth: it devoured and brake in pieces, and stamped the residue with the feet of it: and it was diverse from all the beasts that were before it; and it had ten horns" (Dan 7:7).

Suddenly, a mysterious woman would sit on the fourth beast and would freely drink of the cup filled with the blood of the martyrs of Jesus Christ (Rev 17). John stated, "and I saw a woman sit on a scarlet colored beast." Rome is the fourth beast of the book of Daniel, and the woman that sits on the beast is the city, or religion of Rome. The bible declares, "And the woman which thou sawest is that great city, which reigneth over the kings of the earth" (Rev 17:18). Neither America, nor Jerusalem are that city. To begin with, America is not a city.

Jerusalem is not the city that sits over Rome. Only **Vatican City** fits the description perfectly.

Rome was wrong in murdering Non-Trinitarians as is clearly shown in verse 4 where she drinks from a cup full of abominations and filthiness apart from blood. Catholic Theologians and Apologists write about this period of 381 A.D., expressing the lie that for the first time in history, "Christians were killing Christians." This cannot possibly be true! It was the merging of the Roman beast with that of the Catholic Church. It was a religious Antichrist system that without mercy, was murdering innocent believers. The making of the Trinity into law had produced those who thought that by killing, were doing God service (John 16:2).

It was never Christians killing Christians, but rather, the women who sat on the beast that was killing and drinking innocent blood. Those saying such ridiculous things about Christians, do not know or understand the bible. Believers are not a part of the "Great Whore" (Rev 17:1, 6). One only has to study the history of Vatican City to learn if she also commanded respect and allegiance from the kings of the earth. Study the entire history of the Roman Catholic Church. Most members of this institution are completely blind to its pagan roots. Others know, yet they continue to cover up their lies. There are hundreds of books written on the subject. One simple example is, "A Dark History: The Popes," by Brenda Ralph Lewis.⁷

The Evolution of Catholicism

For over a thousand years, through much persecution, the Roman Catholic Church would reign supreme. The bible

reveals, "And I saw the woman drunken with the blood of the saints, and with the blood of the martyrs of Jesus: and when I saw her, I wondered with great admiration" (Rev 17:6). In 1054 there would be a split between the East and the West. In all those years, would Rome proclaim the one and only gospel of Jesus Christ? It never did. The Christian philosophers who started this particular kind of religion were never strictly biblical Christians. Rome's idolatrous gospel was completely distinct from the gospel of the apostles.

Church communities that followed the scriptures only, were not accepted by Rome. History reveals that there were many groups of believers that continued to proclaim the true gospel despite the serious dangers. To be acknowledged by Rome, they would have to follow the traditions that Catholics alone held as gospel truth. Many were not willing to do such a thing. *The Dark Ages* (500-1500 A.D.) were especially known for "religious superstition," "famine," "disease," and "wars." Indeed, this was a "backwards time" in the history of mankind. True churches and bible believers have continued through the centuries despite persecution from Rome.

Although, Rome would persecute those who rejected the Trinity, it would not persecute for those false doctrines which she herself was responsible. If Rome was to be tried for her many heretical teachings, she would have been burned many times over. God has taken note of this and will reward her twice (Rev 18:6). The dates listed here were taken from LaHaye's book on Revelation. Some more were added. Before providing the list of horrors, LaHaye wrote that the influence of paganism increased over the years, step by step. He also mentioned that from A.D. 312 on, the Church became more Roman and less Christian in its practices.⁸ Then the author

Major Mistakes

does the unthinkable! LaHaye left out 325 A.D., the year the Trinity became official.

- 300 A.D. Sign of the cross
- 300 A.D. prayer for the dead
- 312 A.D. Edict of Milan
- 325 A.D. ??????????????????
- 375 A.D. worship of saints/angels
- 381 A.D. ??????????????????
- 394 A.D. Mass introduced
- 431 A.D. worship of Mary
- 500 A.D. priest dress
- 526 A.D. Extreme unction
- 593 A.D. doctrine of purgatory
- 600 A.D. Latin services
- 600 A.D. prayers to Mary
- 607 A.D. Boniface III, 1st pope
- 709 A.D. kissing pope's foot
- 786 A.D. worship of images
- 847 A.D. Decretals of Isidore
- 850 A.D. holy water
- 858 A.D. Donation of Constantine
- 995 A.D. canon of dead saints

- *998 A.D. fasting on Fridays
- 1079 A.D. celibacy
- 1090 A.D. prayer beads
- 1184 A.D. inquisition
- 1190A.D. sale of indulgences
- 1229 A.D. bible forbidden/lay men
- 1414 A.D. cup forbidden
- 1439 A.D. seven sacraments
- 1534 A.D. Jesuit Order
- 1854 A.D. Immaculate Conception
- 1929 A.D. Lateran Treaty
- 1950 A.D. Assumption of Mary

Leaving out the *Trinity of A.D. 325* from LaHaye's list, reveals a denial by most modern Trinitarian teachers that the Trinity is the product of the Roman Catholic Church. Leaving out A.D. 381 prevents Christians from learning that Catholics were killing Christians in the name of the Trinity. The *Theodosian Code* with all these teachings and practices listed, give the woman a well deserved name written upon her forehead. The name says it all: "MYSTERY, BABYLON THE GREAT, THE MOTHER OF HARLOTS AND ABOMINATIONS OF THE EARTH" (Rev 17:5). There is no other entity in the entire world that fits this description!

Catholics train their people to counter any accusations having to do with these pagan beliefs. They play the "devil's

advocate." Is it possible that one religious organization can practice all these things? It is up to the reader to research and decide whether the many doctrines mentioned classify as abominations and names of blasphemy (Revelation 17:3). Renaming the dated material gives a more serious situation: "necromancy, creature worship, polytheism, goddess worship, emperor worship, idol worship, changing the Word of God, covetous practices, murder, amulets, and a works salvation." Forbidding to marry and commanding to abstain from meats are considered doctrines of devils (I Timothy 4:1-3). Speaking lies in hypocrisy is also a trademark of evil.

Researching The Protestant Reformation

Before one decides to call another a heretic on the sole basis of the Trinity, it is strongly suggested for believers to examine their own denomination. Most Protestants do not understand that they came from a *dysfunctional family*. In this case it is the "Mother Church" of Rome. Some who are the loudest in decrying "heresy," are usually hiding even greater doctrinal atrocities than what one can imagine. This is the history of the Catholic religion. A list can also be drawn up of Protestants who hold many anti-biblical doctrines. They erroneously hold their leaders on a pedestal by following their interpretations of scripture, instead of following Christ. These leaders teach from certain portions of the bible and also maintain Catholic dogma.

The same applies to those who have hatred of others, simply because of their skin color. The bible says that if you hate your brother, you are a murderer. Then there are those who reject salvation by grace. They rather teach obedience to

the law of Moses and keeping certain observances. The bible states that some "entered not in" because of unbelief. Others teach that God is not in the miracle business anymore. Miracles according to them, have ceased. Also rejected are spiritual gifts, and *the promise of the Father*. Rejecting all that the Holy Spirit has to offer, is a serious offense. It is teaching a different gospel.

A growing number claim that Christ died for some, but not for all. This contradicts the bible directly. Holiness is denied by teaching that a life full of sin will not prevent a person from entering heaven. They are known as false grace teachers. There are many that hold to religious unity on social issues, instead of unity upon God's Word. To them, worldly unity is better than God's truth. This is hypocrisy at a high level, and disobedience to Christ. What about those who deny the divinity of Christ? What is their status before the Savior? Then, there are those who make out the Father or the Holy Spirit to be feminine. They proclaim that God is a she. This is witchcraft in the church. Some hold a Narcissistic view, for only their church is the true church.

The subject of the ***Protestant Reformation*** (1300's to 1500's) is something that must be re-studied by today's true biblical Christians. The reason being that most of today's Christian denominations have been greatly affected by this period of history. Was there a complete break from Rome, or were there terms of compromise that ended the movement? The latter seems to be the case. From its historical timeframe it can be seen that the earliest Reformers were completely against Rome. See *Wycliffe* or *Savonarola*. The second wave of Reformers that ended the Reformation, were not as radical. Some might argue that the movement is still reforming.

Major Mistakes

Although promises were made, the truth is that those promises were broken. Oct. 31st, 1517, concerning Luther, is cited as the official start of the Protestant Reformation.

Thanks to the counter reformation movement, today most churches observe October 31, as **Halloween**, instead of Reformation Day. The spiritual significance of one celebration to that of the other is miles apart. Young people have no idea that Halloween is a cover-up for one of the most important events in religious history. Most modern Christians fail to see the extreme sacrifices that were made to attain religious freedom, and to break away from the tyrannical power of Rome. It took real faith and extreme bravery to post the 95 theses on the door of that historical building. Luther's exposition of "indulgences" was just one aspect of Rome's corruption.

From many of the Protestant confessions, the failure to discern the Catholic Creeds can be observed. Some even mention those creeds in their confessions. Leaders within these Reformed Churches teach their members that the "Apostles Creed," the "Nicene Creed," and the "Athanasian Creed," are all useful in the maintaining of orthodoxy. Members of these churches believe that by holding on to the creeds, they are historic biblical Christians. A simple research will reveal that these creeds are not what they claim to be. They appear apostolic, but their philosophical content is far from biblical truth. The origin or hidden authorship is never questioned. As a result, they have foolishly built their house upon the sand (Mat 7:26).

A most telling of accounts occurred on Oct. 27th, 1553. A Protestant Reformer by the name of **Michael Servetus** was unlawfully arrested, jailed, and later burned at the stake

by the strong influence of **John Calvin**. What was his crime? He wrote books in which he addressed "infant baptism" and the "Trinity" as both being unbiblical. He was absolutely right! What is most incredible about this occurrence was that it took place in a supposedly Protestant free, Non-Catholic Republic known as **Geneva**. Calvin's own writings reveal himself as masterminding the murder of Servetus. Clearly, John Calvin betrayed the Reformation in order to accomplish the desires of his cruel and evil heart. See "Did Calvin Murder Servetus?" by Standford Rives.⁹

Calvin's "Institutes of the Christian Religion" reveal all too clearly the same mistakes of the past. When it comes to the chapter that deals with the Trinity, Calvin's arguments and defense of Catholic formulations, are not new. He quotes Catholic Augustine and his rejection of the true meaning of John 14:10. This is the verse that states, "I am in the Father, and the Father in me." Augustine claimed that this meant "mutual relationship between persons, instead of the very substance by which they are one."¹⁰ Calvin also taught that Solomon's meaning of Proverbs 8:22, was that "Wisdom was begotten by God." He alluded by this to the preexistence of the Son of God. The Son, according to Calvin, was begotten of the Father before all ages.

Although, the majority of Reformers held to the golden nugget of the Reformation, which was "Scripture shall interpret Scripture," they limited this precious biblical truth to only certain doctrines. It is because of men such as Calvin, who refused correction, that the Trinity continued as a pertinent issue for Christian denominations. Most modern Reformers see **Calvin as the greatest of theologians**. It is this same blindness that deceives most Christian scholars not only

Major Mistakes

to the Trinity, but infant baptism as well. Calvin was the bridge between the Protestant, Reformed, and of course, the Catholic religion. It became a "conflict of interest."

As a result of Calvin's treason, the main leaders of the Reformation did not completely break free from Catholicism. Most Trinitarians of Christian denominations in order to defend their inherited position, are divided into two groups. **Group A** consists of those believers who are in complete denial that the Trinity doctrine came exclusively from the Roman Catholic Church. They identify themselves as biblical Trinitarians. They try to defend from the bible. **Group B** represents those who admit to the historical evidence, but see nothing wrong with this affiliation! Both of these groups contradict each other, and are wrong in their shallow defense of the Trinity.

Denominations, in order to prevent their members from discovering their affiliation with Catholic dogma, teach that doctrines such as the Trinity and infant baptism are coming directly from the bible. This is completely unfair to their loyal members, especially to those who came out of Catholicism. These same disciples of whatever denomination, will argue and consistently fight over the Trinity, defending this philosophy as if they were defending the bible. What they are really protecting are the dogmatic tenets of the Roman Catholic Church. Like an alcoholic who denies any problems with alcohol, these disciples are in complete denial that the Trinity is Catholic.

Those same Protestant and Reformed who deny their Catholic affiliation, can never come up with any information on the first Protestant who received the Trinity as a revelation. The second question would be "How did they come up with

the same words such as "persons," "substance," "coeternal," "coequal," and so forth? Most of these words are not biblical words. The Catholic Catechism claims that these words came through their own use of philosophy. Reformed groups despite this declaration, continue to teach their people that the Trinity is a biblical doctrine. Some deny that by holding on to this pagan belief, they are the children of the same mother.

Other Calvinist are open and straight forward about their Catholic heritage. See for example, "What is Reformed Theology" by R.C. Sproul.¹¹ Sproul is correct in insisting that Reformed Theology is Catholic Theology. The problem here is that this connection is seen as a good thing! How can Mystery Babylon be a good thing? This is why the label of heresy is placed on all who reject the Trinity doctrine instead of accusing this "Mother" religion of bringing the most terrible of blasphemies into the Christian communities. Most see this organization as harmless, and as a certain type of Christian Church that has a couple of errors in their faith. Again, this is ***a conflict of interest***. This is having a double standard.

The persecution and death of millions has quietly been swept under the rug. Any person, group, or religion that kills in the name of God cannot be Christian! When members are confronted with this information, these same religious people are in complete denial. They have never been told how certain leaders were involved in this horrendous practice. Even more ignorance is displayed when the Catholic creeds are shown to have been the primary tools by which many suffered. See the fruits of the "Theodosian Code," the "Justinian Code," or the "Inquisition." Catholic Rome murdered more Christians since it sat on the beast, than Pagan Rome in the first three centuries of persecution. It is estimated in the millions!

Major Mistakes

Some Christian leaders (Trinitarians) and friends of Rome, downplay idolatry in the Catholic Church, along with certain practices that are completely pagan. The titles given to Mary such as Mother of God, and Queen of Heaven determine how much *veneration* is given. Catholics address their leaders as "fathers," and their high priest as "holy father" in defiance to Christ's words. Jesus had previously stated, "And call no man your father upon the earth: for one is your Father, which is in heaven" (Matt 23:9). Even the title for the pope "Holy Father," pertains to God alone (John 17:11). These are not simple mistakes! Occult symbolism is everywhere for the wise to behold.

Television preachers (mostly Group B) are highly responsible for keeping the majority of Believers in the dark about these issues. The masses of people receive no warnings. These television personalities promote unity and favor with the Catholic Church. The nations of the world are completely blind, more so than most religious organizations. This includes America! There is no such thing as "separation of Church and State" when it comes to the Pope. Wake up! The bible reveals this startling fact: "For all nations have drunk of the wine of the wrath of her fornication, and the kings of the earth have committed fornication with her, and the merchants of the earth are waxed rich through the abundance of her delicacies" (Rev 18:3).

While the nations and most major denominations see this "Mystery Babylon" with favor, the Lord Almighty warns of his wrath against such an alliance. The bible makes it clear that all Christians must come out: "And I heard another voice from heaven, saying, Come out of her, my people, that ye be not partakers of her sins, and that ye receive not of her

plagues" (Rev 18:4). God truly is calling his people. One cannot belong to the Church of Jesus and also to Babylon. This includes all of Babylon's doctrines including the Trinity. The only mystery about the Trinity is how Rome managed to convince Protestant, Reformed, and denominational Churches to keep it within their confessions.

What Side are You On?

When a serious study is undertaken on yesteryear's Reformers, the results are conclusive. All of them believed that Rome was connected to the woman who rides the beast. One modern prolific author writes about them, "The leaders of the Reformation were certain that she represented the Roman Catholic Church in general and the pope in particular."¹² He also stated that many of today's theologians no longer hold to that view. Some proclaim that this woman still remains a mystery. Again, the book of Revelation states that God wants us to "come out of her so that we receive not of her plagues." See Revelation 18:4.

It would be quite unreasonable for God to command his people to come out of something without revealing or telling them what that something signifies. For modern pastors to act like no one knows the meaning or interpretation of "the woman drunk with the blood of the martyrs" is frankly very revealing of what side they stand on. Dave Hunt wrote a marvelous book in which he ventures out to uncover once and for all, the identity of that woman.

He was so confident with the outcome of his research that he wrote, "Although many readers may denounce our conclusions, no one will be able to refute them."¹³ Indeed, the

evidence set forth in his book is of that magnitude! This documentation is unmatched by those who claim America, Jerusalem, or historic Babylon to be the mysterious woman of Revelation.

What was Dave's conclusion? On page 65 he wrote, "The woman represents a worldwide religious system which is based in Rome and claims to be Christian but which has its roots in Babel and Babylon."¹⁴ There is a major group of Christians, both Trinitarian and Oneness, who agree with Hunt that Catholic Rome is the woman who rides the beast. The difference is that only Oneness believers reject the Trinity because of its Babylonian roots. The other, for whatever reason, is in total denial. If the Roman Catholic Church has its roots in Babylon, none of her doctrines can be received by true bible believing Christians. Her teachings are *the product of her fornication*. The teaching on the Trinity happens to be her number one proclamation!

The golden cup in her hand reveals the truth of Rome's doctrines, traditions, and pagan connections. They cannot be anywhere related to the glorious gospel, or the infallible word of our wonderful Savior. In other words, nothing that Rome offers is coming from the words of the Almighty. There is no purity found in a whore! See Revelation 19:2. The book of Proverbs teaches, "Every word of God is pure: he is a shield unto them that put their trust in him" (Prov 30:5). Some Trinitarian theologians are of the idea that although Rome is Mystery Babylon, people should not judge her as to her doctrines. This is not only wrong, but a serious condition. See chapter six. As a result, most scholars have *compromised* with the Harlot.

The bottom line is that all Christians must decide on what side they are on. If they decide to adhere to modern theologians and their denial of the *Goddess Roma* (from where Rome gets her name) as the woman who sits on the beast, they must prove that the author of "A Woman Rides the Beast" was completely wrong in his research. Hunt's research yielded undeniable historical facts that prove the Catholic Church to have persecuted more Christians than any other entity on the face of the earth, including pagan Rome. This is just one of the many facts that exposes the Catholic religion. There are many, many more.

Those who disagree with Dave Hunt must intelligently defend their position and prove that Rome cannot be the one that all of the early Reformers called "the seat of Antichrist." This so great a cloud of witnesses includes such names as: Wycliffe, Huss, Waldenses, Hussites, Luther, Calvin, Zwingli, Melanchthon, Ecolampadius, Bucer, Beza, Calixtus, Bengel, Michaelis, Cranmer, Latimer, Ridley, Knox, Alford, Elliot, Lange, Hooper, Hutchinson, Tyndale, Sandys, Philpot, Jewell, Rogers, Fulke, Bradford, King James, Queen Elizabeth, and all Protestant writers, to name a few.

What is most impressive is the fact that this list does not include the countless books and articles that confirm Catholic Rome as the same Woman of Revelation. Searching through bible commentaries renders the identical conclusion. Bible Commentaries such as, "Jamieson, Fausset, and Brown," "Adam Clarke," "Barnes Notes," "Geneva," "Matthew Henry," "Wycliffe commentary," are just a few examples.

One of the strongest voices that has directly exposed "Constantine's phony Christian church" in more recent times is that of "Alberto Rivera" and Chic Publications (Double-Cross,

page 25). Although written in a Comic Book format, the information exposing the Catholic Church is well documented. Rivera, an Ex-Jesuit priest, was adamant about divulging the secret activities of the men known as the Jesuits. These hidden activities included training for *infiltration into all Christian denominations*. Does this sound familiar? Review chapter one.

Jesuits are bound by oath to protect the interests of the Pope and that of the Catholic Church. The oath is not a godly one, but one that mimics the Mafia, with its adherents to strangle, poison, and kill with all means available. Rivera pointed to ecumenism as the last plot to bring all churches under the banner of a one world Church. The Ex-Jesuit affirmed that "Roman Catholics are not Christians, and that the Roman Catholic Institution is not a Christian church."¹⁵

Along with Hislop's "the Two Babylons" which has never been successfully refuted, the witness against the Trinity is serious business. Can anything good come out of Babylon? Hislop went even further with his claims. He wrote of the Catholic Church, "If the position I have laid down can be maintained, she must be stripped of the name of a Christian Church altogether."¹⁶ The advice given here puts all believers on strong alert.

Dave Hunt's monumental work *indirectly* destroys all notions that the roots of the Trinity are godly. If Catholic Rome has been proven to be Non-Christian by this so great a cloud of witnesses, then Christians must not fall under her seductions. They must not remain under her spells. The description given in Revelation is very revealing. The last part of verse 23 states, "for by thy sorceries were all nations deceived" (Rev 18:23). This includes modern churches!

Christians are not aware of the use of **SORCERY** in the Church. Remember Philo and Babylonian Mysticism? He was told by his own soul that in God there were two primary powers. In other words, God was a trinity! Though he was a Jew, his beliefs and practices in mysticism took him completely away from his true Jewish roots. Think about this! Research the Apocrypha books! There are many Christians who are in complete denial that the Trinity was first introduced by Catholic bishops who were putting out forgeries to deceive the simple minded.

ATTENTION Baptists, Methodists, Church of Christ, Lutheran, Reformed, Pentecostals, Non-Denominational, all Born Again Believers, all who promote *Sola Scriptura*, etc. If it cannot be proven that the Trinity originated from a Christian source, but in fact, is a product of the Whore of Babylon, then the Trinity doctrine is included in the cup full of abominations (Revelation 17:1, 4, 5). It is a serious offense against the true God of the bible. The doctrine must be rejected! One should not abuse God's **Grace** and **Mercy**! Do not mistake God's patience for His perfect Will! See Acts 17:23-31. Referring to idolatry, "the times of this ignorance God winked at; but now commandeth all men everywhere to repent."

The New Testament admonishes, "Be ye not unequally yoked together with unbelievers: for what fellowship hath righteousness with unrighteousness?" 'and what communion hath light with darkness?" (II Cor 6:14). The dictionary states that the word "ecumenical" is a movement that promotes Christian unity throughout the world. The problem here stems with the word Christian. The Lord Jesus taught that Christian unity would be based on his word alone: "Sanctify them through thy truth: thy word is truth" (John 17:17). Unity under

any other circumstance, is not Christian. God prohibits New Testament Believers from fellowshiping with darkness.

Steps in this process have already begun. "Evangelicals and Catholics Together" was signed in 1994, thanks to Chuck Colson (Ex-Nixon, Watergate Advisor). Colson served time in prison for his questionable participation in the Nixon administration. The *Lutheran and Catholic Joint Declaration* took place on October 31, 1999.¹⁷ Then the *Manhattan Declaration* was signed in 2009. A plea from the current Pope for all Charismatic movements to unite with Rome was seen on Jan. 21, 2014 in a video addressed to Kenneth Copeland Ministries. Apparently, Copeland was delighted with the pope and his messenger, Tony Palmer.

This man compared his ministry to that of the prophet "Elijah" while admitting at the same time to being a close friend of the pope. This is the equivalent to the historic Elijah being close friends with king Ahab and Jezebel. The historical Old Testament prophet (the real Elijah) was a friend of God who stood up against the "apostasy" of his time. Palmer stated that the "Reformation was over, and that everyone was now Catholic." At the time of this writing, shocking news would come that Palmer was killed in a motorcycle accident, just a few months after his ridiculous assertions were made before a wide television audience.

Serious questioning must be made about Copeland's views of scripture, including Ephesians 4:13, which was completely taken out of context. The verse says "till we all come in the unity of the faith." Studying the context of this passage does not fit the scenario at Copeland's meeting. The Apostle Paul was alluding to the different *Christian Ministries* given by the Lord to perfect the saints. This would

be done by preaching the pure gospel and correcting those things that were contrary to sound doctrine. The unity implied by the Pope, Palmer, and Copeland is completely opposed to that of the New Testament.

Christians must be aware that along with the Trinity, the Church of Rome brings the adoration of the "Mother of God." The endtimes will increase this frenzy of goddess worship. Most ecumenical participants will be part of this serious and long standing abomination. Revelation 13 is one of the scariest chapters in the entire bible. It points specifically to the world as worshipping the dragon, the beast, and *the image that speaks*. This is the chapter that exposes the number 666. The bible warns that the whole earth will worship.

In the final chapter of Revelation, Christ warns again of those who will not enter the holy city: "For without are dogs, and sorcerers, and whoremongers, and murderers, and *idolaters*, and whosoever loveth and maketh a lie" (Rev 22:15). There are multiple theologians who fall under the last category! Covering up true historical facts, and presenting only those things that point in favor of a Trinitarian position, is not a simple mistake before God. They are playing with God's Word. What about idolatry? Millions have been sold the idea that pictures and statues of Jesus, Mary, and other bible characters, are only reminders to help the religious in their devotion to God. They are ignoring the words of Jesus! They are making excuses for their rebellion.

Catholics do not need Mary to go to Jesus. The Lord made this invitation: "Come unto me, all ye that labour and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest" (Matt 11:28). You need not be afraid of Jesus, he loves you, and died for you! Study these verses on salvation: Mt 1:21, Acts 4:12, 26:18, 1Th 5:9,

Major Mistakes

2Ti 2:10, Heb 5:9. The last writing of the bible, the book of Revelation reminds us, that only God is to be worshipped. Paganism is the all-inclusive religion that has promoted the worship of many gods and goddesses throughout history. It started in Babylon and has continued to the present day through ***Mystery Babylon***. Those who worship Mary, the saints, angels, and that pray to and for the dead are in serious trouble. Repent or perish!

Can Christianity survive without a Trinity? It did in the first, second, and third centuries. The Christians honored and praised their God with every fiber of their being. They preached the eternal gospel with the help and power of the Holy Spirit. The majority of believers in those days were classified as Monarchians. They believed in the one true God of the bible. They upheld that Jesus was not another God, but the very image and person of the Almighty. The Holy Spirit was the self-same Spirit of God the Father. In the New Testament, the Holy Spirit is the Spirit of the Son. Would it not be better to go back to the true and original teachings of the early church?

It is actually Trinitarians who are continuously stating that belief in the Trinity is necessary for salvation. Some of them have forgotten that it was Christ who saved them in the first place! The bible states: "And being made perfect, he became the author of eternal salvation unto all them that obey him" (Heb 5:9). Does the "everlasting gospel" of Revelation 14:6 include a Trinity in its proclamation? The answer is both a historical and biblical "no." The evidence is there for the wise to behold.

The polytheistic Greek philosophy that came in the second century was never a part of the original teachings

given by Christ, his apostles, and the true biblical Christians that followed afterwards. Away with Babylon! Come out of her my people, that you partake not of her plagues! The bible clearly states, "Wherefore come out from among them, and be ye separate, saith the Lord, and touch not the unclean thing; and I will receive you" (2 Cor 6:17).

If the Trinity doctrine is coming from the Woman who rides the beast, then the teaching is not biblical. If Babylonian mysticism was the origin of this dogma (Philo's trinity), then, it is an unclean thing. For Trinitarians to stay with the Trinity, they must prove to the world, and to themselves, that the origin is coming exclusively from scripture. Unfortunately, this has already been proven to be a fallacy. Remember, Babylon's teachings are the product of her fornication.

Chapter 5

Trinitarian Thinkers

The differences between true Christians and Catholics are irreconcilable. It is a matter of authority. Do church communities take their stand on doctrinal issues from the bible or from the Church itself? Christians follow the Word of God exclusively. The gospel is eternal, protected by God himself. All Churches can be infiltrated, and historically this is what happened! Ironically, the only connection that keeps certain Christian denominations and the Catholic religion together is the Trinity doctrine. That is why a belief in a Triune God is such a contradiction to all Christian denominations, especially since the Trinity is the foundation of the Catholic Church! This is the only strand that keeps believers from breaking completely away from the sorcery of Mystery Babylon.

How can two church entities that have two completely different sources of authority, end up with the exact same foundation? It should have never happened! It was a deceptive betrayal within the Reformation. That is why intelligent men such as Michael Servetus were burned at the stake. The spirit of the Harlot was operating with Calvin in Geneva! Not only to persecute, but to defend its deceptive pagan foundation. This particular religion of Rome denies *Sola Scriptura*. If Catholicism denies Sola Scriptura, then the Trinity is not scriptural! What complicates matters even worse is the long standing history of forgery in the Church! Countless lies, cover-ups, and murders have all been committed in the name of Christianity. The Apostle Paul warned, "See then that ye

walk circumspectly, not as fools, but as wise" (Eph 5:15).
Christians wise up!

The fifth and sixth chapters will reveal some of these mistakes:

Baptism was not in the name of Christ.

The Apocrypha books are not dangerous.

Biblical history and Catholic history are similar.

Ante-Nicene Fathers were true Christians

Creeds are biblical and necessary.

The philosophical "persons" is acceptable.

Origin of the word "Trinity" is not important

Matthew 28:19 teaches Trinity and infant baptism.

Wisdom is the second divine person of the Trinity.

Tertullian was the first to mention Trinity.

The Apostle John was a philosopher.

Christians killed other Christians in the name of God.

Rome (Satan's seat) gave us pure, sound doctrine in 325 A.D.

*The Synthesis principle is practiced consistently by
Trinitarians.*

History of the church promotes the Trinity.

All Christians are Catholic.

Inferred doctrine is sound doctrine.

Godhead means three.

Christ is a woman.

The Holy Spirit is feminine.

Sabellius was a cult leader.

Dogmatic Theology is orthodoxy.

Three persons are not three beings.

Wisdom is the third member of the Trinity.

Major Mistakes

Philo had nothing to do with the Trinity

The Logos was a divine being before creation

Without the Trinity, there is no salvation

1st Century

Herein is a collection of some of the quotes by the men that came after the apostles. Citations are from the ten volume set of the Ante-Nicene Fathers.¹ The first number before the period is the volume number. The numbers after the period are the page numbers. Example: **1.61**. The number 1 stands for the volume number. The number 61 stands for the page number. Some of the quotes are self-explanatory. The last part of this chapter includes a very revealing snapshot of the Apocrypha. Within the content of these vast amounts of lost books comes the unveiling of Catholic doctrine and tradition.

Philo is mentioned because of his incredible influence with the Apostolic and Ante-Nicene Fathers. There are far too many quotes from this first century philosopher to include here. Those given, are to provide the reader with an idea of what Philo was saying in his numerous works. Some of his statements were mentioned in previous chapters. His teaching on the three days before the sun, and his alluding to wisdom as being a member of the *divine company* are mentioned in chapters one and four.

Philo of Alexandria

Mistake: Although this pagan philosopher has been mentioned throughout history, his actual writings on the Trinity have never really been exposed by any Trinitarian Thinkers. Most

modern theologians actually deny that Philo had anything to do with the Trinity of Christianity.

"It told me that in the one living and true God there were two supreme and primary powers ..." (referring to his mystical soul revelation) *The Works of Philo*, page 83.²

"For he called that divine and **heavenly wisdom** by many names; and he made it manifest that it had many appellations; for he called it the beginning, and the image, and the sight of God." *The Works of Philo*, page 29.

"For it was impossible that anything mortal should be made in the likeness of the most high God the Father of the universe; but it could only be made in the likeness of **the second God, who is the Word** of the other ..." *The Works of Philo*, page 747.

"the one in the middle is the Father of the universe, who in the sacred scriptures is called by his proper name, I am that I am; and the beings on each side are those most ancient **powers** which are always close to the living God, one of which is called his creative power, and the other his royal power." "... Therefore the middle **person** of the three" ... a vision at one time of **one being**, and at another time **of three**." *The Works of Philo*, page 421.

Ignatius of Antioch

Mistake: Most Reformers and Protestants do not expose this bishop's anti-biblical doctrines including the preexistent "God, the Word" (apart from God), and "perpetual virginity." Note how Ignatius combined **John 1:1** with **Proverbs 8**. This

technique would be used consistently all the way to Nicaea. His writings reveal the first mention of a triune baptism.

"He being begotten by the Father before the beginning of time, was God the Word, the only begotten Son, and remains the same forever." **1.61**

"For in the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God.' 'And in another place, the Lord created Me, the beginning of His ways, for His ways, for His works.' 'Before the world did He found Me, and before all the hills did He begat Me." **1.108**

"Wherefore also the Lord, when He sent forth the apostles to make disciples of all nations, commanded them to baptize in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and the Holy Ghost, not unto one [person] having three names, nor into three [persons] who became incarnate, but into three possessed of equal honour." **1.116**

"...while your bishop presides in the place of God, and your presbyters in the place of the assembly of the apostles..." **1.61**

"She is the lady of our new religion." "There is in Mary the mother of Jesus an angelic purity of nature allied with the nature of humanity." "She is full of all graces and all virtues, after the manner of a virgin." (our new religion-*the Catholic Church*) **1.124**

Mistake: Perpetual virginity is not a Christian doctrine. It is one of the first false teachings brought in by Trinitarians.

Didache

Mistake: Most Trinitarians make use of this New Testament "Apocrypha" book when defending Triune baptism. The book came a few years later to confirm Ignatius' own special version of baptism that was completely contrary to the early church. Note the permission given to pour water on the head three times.

"But if thou have not either pour out water thrice upon the head into the name of Father, Son, and Holy Spirit." **7.379**

"...thou shall not commit pederasty (sexually corrupt boys)." **7.377**

Mistake: It takes a certain type of men to abuse young boys. This same message would be included in several books of the Apocrypha. The Greek word implies "a love of boys." Some dictionaries define it as "homosexual relations between adults and boys."

"But let not your fasts be with the hypocrites; for they fast on the second and fifth day of the week." "Neither pray as the hypocrites; but as the Lord commanded..." "Thrice in the day thus pray." (referring to the Our Father) **7.379**

Mistake: The Didache reveals a separating of the community of believers into different camps. Who were the disciples who fasted on the second and fifth day of the week? The fact that they were called hypocrites for fasting on different days is questionable. Contradicting Christ's words, praying the "Our Father" three times a day is vain repetition (Matthew 6:7).

Major Mistakes

Clement of Rome

Mistake: Clement, one of the bishops who claimed apostolic succession, made use of mythology and the book of Judith.

"There is a certain bird which is called a phoenix.' It is the only one of its kind, and lives five hundred years." **1.12**

"The blessed Judith, when her city was besieged, asked of the elders permission to go forth into the camp of the strangers..." **1.20**

2nd Century

Barnabas, the Epistle

Mistake: This is a second century forgery that appeared after the Didache. It is part of the lost books of the Apocrypha. It promoted two Lords instead of one. Similar to the Didache, it warns against "pederasty" or sexually corrupting children. It makes an interesting point of the weasel.

"...He being Lord of all the world, *to whom God said* at the foundation of the world, "Let us make man after our image, and after our likeness." **1.139**

"And he has fully hated the weasel, ...'For this animal conceives with its mouth." *Lost Scriptures, Bart D. Ehrman, page 228.*

Justin Martyr

Mistake: He was one of the first to theoretically separate God into separate beings, similar to Philo and Ignatius. According

to these men, the Son (first power after God) was ***a second God***. Note his words, "that there is said to be, another God and Lord ..." This is not monotheism.

"And the first power after God the Father and Lord of all is the Word, who is also the Son; and of Him we will, in what follows, relate how He took flesh and became man." The Ante-Nicene Fathers, **1.173**

"that there is said to be, ***another God*** and Lord subject to the Maker of all things; who is also called an Angel, because He announces to men whatsoever the Maker of all things--above whom there is no other God--wishes to announce to them." Ante-Nicene Fathers, **1.223**

"I shall give you another testimony, my friends, said I, from the Scriptures, that God begat before all creatures a Beginning, a certain ***rational power*** from Himself, who is called by the Holy Spirit, now the Glory of the Lord, now the Son, again ***Wisdom***, again an Angel, then God, and then Lord and ***Logos***." Ante-Nicene Fathers, **1.227**

"The Word of Wisdom, who is Himself this ***God begotten*** of the Father of all things, and Word, and Wisdom, and Power, and the Glory of the Begetter..." **1.227**

Mistake: This is the same description (and identical words) used by Philo of Alexandria in his allegorical works. Catholic Fathers accepted the teachings of Philo, and incorporated them into their own works. Today's Trinitarian thinkers bypass this important information. That is why the Catholic Fathers are quoted in this book. There is no room for denial when the facts are presented. Books on the Trinity do not quote the Ante-

Major Mistakes

Nicene Fathers and their correlation with the writings of Philo. Theologians do not mention the Logos as a "rational power" that became a "rational being." This is a second century innovation within the Christian Church communities.

"I shall quote again the words narrated by Moses himself, from which we can indisputably learn that [God] conversed with someone who was numerically distinct from Himself, and also a *rational Being*." Ante-Nicene Fathers, **1.228**

Mistake: Philo's allegorical "Power" with God to Justin meant a rational being. Philo's Logos was given "personal existence" contrary to what modern theologians are saying. The Greek Word or Logos that started out as "reason," "wisdom," "power," and "angel" became to the Ante-Nicene Fathers, the doctrine of God, the Son. Trinitarians claim that personal existence for the logos was derived from the bible itself. This is not true. If reference is sought for this theory, chapter one reveals Ignatius of Antioch as one of the first to state that the logos was not the spoken word. The bible does not teach that the logos was a separate preexistent divine person.

Theophilus

Mistake: First to mention the word "Trinity" in his writings. This bishop used the same theory of "emanations" used by the Gnostics. Tertullian would be accused of the very same thing in the third century. This second century writer reveals similar to Justin, a direct connection with Philo of Alexandria.

"God then, having his own Word internal within His own bowels, begat Him, *emitting Him* along with his own wisdom before all things." **2.98**

"He, then, being Spirit of God, and governing principle, and wisdom, and power of the highest, came down upon the prophets..." **2.98**

"In like manner also the three days which were before the luminaries, *are types of the Trinity* of God, and His Word, and His wisdom." Ante-Nicene Fathers, **2.101**

"Let us make man in Our image, after Our likeness.' 'But to no one else than to His own Word and wisdom did He say, "Let us make." **2.101**

Mistake: Theophilus, like the bishops before him, made a Trinity out of God, his Word, and wisdom. His ideas, like those of Ignatius, the Didache, Justin, and others are coming from Alexandrian philosophy. His three days before the luminaries connect with Philo's three days before the sun.

Athenagoras, Philosopher and Christian

Mistake: The Trinity doctrine began with the separating of God from his own reason. Tertullian wrote much on the reason of God. That ***reason*** was known by other names, such as "wisdom," "logos," "power," etc. This is Christian philosophy at its best! The Apostle John in no way intended for the "Logos" to be viewed through Greek philosophy. He was referring to the word or "Memra" of the Old Testament.

Major Mistakes

"...by whom the universe has been created through His Logos..." **2.133** "...the understanding and *reason* of the Father is the Son." **2.133**

Irenaeus

Mistake: The defender of Catholic tradition. Promoted all the false doctrines of Ignatius. He advocated second century Rome as the true and universal leader of all churches.

"... of the very great, the very ancient, and universally known Church founded and organized at Rome by the two most glorious apostles, Peter and Paul ..." **1.415**

"For it is a matter of necessity that every Church should agree with this Church, on account of its preeminent authority ..." **1.415**

Mistake: Jesus never set up one church to be in control of all others. If any church was to be given credit, it would have been the church of Jerusalem, not Rome. The authority described by Irenaeus is coming from a false foundation that placed Peter and Paul as ruling apostles. The forged "Teaching of the Apostles" placed an *ordained priest apostle* as the founder of the church of Rome. **8.671**. While Irenaeus places Paul as one of the founders, the false book completely omits him. Accordingly, Paul, unlike Peter, was never ordained to the Moses, Aaron priesthood.

"I have also largely demonstrated, that the Word, namely the Son, was always with the Father; and that Wisdom also, which is the Spirit, was present with Him, anterior to all creation..." **1.488**

"There is therefore one God, who by the Word and Wisdom created and arranged all things." **1.488**

Mistake: One of the earliest blunders committed by these Trinitarian Thinkers is the formula of "God, Word, and Wisdom." A much bigger problem arose when they used "personified" feminine wisdom as one of the divine members. They applied this attribute directly to Christ. Others like Irenaeus stated that wisdom was the Holy Spirit. This is a strong contradiction that was never solved. Applying the attribute of wisdom (Proverbs 8) to both Christ and the Holy Spirit takes away distinction. It puts doubt on who existed with God before the creation of all things. Who was in the beginning with God? Christ and the Spirit cannot both be the Wisdom of Proverbs 8!

Mistake: Another problem arises with the Catholic *book of Sirach*, which states that "Wisdom" was created. All of the Ante-Nicene Fathers quoted from it. This is a major contradiction to the Athanasian Creed, where it states that the Son was "uncreated."

3rd Century

Clement of Alexandria

Mistake; He was the second leader of the theological school of Alexandria. He was a true Gnostic. He believed that God became feminine. His love for philosophy is undeniable.

"And God Himself is love; and out of love to us became feminine.' 'In His ineffable essence He is Father; in

Major Mistakes

His compassion to us He became Mother.' 'The Father by loving became feminine." **2.601**

"...indicating that philosophy is in a sense a work of Divine Providence." 2.303 "...philosophy does not ruin life by being the originator of false practices and base deeds..." **2.303**
"...nor does it drag us away from the faith, as if we were bewitched by some delusive art..." **2.303**

Mistake: The use of philosophy did exactly the things that bishop Clement was denying. It did drag many disciples away from the true and historical faith. It created a new religion! This philosophy was mixed with Jewish mysticism that came from Babylon. It did have a bewitching influence on those who received it. It is sorcery that deceives even in our most modern times. Rev 18:23.

Hippolytus

Mistake: He was a third century bishop who reveals much error, including the applying of baptism in the nude. This religious philosopher was Trinitarian as seen in his application of a triune formula. Hippolytus became the first anti-pope in history. He caused a major division within the Catholic Church. Note his praying as "unto Thee, O Father, Son, and Holy Ghost." This is not biblical!

"Then after these things let him give him over to the presbyter who stands at the water (to baptize); [...standing above the water he says after receiving the Oil of Exorcism, thus: I believe and bow me unto Thee and all thy service, O Father, Son, and Holy Ghost.' 'And so he descends into the water.] 'And let them stand in the water naked.' 'And let a

deacon likewise go down with him into the water." *The Treatise On The Apostolic Tradition Of ST Hippolytus Of Rome, page 35.*

Mistake: Nude baptism lasted for several centuries. What do Trinitarians say about this "nude" baptism? Why was this form of baptism used in Rome in 200 A.D.? What led to this false application of baptism? This is the danger of church doctrine outside of the bible. This is one of the major reasons why "Scripture must interpret Scripture."

But (Zephyrinus) himself, being in process of time enticed away, hurried headlong into the same opinions; and he had Callistus as his adviser, and a ***fellow champion*** of these wicked tenets (Noetian doctrine)" **5.125**

Mistake: Callistus, reported as being a champion of the Oneness or Monarchian movement by Hippolytus, is never mentioned by modern Trinitarians. The Catholic encyclopedia states that Callistus was a Trinitarian. Wrong! A Roman Pope being champion of Oneness doctrine is a strong statement against what is believed today as orthodoxy.

"But Callistus perverted Sabellius himself, and this, too, though he had the ability of rectifying this heretic's error." **5.128**

Mistake: He reveals the truth of Sabellius as a disciple of Callistus. He also reveals that many of the Roman Popes were Oneness believers. True history has Sabellius as a third century defender of the major view of Biblical Christians in Rome. He represented the Monarchian school long after both Popes, Zephyrinus and Callistus had died. Years later, after

Major Mistakes

the death of Pope Stephen I and Pope Sixtus, Sabellius and his followers were falsely accused of heresy by a Trinitarian pope. There was a shift in the way that third century Catholics were proclaiming their faith.

Tertullian

Mistake: Hailed erroneously by most as the one who gave us the Trinity. He left the Roman faith to become a Montanist. He understood the Trinity as several beings, similar to Justin and others.

"This *reason* is His own thought or (consciousness) which *the Greeks call Logos*, by which term we also designate Word or discourse and therefore it is now usual with our people, owing to the mere simple interpretation of the term, to say that the Word was in the beginning with God." **3.600**

Mistake: Tertullian admits to believing in the reason or Logos of the Greeks. He admits here that his group understood the biblical logos to mean simply word or discourse. Yet, he followed the Greek rendition of reason, which placed the logos as a separate being alongside of God.

"He who subjected (all things), and He to whom they were subjected--must necessarily be two *different Beings*." **3.600**

Mistake: Did the apostles teach that in the beginning there were two beings? Further reading of John's gospel destroys such error. More than one God is polytheism. John along with the rest of the apostles were monotheistic Jews. Tertullian was blinded by Greek philosophy.

"Now if He too is God, according to John, (who says) "The Word was God," then you have *two Beings*." **3.607** (This is in reference to John 1:1).

Mistake: The lie that there were two Gods spoken of in John 1:1 is still being preached today by modern Trinitarians. The Apostle John never taught that in the beginning there was God the Word, face to face with God the Father. This is a false claim and wrong interpretation of one verse of scripture. John's "in the beginning was the Word," is Strong's #3056. It has only one meaning. It is something said. We are born again by the word (incorruptible seed) of God that liveth and abideth forever (1Pe 1:23). Word is logos (#3056), seed is spora (#4701).³

Mistake: While Trinitarians try to defend their doctrine by pointing directly to John 1:1 as the classical text to prove the preexistence of the Son, they fail miserably in showing any texts on the preexistence of the Holy Spirit. In other words, the verse mentioned does not in any way teach a trinity. How do you prove from this verse that within the one being of God there are three persons?

"For although the Word was God, yet was He with God, because He is God of God." **3.610**

Mistake: Some believe this teaching originated with Plato. Nonetheless, Tertullian's idea of *God of God* is not biblical. It is coming from the writings of Philo of Alexandria. See "On Rewards and Punishments" page 668.⁴ Philo also mentions "of light from light" as found in the Nicene Creed. Trinitarians hold the Nicene Creed to the same level as scripture. Wrong!

Origen

Mistake: Most claim that this bishop was the greatest thinker of the school of Alexandria. He became the greatest heretic. This is what happens when you mix philosophy with scripture.

"And therefore that language which is found in the *Acts of Paul*, where it is said that "here is the Word ***a living being***," appears to me to be rightly used." **4.246**

Mistake: Like many of the bishops before him, his use of the Apocrypha reveals much about Christian philosophers. Insistence that the Word (logos) was a separate being from God, was a second century innovation that caused much division in the third century Church.

"Now that to Him belongs a Son, is a statement not made by us only; although it may seem a sufficiently marvelous and incredible assertion to those who have a reputation as philosophers among Greeks and Barbarians, by some of whom, however, ***an idea of His existence*** seems to have been entertained, in their acknowledging that all things were created by the word or reason of God.' 'We, however, in conformity with our belief in that doctrine, which we assuredly hold to be divinely inspired, ..." The Ante-Nicene Fathers, **4.252**

Mistake: Origen admits several things here. First, that pagan philosophers and Catholics believed the same as pertaining to the Word or Reason of God. They held the same doctrine! Origen speaks of Greek philosophers as having an idea of "His existence" (Son) when they spoke of the reason or logos of God. Why are modern apologists denying this information?

Secondly, they saw this teaching as divinely inspired. In other words, ***Catholics treated the Greek Logos as being a biblical teaching.*** They ignored the simple explanation of logos as taught in the scriptures. This is a major mistake! It is a lie that deceives to this day!

"I wish to ask you to extract from the philosophy of the Greeks what may serve as a course of study or a ***preparation for Christianity***, and from geometry and astronomy what will serve to explain the sacred scriptures." **4.393**

Mistake: This is coming from one that many considered the greatest scholar and theologian of the Eastern Church. This is not "rightly dividing the word" (2 Timothy 2:15). This is as far as you can get from biblical Christianity. You do not need Greek philosophy to prepare you for studying the bible! How foolish when compared to Christ's words of the wise man who built his house on the rock (Matthew 7:24). Again, the Ante-Nicene Fathers were not biblical Christians.

Cyprian

Mistake: He opposed the Roman Pope in 257 A.D. who declared that baptism in the name of Christ was legitimate. Cyprian believed in Catholic baptism which he proclaimed as the only baptism. Most church communities from the first to the third centuries baptized in the name of Christ. Cyprian wrongly defended Catholic baptism by calling the other, a baptism of heretics. It was first introduced in Antioch by Ignatius. It was promoted in Rome by Justin Martyr. Falsely claimed to be the most original by Cyprian and his bishops of Africa.

Major Mistakes

"How, then, do some say, that a Gentile baptized without, outside the Church, yea, and in opposition to the Church, so that it be only in the name of Jesus Christ, everywhere, and in whatever manner, can obtain remission of sin, when Christ Himself commands the heathen to be baptized in the full and united Trinity?" **5.383**

Mistake: Christ never commanded the heathen to be baptized in the Trinity, or any other name. That is a lie and false theology! When it comes to the New Testament, there is only one true baptism in water. All verses on baptism point to the name of Jesus Christ. Trinitarians are completely wrong on this! Jesus stated, "he that believeth and is baptized" (Mark 16:16).

"...can they who among the heretics are said to be baptized in the name of Christ, be judged to have obtained the remission of sins?' 'For the case of the Jews under the apostles was one, but the condition of the Gentiles is another." **5.383**

Mistake: Cyprian's biblical response was that the Gentiles were baptized differently than the Jews. This is a most popular mistake. When it comes to biblical water baptism, there is only one. Baptism in the name of Christ was applied to Jews and Gentiles alike. Study the book of Acts! Jews, Samaritans, and Gentiles were all baptized in the wonderful name of Jesus. See chapter 1.

Dionysius, Bishop of Rome

Mistake: After becoming of a Trinitarian mindset, this bishop in the office of the pope, persecuted those believers who did not accept the teachings of Alexandria. He labeled Sabellius

and his many followers as heretics. The bishop represented the rivalry that existed between schools. He used his position of power to destroy the opposing view.

"And if Christ is the Word, the Wisdom, and the Power, assuredly these are powers of God." **7.365**

"Dionysius has the great distinction of sustaining the orthodoxy which Hippolytus and other comprovincial bishops had established against the heresy of two of his predecessors." **7.363**

Mistake: This statement reveals that the two bishops (popes) before him were not Trinitarian. These were Stephen I, and Sixtus II. Could this be the reason why they were in office for such a short time? This raises the question, "How many of Rome's Popes were Monarchian?" Another point of interest is that Dionysius was on the side of Hippolytus, who was the first Anti-Pope in history. The question arises, "Which Catholic Church was the right one?" This kind of situation is only one of many that puts strong criticism against any true apostolic succession.

4th Century

Athanasius

Mistake: He was a disciple of the school of Alexandria. His participation at the council of Nicaea is legendary. He defended the Eternal Son doctrine with Proverbs 8. He believed that the personified feminine wisdom of Proverbs was really Christ. This wisdom had also been applied to the Holy Spirit by Theophilus and Irenaeus. That is why the

Major Mistakes

Gnostics of today claim that the Holy Spirit is feminine. These were contradictory issues that were never resolved.

"And so, since this image of the Wisdom of God has been produced in us and in all creatures, the true and creative Wisdom rightly takes to himself what applies to his image and says: ***The Lord created me in his works.***" Oratio, 2,78. 81-82: PG 26, 311.319 or *The New Advent Catholic Encyclopedia (2015) section on Athanasius, (four discourses against the Arians)*

Mistake: Some bishops believed that "Wisdom" was Christ, while others claimed it was the Holy Spirit. Apart from this basic error of identification and distinction, Athanasius quoted scripture where **Wisdom was created**. If Wisdom was created, then both the Son and the Holy Spirit were created. This is a direct contradiction with the Athanasian Creed that states in lines 22 and 23 that the Son was not created. It also claims that the Holy Spirit was not created. Since history reveals that Athanasius had no part in the Athanasian forgery, whoever wrote this false letter was completely at odds with Athanasius.

"For as He is God from God, and Wisdom from the Wise, and Word from the Rational, and Son from Father, so is He from Subsistence Subsistent, and from Essence Essential and Substantive, and Being from Being." *The New Advent Catholic Encyclopedia (2015) section on Athanasius, 4th discourse against the Arians, paragraph 1.*

Mistake: God from God, as stated before, is a statement coming from philosophers. Philo wrote about this without any connection with Christianity whatsoever. In other words, it is a

pagan teaching. By separating the Word from God, the fathers created a second divine being. In the bible, the Word is God's expression, power, and creative ability. The book of John states that "the word was God." It also states that "the word became flesh."

Constantine

Mistake: After Nicaea, the Roman Emperor Constantine went on to construct the largest cathedral in Constantinople. It was the largest for a thousand years. The name of this building, ***Hagia Sophia*** reveals the theology that dominated the council of Nicaea. Research into "Holy Wisdom" will reveal the paganizing of Christianity through the use of allegory. Wisdom, an attribute of God was made into two divine beings by the followers of Philo, identified by this book as Christian Philosophers. The original construction of the Trinity was, "God, Word, and Wisdom." Modern Apologist have been detectibly reserved about this formula. It is time to reveal this to the world. Christians must be educated as to this allegorical application.

Eusebius of Caesarea

Mistake: Came up with a creed that was adopted by the Council of Nicaea. Included in the creed were the ideas of Philo of Alexandria. He also continued the lie that "Linus" was the first to receive the episcopate of Rome. His theology reflected that of the school of Alexandria. Similar to the Christian philosophers before him, his view on Wisdom and the Word was in line with the rest.

Major Mistakes

"Who but the Father has thoroughly understood that Light which existed before the world was---that intellectual and substantial Wisdom, that living Word which in the beginning was with the Father before all creation..." *Eusebius Ecclesiastical History*, page 5.

"That there is also a certain primeval, living, and self-existing substance, ministering to the Father and God of all unto the formation of all created objects, called the Word and the Wisdom of God..." page 7.

Mistake: Philo, according to Eusebius, impacted the churches to which he belonged to. That is why he claimed Wisdom to be more than an attribute. Wisdom had intellectual character and self-existing substance.

Concerning this Philo, he wrote, "...comprehensive in thought, sublime, and elevated in his views of the sacred Scriptures..." page 54.

Mistake: Although Protestant theologians downplay Philo's influence, the Catholic Church readily admits to the use of Philo's Logos. *The New Advent Catholic Encyclopedia* (2015) on its section of the Logos states, "Philo alone is fully known to us, his writings are as extensive as those of Plato or Cicero, and throw light on every aspect of his doctrine, from him we can best learn the theory of the Logos, as was developed by Alexandrian Judaism."⁵

Mistake: Eusebius commented on Philo's elevated views of scripture, instead of exposing those same views as mythical, allegorical, and cultic. It was the Catholic Church that gave us Philo's Logos along with their own formula and application of

water baptism. Protestants can continue denying this important information, but the facts of history are there for the wise to consider. The Trinity doctrine was birthed in paganism.

Catholic Doctrines Found in the Apocrypha

The Snapshot

It is inconceivable how some modern apologists and Trinitarian theologians defend the Apocrypha books! Some are cited in this book as saying that these writings are "pure and healthy" for all to read. There is something seriously wrong with Christians who advocate such false notions. This is the result of violating Christ's admonition in Revelation 22:18, 19. They do not understand how serious it is to add or take away from God's words, especially when they are well known forgeries. These same literary works with their hidden and disguised authorship have led many down the path of error.

In researching those books that appeared before and after the New Testament Canon, one is immediately struck with the *mysticism* prevalent throughout its pages. One can also recognize *fables* and *myths* within the structure of these famous forgeries. The one thing that stands out from the majority of these writings, including the Didache, is the connection with a specified religion. All of these writings point to one religion that not only carries the majority of these doctrines, but also practices to this very day, these self-same traditions. This connection is seen through bits and pieces that are spread throughout many of these books. Some of the themes seen as patterns in the Apocrypha lost Books (B.C. and A.D.) are such things as:

Major Mistakes

The apostles ordained to be priests, *High priests*, Father of the Christians, *The teacher of Asia*, Lust, Nakedness, Submitting to penance, Tolerance of images, Forced chastity on married couples, Sign of the cross, Sacrifices, Sorcery (used by men of God), False angels by name, The angels Uriel and Raphael in particular, The eternal secrets of heaven, Chants, Prayer for the dead, The wise philosopher, Jesus believing in *three gods* (and being part of), Sexual relations between angels and women, Children of the angels (watchers), A son not born of woman, Son existing *before creation*, Son of one essence with the Father, City of the sun, Universal church, Eighth day, Holy church, Worshipping the image, The lady greeting from heaven (goddess), *Sophia*, The phoenix, The dove, Rejection of marriage, Inquisition, Orthodox treatise, Catholic rule of the church, The Eucharist, Altar of the sun, Succession of priesthood, Our religion, Eternal punishment for not believing in the Mother of God, *Father, Mother, Son*, Triad formula in baptism (three immersions, pouring, sprinkling), and a personal favorite, *The wise men of Asia*.

A majority of the statements, quotes, or references correspond directly with the theology found in today's subsequent religion that honors and protects these same books. Most Catholics, and some Protestants defend these corrupt works without knowing what they contain. It is a case of "the blind leading the blind." Some of the works include sorcery (Tobit, Bel and the Dragon). Those who are wise in the things of God must examine all things, and prove all things. The following list contains some of the books that provided the snapshot to confirm many of the false unbiblical teachings seen today. They are not in any specific order.

In B.C. we have:

The Book of Tobit, Bel and the Dragon, Judith, Wisdom, Sirach, Baruch, Maccabees, Susanna, Prayer of Manasseh, letter of Jeremiah, Esdras, etc.

In A.D. we have such books as:

The Teaching of the Apostles, Clement's Letters to the Corinthians, letters of Ignatius, the Letter of the Smyrnaeans (Polycarp), Didache, Epistle of Barnabas, Shepherd of Hermas, Enoch, Acts of Thecla, Gospel of Thomas, Adam & Eve, the Acts of Phillip, Gospel of the Egyptians (Salome), Gospel of Peter, Proto-Gospel of James, Secret book of John, Gospel of Truth, On the Origin of the World, The First Thought in Three Forms, The Infancy Gospel of Thomas, Apocalypse of Mary, Gospel of Mary, Infancy of Mary, Gospel of Pseudo-Matthew, and many more.

These books contain some of the very doctrines seen and believed today in the Catholic Religion. Yet these doctrines were *never* a part of the true and early Christian Church. Not one of these teachings is found in the bible. The majority of these books have one thing in common. No one knows who wrote them! Many of these works were attributed to some bible character as the author. The book of Wisdom, for example, was attributed to Solomon. Even though many of these beliefs are Gnostic, they are still part of the Roman Institution. The reader has been given a snapshot of the varied themes and entire content of what is known as the Apocrypha lost books.

Chapter 6

Modern Trinitarian Thinkers

Major Mistakes

It is well understood that Trinitarian literature has dominated for centuries. It is only in recent years that books that uphold the oneness of God are being published for the general public to consider. It is important for those who are not theologians to hear both sides of the argument. It is sad but true, that Non-Trinitarians have been presented throughout history as nothing but heretics or members of a cult. Unfairly, name calling and persecution have been a major defense of Trinitarian Thinkers. Oneness believers were never really given a voice, since their letters, books, and memoirs are non-existent. It must be different in these modern times of intellectual advancement. With rapid increase in information in most fields of knowledge, the time is right.

Before commencing with a limited list of modern Trinitarian Thinkers included in this section, some important points need to be addressed. The authors and the books included here were chosen simply because of their availability. There are hundreds of Trinitarian authors to choose from, but those listed are part of a small church library from which easy access was granted. This list though limited, represents what the majority of Trinitarians believe. They are well represented within these pages. Otherwise, strong criticism would have surfaced against any of these books within the first few years after their publication.

There is no hidden agenda or animosity towards any of these writers. It must be admitted though, that some of these authors and their works stood out because of their boisterous claims. Such titles as "What Christians Believe," "Knowing the Doctrines of the Bible," "Understanding God," are a few that seem to assure the reader that they have purchased the right book. Then there is the one that everyone must read, which is "Doctrine, What Christians Should Believe." Such claims must be challenged, especially if they are telling the world that this is what the early church believed. The booklet "Jesus Only' Churches" deserves a special place because it uses as its title, a strong and derogatory term that historically has been used to attack Oneness believers.

One cannot help but notice that the book "The Trinity and the Eternal Sonship of Christ" seems to hold a private vendetta against one individual who previously had written and defended the Oneness position. The Jesus Only booklet does the same, and to the same person. The Oneness book must have been very powerful, since it elicited such a response from several authors. This person was needlessly mentioned by name countless times.

It is advisable to go back and forth between the comments here and those of other pertinent segments. Some previous chapters might have more information on any given point that is stated in this section. If there is repetition, it is with the intention that the truth is understood. Although, names have been provided, the denominations they belong to are not. The authors of these books probably represent all the major denominations of this time. The Catholic religion is also included. Both parties are identical when it comes to the Trinity doctrine.

The Trinity Defenders

Jimmy Akin

"Oneness Pentecostals note that Jesus told the apostles to baptize in "the name" (singular) of the Father, the Son, and the Spirit, but they make the mistake of assuming that the name is Jesus." *The Fathers Know Best*, page 273.

"On the other hand, if there is a single name that Jesus has in mind in this passage, it likely isn't "Jesus" but "Yahweh." *The Fathers Know Best*, page 274.

Mistake: Historically, the name used in baptism was Jesus. Akin has to omit much information in order to state such a false assertion, including the history of his religion. Cyprian and the bishops of Africa were fighting against the baptism in the name of Jesus Christ in the third century. The name was not Yahweh. Pope Stephen I said that the name of Christ was of "great advantage to faith and baptism." Even Hans Kung (Catholic) in his book "On the Short History of the Catholic Church," admits to early baptism in the name of Jesus. By his own admission, Akin is confessing that early baptism was not in the names of the Father, Son, and Spirit.

Robert Baker

"These early Christian writings reflect a healthy and pure Christianity." Baker lists six writings with dates: First Clement (AD 96), Epistle of Barnabas (AD 135), Epistles of Ignatius (AD 115), Shepherd of Hermas (AD 140), Epistle of

Polycarp (AD 116), and Didache (AD 140). *A Summary of Christian History*, page 28.

Mistake: Teaching those in seminary, that the New Testament Apocrypha is pure and healthy, is deception. The ruling coming from several sources after the Reformation was that those books did not have any authority when placed alongside of scripture. These books are forgeries that contain the Catholic agenda along with mythology, mysticism, and Alexandrian Theology. See Bart D. Ehrman's *Lost Scriptures, Books that Did Not Make It into the New Testament*. Ehrman wrote, "The practice of Christian forgery has a long and distinguished history."¹

E. Calvin Beisner

"Historic, Biblical Christianity, teaching instead that he has been distinct from the Father and the Spirit as the Son of God for eternity, and he became Son of Man at his incarnation." *Jesus Only Churches*, page 13.

Mistake: Beisner is wrong in saying that it was Historic, Biblical Christianity. The early church never taught distinction in the Godhead. Instead, it was in the second century, introduced by Christian philosophers. It was men such as Justin Martyr who brought in the new philosophy.

He states "Orthodox Christianity confesses as in the Chalcedonian Creed (AD 451), "but in these last days for us men and for our salvation born into the world of the Virgin Mary, the Mother of God according to his manhood." *Jesus Only Churches*, page 19.

Major Mistakes

Mistake: Orthodox Christianity is not Biblical Christianity. Those who call themselves orthodox are really Catholic. True bible believing Christians do not believe in the Mother of God. This is as pagan as it can get. The teaching of the Mother Goddess goes all the way back to Babylon.

"The early church used a triune formula." He goes on to name the "Didache, Justin Martyr, Irenaeus, Tertullian, Cyprian and others." *Jesus Only Churches, page 71.*

Mistake: The early church did not use a triune formula. It was the second century philosophers who emphasized a different baptism. This issue came to a climax in the mid third century. All churches baptized in the assigned name of Christ, with the exception of the Catholic Church. Some within the Catholic Church insisted that baptism in the name of Christ was heretical. The Roman popes of that time did not agree with the minority of Trinitarians, especially those of Africa.

"The church historian Sozomen, in the fifth century, wrote of the triune formula as "the apostolical tradition which has been carefully handed down to the present day" and of the insistence on a Jesus' name formula as an "innovation" brought on by fourth-century Arians (who denied the deity of Christ)." *page 72.*

Mistake: Sozomen, like all Trinitarian historians, tended to sway historical data in his favor. If you study the writings of the early church, there is no triune baptism. This type of baptism was a second century innovation. The Church of Rome in the third century stood strong and declared that those baptized in Jesus' name, were not to be rebaptized. This was

way before Arius! Beisner's information brings about a more interesting scenario. If Arians baptized in the name of Christ, then the Catholic Church, ten years after Nicaea, was baptizing in Jesus' name. Worse still, Constantine on his deathbed, was also baptized in the name of Christ instead of the triune formula. History has it, that it was an Arian bishop who did the honors.

"It was not by the power of the empire that orthodoxy won.' Had Theodosius not been a Nicene, Arianism would have died under the weight of the orthodox arguments anyway.' 'Orthodoxy had defeated heresies in the past without the help of the emperor, and in time it surely would have defeated this foe as well.'" *God in Three Persons, page 142.*

Mistake: Beisner ignores the history of the third and fourth centuries. It is wrong to state such an opinion. Historically, Monarchians, Arians, and Jews were brutally persecuted and killed. Orthodoxy is stained with the blood of the martyrs. She is the woman who rides the beast. Trinitarian arguments were never compelling enough. For this reason, they were the minority for centuries. Monarchians lasted for three centuries as the majority, while Arianism lasted over 40 years. The Arians began their rule ten years after the Nicene Creed. All these movements were stopped by persecution through emperors and popes. The Biblical Church went underground!

"God of God, Light of Light, true God of true God," three phrases designed to reiterate and emphasize the same point." (used in the Nicene Creed) *God in Three Persons, page 149.*

Mistake: Beisner tried to explain the creed in a favorable light. He fails to tell his readers where these phrases originated. He does mention Eusebius as giving us the model. These words were borrowed from Greek philosophers, not the bible. Philo of Alexandria quotes these statements in his allegorical works. See "On Rewards And Punishments, page 668."¹ Eusebius was a follower of Philo. His book on ecclesiastical history places Philo at the center of Catholic theology.

Pope Benedict XVI

"This is why Greek philosophy cannot be opposed to Gospel truth, and Christians can draw from it confidently as from a good of their own." *The Fathers, page 21.*

Mistake: Greek philosophy is responsible for the changing the gospel. Philosophy has given us a Hellenized gospel. The revelation of God's Word cannot be changed to fit our own speculations. The critical issue is obeying God's Word and not the words of men.

"He founded a school in Rome where, free of charge, he initiated students into the new religion, considered as the true philosophy." *The Fathers, (about Justin Martyr) page 20.*

Mistake: If Christianity has always been Catholic as some teach today, why was Justin introducing a new religion? Pope Benedict is correct in admitting that Justin initiated students into a new religion and philosophy. What did the early church believe before Justin? It was the inspired writings of the apostles. The mistake comes with assuming that philosophy helps to interpret the scriptures. Greek philosophy contradicts

Gospel truth. To arrive at a second God, the reason of God was separated into a different Being. It was also called the "logos" or "wisdom."

Louis Berkhof

"The Bible teaches that, while He exists in three Persons, called Father, Son, and Holy Spirit.' 'These are not three persons in the ordinary sense of the word; they are not three individuals, but rather three modes or forms in which the Divine Being exists." *Summary of Christian Doctrine, Part II: The Doctrine of God and Creation, Chapter VII: The Trinity.*

Mistake: This Trinitarian Theologian did not fully understand the Trinity. He claimed that the Trinity was three modes or forms in which the Divine Being exists. He was teaching Modalism instead of persons or beings. This is not what the Apostolic and Ante-Nicene Fathers taught.

"They are generally in full agreement with the teachings of Scripture, are often couched in the very words of the Bible.' '...and form a doctrinal link between the New Testament and the mere speculative writings of the Apologetes which appeared during the second century." *The History of Christian Doctrines, (on the Apostolic Fathers) pages 38, 39.*

Mistake: Louis Berkhof makes the same mistake as most Trinitarians. He taught that the *writers* which came after the apostles formed a doctrinal link with the early church. This is false. Many of the doctrines taught by these men were quite different than biblical Christianity. See chapter 1.

Major Mistakes

"Yet it did not fail to leave a lasting impression on the Church.' 'Some of its peculiarities were absorbed by the Church and in course of time came to fruition in the Roman Catholic Church with its peculiar conception of the sacraments, its philosophy of a hidden God, who should be approached through intermediaries (saints, angels, Mary), its division of men into higher and lower orders, and its emphasis on asceticism." (on *Gnosticism*). page 49.

Mistake: While he admits that Gnosticism did influence the doctrines and practices of the Roman Catholic Church, Berkhof fails to make a connection with the earlier Apostolic Fathers, Gnosticism, and the Trinity. It started with the very first writers after the apostles, especially Ignatius. Along with Philo, the writers laid the groundwork for the Trinity doctrine. The concept of Divine Wisdom was used to separate God into more than one being. This *allegorical wisdom* was used by the Gnostics, the Kabbalah practitioners, and the Ante-Nicene Fathers.

"The Apologists did not have the biblical conception of the Logos, but one somewhat resembling that of Philo.' 'To them the Logos, as He existed eternally in God, was simply the divine reason, without personal existence." *The History of Christian Doctrines*, page 58.

Mistake: Berkhof does well to admit to Philo, though he is mistaken about his conclusions. He admits that he does not agree with "Harnack and Loofs" who argued that the early fathers did give the Logos of Philo, an "intellectual character." It was more than that! The Logos of the Apologists went from a "rational power" to a "rational being." Refer back to Justin

Martyr. Berkhof fails to understand that the entire Trinity was formulated from attributes that were personified. "God, Word, and Wisdom" was the original formula for the Trinity. After many years of misinformation, the truth must be told!

"The most important representative of this sect was Sabellius.' 'Since only a few fragments of his writings are extant, it is hard to determine in detail just what he taught.'" *The History of Christian Doctrines, page 79.*

Mistake: Berkhof mentions Praxeas, Noetus, and Sabellius in the context of Monarchianism as being the outstanding heresy or sect of the third century (page 77). Yet, he claims that not much was known of what Sabellius taught. Berkhof willingly or ignorantly fails to mention the popes Zephyrinus and Callistus who were in favor of Oneness, and sponsors of the Monarchian School that stood against the developing Trinitarianism. Like most Trinitarian scholars, he fails to mention the School of Rome. The leaders of the Catholic Church at that time represented the majority of the believers in Rome and abroad. Sabellius represented most of the Christians who also baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ. Berkhof does not mention that Hippolytus, a Trinitarian, became the first Catholic Anti-Pope (in history).

Harold O.J. Brown

In reference to the Trinity Doctrine: "The fact that it has thus persisted and endured, despite its evident difficulty, may be offered as evidence of the claim that it is the proper and necessary interpretation of the Bible's testimony to God,

Major Mistakes

and is indeed essential and integral to the Christian faith." *Heresies, page 10.*

Mistake: This is "wishful thinking." Brown is ignoring the entire history of persecution. The only reason that this doctrine endured was that Rome defended it by persecuting those who were opposed. It became the State/Religion and the only rule of faith. It is the symbol of the Catholic Christian. Rome followed the way of the dictators or the beast that tramples underfoot (book of Daniel). Downplaying persecution as some do the "Holocaust" is outright deception.

"Creeds played a prominent part in the daily worship and life of early Christians." "Some of these things--such as the Nicene doctrine of the consubstantiality of the Son with the Father (adopted in A.D. 325)--appear complex and mysterious." "This fact should not cause us to fail to see how **important they were to saving faith** as the early church understood it." *Heresies, page 21.*

Mistake: The author of "Heresies" was not truthful about the creeds. Most were really forgeries because they were not written by the apostles. Creeds such as the "Apostles' Creed, the Didache, and the Athanasian Creed bear the names of the ones who did not write them. The author mentions the early church. He is really describing the fourth, and fifth centuries. The creeds have nothing to do with biblical salvation. See "A Woman Rides the Beast" by Dave Hunt. Dave argues in chapter 23 of his book that the creeds do not even mention salvation.²

"Modalism apparently reached its high point early in the third century in the teaching of Sabellius, a little-known figure of Libyan origin who was active in Rome under Bishops (or Popes) Zephyrinus (reigned 198-217) and Callistus I (reigned 217-22). *Heresies, page 102.*

Mistake: Sabellius was extremely well known, especially by schismatic Trinitarians who were referring to all of Rome's leaders (including the popes) as heretics. The majority of believers during this "high point of the third century" were Monarchian, not Trinitarian. Brown fails to mention that Sabellius, alongside Callistus was a representative and a (champion) defender of the Monarchian school. It was overseen by the popes themselves. The division causing Trinitarians were the real heretics. Most Christians today have been taught only part of Sabellius' true story.

Catholic Catechism

"In order to articulate the dogma of the Trinity, the Church had to develop its own terminology with the help of certain notions of philosophical origin: "substance," "person," "hypostasis," "relation," and so on.' In doing this, she did not submit the faith to human wisdom ..." *Catechism Of The Catholic Church, page 74.*

Mistake: Note that the Catholic Church says it did not submit the faith to human wisdom. They also state that with the help of certain notions of philosophical origin they defined the Trinity. This is a major contradiction. All philosophy is human wisdom. Although, the Ante-Nicene Fathers in their reasoning claimed philosophy to be a gift from God, they were wrong. It

Major Mistakes

is human speculation. The word "person" or "persons" in regard to the Trinity, did not originate with Catholics. Earlier pagan philosophers were tossing around such ideas, including the word *substance*. See Stoic philosophy along with Plato, and of course, Philo.

"...who truly became her Son according to the flesh, was none other than the Father's eternal Son, the second person of the Holy Trinity.' Hence the Church confesses that Mary is truly "Mother of God" (Theo-tokos)." *Catechism of the Catholic Church, Mary's divine motherhood, page 139.*

Mistake: Mary's divine motherhood is false doctrine. As far as Mary is concerned, she gave birth to a human child. The miracle was that she was made to conceive supernaturally. She was a virgin when she conceived. She gave birth as a woman. The bible states that if you do not believe that Christ came in the flesh, it is the spirit of antichrist. Mary is not the mother of God. This doctrine goes back to the council of Ephesus, in the fifth century. It was the **God Son theory** that gave us the **Mother God belief**. It is a false theology that brings idolatry into the church.

"In this sense the Church's tradition has often read the most beautiful texts on wisdom in relation to Mary.' Mary is acclaimed and represented in the liturgy as the "Seat of Wisdom." *Catechism of the Catholic Church, page 208.*

Mistake: Wisdom has not only been misrepresented, but distorted in Trinitarian history. In the Trinity formulation, wisdom was first applied to Christ, then the Holy Spirit, and now to Mary. According to most Catholics, the Trinity has a

goddess connection, the Queen of Heaven. This is the same identical teaching of Ancient Babylon. This is the doctrine of ***Mystery Babylon***. This is the cup full of abominations and filthiness of her fornication. See Revelation 17:4.

Adam Clarke

"The apostles knew well that the Jews not only circumcised the children of proselytes, but also baptize them; and as they now received a commission to teach and proselyte all the nations and baptize them in the name of the Holy Trinity, they must necessarily understand that infants were included." *Adam Clarke's Commentary on the holy bible, page 835.*

Mistake: Infant baptism was never practiced by the first century church. The Catholic bishop Cyprian applied this false interpretation in 253 A.D. The apostles never baptized in the name of the Holy Trinity. It was the second, third, and fourth centuries where you see Catholic baptism as opposed to the original one. It is a clever counterfeit teaching of the Great Commission.

Referring to Matthew 28:19, "The orthodox, as they are termed, have generally considered this text as a decisive proof of the doctrine of the Holy Trinity, and what else can they draw from it?" *Adam Clarke's Commentary on the holy bible, page 835.*

Mistake: What else can they draw from it? Baptism in the Trinity is Catholic dogmatism. This passage has been violated by all Trinitarians including Protestants and Reformers. The

Major Mistakes

Synthesis Principle that teaches "scripture interprets scripture" has been totally ignored. Third century Trinitarians understood baptism to be applied to infants and also to adults. Women, children, and men were also baptized in the nude. This is what they drew from the verse. It is a major problem when only one verse of scripture is used to teach doctrine. This is known as "C.O.S.A." or the Classical One Scripture Application.

W.T. Conner

"God is one, but there are indications in the Old Testament that he is more than a simple unity.' 'Wisdom was his companion from the beginning (Proverbs 8:22)." *Christian Doctrine, page 145.*

Mistake: This is a basic blunder committed by all Christian philosophers, regardless of denomination. The allegorical use of "Divine Wisdom" was applied to Christ by these men. Later, they would apply this same Wisdom to the Holy Spirit. Proverbs 8:22 was misinterpreted all the way to the Nicene Council. Besides divine wisdom, the words *understanding* and *prudence* were also personified in this chapter. None of them are conveniently applied to the Trinity. (Proverbs 8:1, 12)

Mark Driscoll

"The word Trinity is used as a shorthand way of explaining a great deal of biblical truth.' 'It was first used by the church father Tertullian (AD 155-220)." *Doctrine, What Christians Should Believe, page 12.*

Mistake: Driscoll is wrong in alleging that Tertullian was the first. This is poor research, and the most common mistake in

discussing history as presented by the majority of defenders. Modern theologians must understand that this is an inaccurate presentation of historical facts. Besides, Tertullian was not the originator of this concept. If Trinitarians continue to hold on to such inaccurate information, then they must admit that prior to this, the first two centuries had no knowledge of any Trinity whatsoever. What about those who allege that the early church was Trinitarian or that they baptized in a Triune formula? Tertullian was a third century writer.

"To be fair, there are a handful of other ancient books that have some good content.' Books such as the Shepherd of Hermas and the Didache were appreciated by the early church and are akin to some popular Christian books today that can provide some insight but do not rise to the level of Scripture or fail to the level of heresy." *Doctrine, What Christians Should Believe*, page 57.

Mistake: Most modern Trinitarians teach contrary to the views of the Reformation and in favor of Catholic endorsed books. These ancient books are works listed under the Apocrypha lost books or forgeries. See the Belgic, Westminster Confessions. As to their good content, it can be proven otherwise. The Shepherd makes mention of a woman in the sky that appears in a dream to the main character. He greets her as "lady" and mentions that he has always thought of "her as a goddess." This is only the first page of that book! Is this good content? No! The Didache was also known as "the teaching of the twelve." Not true! They had nothing to do with it!

Mistake: The authors compound their mistakes by referring to the title of their book as, "Doctrine, What Christians Should

Major Mistakes

Believe." Not all Christians are willing to follow such poor and superficial research.

Patricia Beall Gruits

"The tri-unity of God is also called the "Godhead."
Understanding God, page 6.

Mistake: Sadly, for the sincere, this is not a true statement. This lie has circulated for centuries. The few verses in which the word "Godhead" is used in the bible, are never a reference to a tri-unity of any sort. The Godhead is the essential being or nature of God. There is no single verse that teaches that God is triune.

Dave Hunt

"One might as well demand "just one verse that states that God is a triune being of Father, Son, and Holy Spirit." 'No single verse says so, yet the doctrine of the trinity is accepted by both Catholics and Protestants as biblical.'" *A Woman Rides The Beast, page 342.*

Mistake: Finally, a Trinitarian that admits to a basic truth concerning the Trinity! Although Hunt is correct to say that no single verse states that God is triune, others will argue to the contrary. Even with Hunt's true statement, many Trinitarians continue to insist that the Trinity is found in the scriptures. They pluck verses out of context and call it accumulative proof. Some claim by this improper practice to be "Biblical Trinitarians." There is no such thing, as a Biblical Trinitarian.

"However, there is absolutely *no* Catholic tradition which can be traced back to the apostles. *None!*" *A Woman Rides The Beast*, page 513.

Mistake: Dave Hunt mentioned on page 517 that the written tradition of Catholicism came from the so-called Church Fathers. He was correct to say this! The first chapters of this book document this very thing. The apostles had no traditions "spoken or written" that even came close to Catholics. It is unfortunate that authors such as Hunt, even though, extremely knowledgeable, fail to see that the Church Fathers were also wrong about the Trinity. Most Christians find it most difficult once they are taught to reexamine their position. The price is too great! Apart from being labeled a heretic, they will isolate the person from members and ministers of that specific denomination. Once someone rejects the Trinity, they can say goodbye to their ministerial career.

Norman James

Stated "Jesus Christ, the second person of the Triune Godhead, was preexistent with the Father before all of time.' 'Christ existed as the eternal "Word" (Jn. 1:1-5)." *The Christian Life Series*, page 311.

Mistake: Second person and preexistent with the Father, are ideas that came in the second century with the Christian philosophers. See the Apocrypha book of Barnabas, writings of Justin Martyr or the Works of Philo. John 1:1 directly states that the Word was God, not another God! The teaching of a Triune Godhead has already been addressed. It is dealing with error!

Clayton Jefford

"But the author of John means more than what is implied in Genesis, intending to call upon the developing Jewish belief that the figure of Wisdom, who speaks as a personified voice in the book of Proverbs, was present at the creation of the world." *The Apostolic Fathers, An Essential Guide, page 72.*

Mistake: John's logos was the biblical one believed by Old Testament Jews, and not the developing philosophical one of Philo of Alexandria. It is true that Philo was Jewish! What is implied in Genesis and also John 1:1 is the spoken word or logos. Stating that the author of John believed similar to Greek philosophers is ridiculous. It was in the second century, using Proverbs 8 and John 1:1, that the figure of Wisdom combined with Logos developed as a second divine being. ***This was after the book of John was written.*** Certain men pretending to be Jews, borrowed Philo's concept of Wisdom/Logos and applied it to the Son of God.

Hans Kung

"...what the Catholic Church has always said and intended is what originally Jesus Christ himself said and intended.' 'So, in principle Jesus himself would already have been a Catholic..." *The Catholic Church, A Short History, page 6.*

Mistake: To say that Jesus or the apostles were Catholic, is a little bit presumptuous. When the doctrines of Ignatius of Antioch, the first to mention "Catholic" in his writings are

compared to what Jesus Christ taught, they are not the same. They are miles apart!

"However, the earliest list of bishops, in Irenaeus of Lyons, according to which Peter and Paul transferred the ministry of episkopos to a certain Linus, *is a second-century forgery.*" *The Catholic Church, A Short History, page 22.*

Mistake: Admitting to a second-century forgery, although a good thing, contradicts what the Catholic Church has always said and intended in connection to Christ. Here, it is a false line of succession which is still included in the most modern Catholic bibles. Many Catholics still believe that Linus was the second pope after Peter. In other words, the information does not make full circle. Continuous publication of error, even after it has been exposed, is a technique to keep members in the dark.

"The Christian state religion was crowned by the dogma of the Trinity.' 'Only now can this term be used, since the Second Ecumenical Council, of Constantinople, convened by Theodosius the Great in 381, defined the identity of substance of the Holy Spirit with the Father and the Son." *The Catholic Church, A Short History, page 39.*

Mistake: Kung's information is correct. His statement of the Christian state religion can be better described as Roman Catholicism. It was at this time in history that persecution extends to all who are not Catholic or Trinitarian. The Apostle John stated in Revelation, "I saw a Woman sit upon a scarlet colored beast." Most Catholics fail to see the connection.

Major Mistakes

Kung: "For the first time now Christians killed other Christians because of differences in their view of the faith." *The Catholic Church, A Short History, page 38.*

Mistake: To believe that Christians kill other Christians is incredible ignorance. True disciples of Christ do not belong to the murderous Whore of Revelation. Catholics do not want to admit what side they are on. Can you blame them? Murder cancels out any church or religion as being truly Christian and stains it as being *antichrist*. It is written, "And in her was found the blood of prophets, and of saints, and of all that were slain upon the earth" (Rev 18:24). All!

Tim LaHaye

"We have already seen the evil nature of that city where Satan made his headquarters.' This headquarter was moved to Rome near the close of the first century." *Revelation, Illustrated And Made Plain, page 38.*

Mistake: LaHaye is accurate in his knowledge of Satan's headquarters. Theologians such as LaHaye have for many years taught that the seven Churches of Revelation correspond to seven longer periods of Church History. See most Baptist Commentaries on Revelation 2 and 3. This type of application is not a mistake! Concealing the deceptive origin of the Trinity, is.

This is LaHaye's description of the periods: Ephesus- The Apostolic Church, A.D. 30-100, Smyrna- The Persecuted Church, A.D. 100-312, Pergamum- The Indulged Church, A.D. 312-606, Thyatira- The Pagan Church, A.D. 606- Dark

Ages, Sardis- The Dead Church, A.D. 1520- the Tribulation, Philadelphia- The Church that Christ Loved, A.D. 1750- the Rapture, Laodicea- The Apostate Church/People's Church, A.D. 1900- the Tribulation.

Mistake: Theologians such as LaHaye, who believe in the Trinity, have unknowingly placed the council of Nicaea within the Pergamum Church age. This was Satan's seat, or the place where his rule was found on earth: "I know thy works, and where thou dwellest, even where Satan's seat is" (Rev 2:13). Naming this period as the "Indulged Church" is incorrect. Indulge means to yield to an inclination or desire. This title has nothing to do with the description given in Revelation 2. Nonetheless, the theological application of the seven church periods to that of the seven churches of Revelation, has conclusively revealed the shocking truth that the Trinity is coming from the seat of Satan. To prevent this way of thinking, LaHaye makes a deliberate counter statement.

"Criticism cannot be hurled against the doctrine of the church or church age, for they were doctrinally pure." *Revelation, Illustrated And Made Plain, page 38.*

Mistake: To say that Rome was Satan's headquarters, and then to say that one cannot criticize the doctrine of the church or **church age** that developed from it, is a major contradiction. The church period where the council of Nicaea took place, according to LaHaye and others, is **the Pergamos Church Age of 312 to 606 A.D.** This is the only Church in Revelation that places Satan's Seat in a specific location. The translation of the word "Seat" (Greek) is "thronos" or throne. For the first time in history, Christianity was governed by Imperial decree.

Constantine's throne was really Satan's throne. LaHaye should have called Pergamos, Satan's Seat, instead of the Indulged Church. The truth must be told!

John McArthur

Point: "The Reformers used the expression "Scripture interprets Scripture." 'By this they meant that obscure passages in Scripture must be understood in light of clearer ones.' 'If the bible is God's Word, it must be consistent with itself.' 'No part of the Bible can contradict any other part.'" *Charismatic Chaos, "the synthesis principle" page 113.*

"The synthesis principle puts Scripture together with Scripture to arrive at a clear consistent meaning.' 'If we hold to an interpretation of one passage that does not square with something in another passage, one of the passages is being interpreted incorrectly.'" *Charismatic Chaos, page 113.*

Mistake: Trinitarians violate the synthesis principle. McArthur does not relate to his many followers that they do not practice this principle consistently. When it comes to Matthew 28:19 and baptism, time and again, they violate this verse by not comparing it with all other scriptures on the great commission. Matthew 28:19 does not "square" with Mark 16:16, Luke 24, Acts 2:38, Acts 8:16, Acts 10:48, Acts 19:5, etc. When all scriptures on baptism are compared, the conclusion is not in favor of the orthodox (Catholic) view. It is not in favor of the Protestant Trinitarian view either. It takes a real and honest Christian to admit to this horrific mess caused by their very own theologians. The synthesis principle *destroys* Trinitarian dogmatic theology.

Moody Publishers

"The bible teaches not only that there is one God, but also that there are three persons in the Godhead." *What Christians Believe*, page 16.

Mistake: There is only one person in the Godhead. The bible clearly teaches, "For the invisible things of him from the creation of the world are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made, even ***his eternal power and Godhead***; so that they are without excuse" (Rom 1:20). Teaching that there are three persons in the Godhead is a direct violation of scripture. Christians must tell the truth at all times! The use of *persons* in the Godhead appeared with the first century writings of Philo of Alexandria. Ignatius of Antioch took this teaching and applied it to baptism. He insisted that baptism was into three persons of equal honor. Tertullian continued with this concept, writing that baptism was to be repeated three times, and in three names.

Robert Morey

"It is beyond the scope of this book to deal in detail with the first three or four centuries of the Christian Church.' This has already been done by several competent writers.' We will, thus, limit ourselves to the literature of the Apostolic Fathers." *The Trinity, Evidence and Issues, Part V, The Historical Evidence*, page 452.

Mistake: If Morey's book includes a chapter on the history of the Trinity, why would the first three or four centuries not be mentioned? It is like buying a delicious "banana split" without

Major Mistakes

the bananas! Why would Morey omit such crucial information in part 5 of his *historical evidence*? In doing this, the author did not provide any historical evidence whatsoever. Most Trinitarian Thinkers, if not all, fail to teach their followers the truth that the early church of the first three centuries was Oneness. Morey mentions more competent writers, but fails to name even one. Many books have been written on the origin of the Trinity, but none really expose the specific men who infiltrated the first church communities. Jude 4 reveals that they would "deny" the only Lord God.

New Advent Catholic Encyclopedia

"The Vatican Council has explained the meaning to be attributed to the term "mystery" in theology.' 'It lays down that a mystery is a truth which we are not merely incapable of discovering apart from divine revelation, but which, even when revealed, remains hidden by the veil of faith and enveloped, so to speak, by a kind of darkness." *The Blessed Trinity, (the trinity as a mystery) Jan. 2015.*

Mistake: The Bible contradicts the Vatican Council: "This then is the message which we have heard of him, and declare unto you, that God is light, and in him is no darkness at all" (1 John 1:5). This is what happens when councils are directed by men without the aid of the Holy Spirit. Philosophy appears to be godly, but it is merely the greatest of human speculations.

"In reality it is certain that Zephyrinus and Callistus condemned various Monarchians and Sabellius himself, as well as the opposite error of Hippolytus. This is enough to

suggest that Callistus held the Catholic Faith." *Section on "Callistus" Jan. 2015.*

Mistake: This statement contradicts the most recent research done on Callistus, Hippolytus, and Sabellius. Callistus was himself a Monarchian, and a champion defender of Oneness doctrine. Hippolytus was a schismatic Trinitarian. Hippolytus himself wrote in his memoirs that this Sabellius had been indoctrinated by the one and only Callistus. If Hippolytus was condemned, how could Callistus have held the Catholic Faith which later is described as Trinitarian? The information is misleading. The truth is that Callistus and several other popes did not believe in a Trinity.

Mistake: The confusing article indeed goes on to suggest that the Catholic Faith was Trinitarian as taught by Tertullian. If the pope was Trinitarian, why would Hippolytus accuse him of believing in a type of modified Sabellianism? Also, the article does not mention that the Catholic Church would suffer its first division. Hippolytus is recorded in history as the first Antipope. The subject at hand is what drove him to separate from the church. Tertullian also left the Catholic Church and became a Montanist.

Myer Pearlman

Pearlman's main point: "How was the doctrine of the Trinity preserved from becoming overbalanced either on the side of Unity (Sabellianism), or on the side of Tri-unity (Tritheism)?" 'By the formulation of dogmas, that is, interpretations which define the doctrine and "fence" it against error.' The following example of dogma is found in the

Major Mistakes

Athanasian Creed, formulated during the fifth century." *Knowing the Doctrines of the Bible, page 71.*

Mistake: The bible does not need to be protected by the formulation of dogmas. The so-called fencing against error, was really a denial of scripture, replacing it with man-made ideas of the philosophical kind. His use of the Athanasian Creed, which is not really a creed at all, was not written by Athanasius or a convened council. He fails to mention the secrecy behind this so-called creed, and the exact time of its formulation by one unknown individual. Most modern day Apologists stubbornly continue using this document as proof for the Trinity.

"For example the "Didache," a Christian document of A.D. 100, speaks of Christian baptism being in the name of the Lord Jesus, but when it comes to describe the rite in detail the Trinitarian formula is described." *Knowing the Doctrines of the Bible, page 354*

Mistake: When defending the Trinitarian formula for baptism, Pearlman makes use of the Didache by calling it a Christian document. Careful inspection of this writing reveals otherwise. The Canonization of Scripture never included this manual of instruction for many reasons. It was known as the "teaching of the twelve." This was one of the first New Testament forgeries to appear with the Epistle of Barnabas following after. It tells its leaders among other things, not to corrupt boys, and emphasizes praying the "Our Father" three times a day. It tells its members not to fast on the days that the hypocrites fast. It reveals a religious group who followed their own traditions.

Mistake: Catholic baptism uses Matthew 28:19 in a dogmatic interpretation. It does not allow for scripture to interpret scripture. Pearlman ignored the fact that this document does not emphasize baptism by immersion, the method used by his organization (Assemblies of God). It points to pouring water three times on the head of the person being baptized. The bible does not teach this! The New Testament does not ever teach alternative ways to baptize. There is only one: "One Lord, one faith, one baptism" (Eph 4:5).

Rose Publishing

"What is a cult? 'As cult expert Alan Gomes has stated, "cults grow out of and deviate from a previously established religion." *Christianity, Cults & Religions*, page 98.

Mistake: If one is to follow this simplistic line of thinking, then all Protestants are part of a cult. The Catholic religion was before Protestantism. The Protestant movement was really a response to the evils displayed by the Catholic Church, not some cult seeking its own expression. Now when it comes to the true history of Christianity, the early apostolic church was established first. It was the Catholic religion that separated itself from the first Christian communities and declared itself within time to be the only representation of God on this earth. See chapters 1, 2 and 3.

"God is one absolutely perfect divine Being in three Persons." *The Trinity*, page 2.

Mistake: The holy bible does not teach such confusion. This statement is also historically inaccurate. When one examines

Major Mistakes

the early writings of the Ante-Nicene Fathers, including Tertullian, this definition is never found. These early bishops are quoted in chapters 2 and 3. To these men, God and his Son were two Beings. Tertullian added that with the Spirit it was three. Beings and Persons were used interchangeably by the formulators of the Trinity. It is today's apologists who are using this definition to cover up major contradictions. Is this being honest? NO.

"The Persons are distinct: The Father is not the Son. The Son is not the Holy Spirit. The Holy Spirit is not the Father." *The Trinity, page 1.*

Mistake: The one Lord of Deut 6:4 has been changed to God as a group, combination, team, or mixture of divine Persons or Beings. When the titles used for the Father are also used by the Son, there is no distinction. These titles are used for both: ***I Am, Almighty, only wise God and Savior, first and last, Redeemer, Creator, King of kings, Lord of lords, Great God, the Rock, the Shepherd, God changes not, Healer, Coming again, Worshipped, Forgiver of sin, Everlasting Father***, etc. The Holy Spirit is called the Spirit of God, while in the New Testament it is the Spirit of the Son.

Point: "Without the Trinity, the Christian doctrine of salvation cannot stand." Some religious groups that claim to believe in the God of the bible, but reject the Trinity, have an understanding of salvation that is based on good works." *The Trinity, page 4.*

Mistake: These two statements are the furthest thing from the truth! ***Salvation does not depend on the Trinity.*** It is Christ

who saves! "To open their eyes, and to turn them from darkness to light, and from the power of Satan unto God, that they may receive forgiveness of sins, and inheritance among them which are sanctified by faith that is in me" (Acts 26:18). It was the Catholic Church who brought us the Trinity doctrine that has historically based their salvation on good works. See the entire history of the Reformation! The people who wrote this article are covering up the true history of Catholicism. How ridiculous? They compound this by stating in their cover page, "What is the Trinity and What do Christians Believe?" Only Trinitarians are good according to this booklet!

Under heading-Misunderstanding #1, "The following early church leaders and/or writings all defended the doctrine of the Trinity long before A.D. 300: Clement, Didache, Ignatius, Justin Martyr, Theophilus, Athenagoras, Irenaeus, Tertullian, Gregory Thaumaturgus." *The Trinity, page 4.*

Mistake: In providing a list of the defenders of the Trinity before A.D. 300, contributors to this pamphlet have admitted one major thing. Neither the apostles or the members of the early New Testament Church are cited, because they did not believe in a Trinity. If anything, this list proves that these later bishops and priests of the Catholic Church were the ones that introduced their Greek philosophy of the Logos. This is what gave the world a false Triune Godhead. Case closed!

Bob L. Ross

Point: "So again, as Bernard failed to pin the trinity to paganism, he has failed to pin the trinity to Philo.' Philo had

no trinity and no personal Logos in reality." *The Trinity And The Eternal Sonship Of Christ*, page 57.

Mistake: Ross is not the first to deny Philo's trinity. Although incorrect, most educated and scholarly Trinitarian thinkers have done the same throughout history. The Trinity is pagan. It originated in Babylon. The so called Christian Trinity came after the Catholic Trinity. The Catholic Trinity was derived from Philo's Logos. Now as to his allegation of the Jewish philosopher, ***Philo did have a trinity!*** He revealed in his writings that from his own soul, he was told that in God there were two equal powers. These powers he would call ***persons*** and ***beings***. He also wrote that "let us make man in our image" was a reference ***to more than one Creator***. Philo called it the ***divine company***.

Mistake: Ross ignores the fact that the original formula for the Trinity was allegorical. If anyone is guilty of presenting a non-personal God, it is the Ante-Nicene Fathers. Louis Berkhof stated in his "history of Christian doctrines" that the fathers did borrow the Logos from Philo without "personal existence" (page 58). He was wrong about the lack of personal existence! See the section on Justin Martyr. Berkhof mentioned that Harnack and Loofs were of a different opinion. They believed that the Apologists did give the Logos an "intellectual character" thus falling away from the right apprehension of the Christian Gospel (page 59). They did more than that! They made the terms power, reason, and wisdom into separate divine beings.

"The Bible plainly tells us who this "woman" Wisdom, is and it is Christ: "Christ the power of God, and the Wisdom

of God" (I Cor.1:24)." *The Trinity And The Eternal Sonship Of Christ, page 70.*

Mistake: Philo taught that feminine "Divine Wisdom" was the image or second God. She was the mother of all things. Wisdom was being used in a totally pagan application. Wisdom was both male and female when connected with the logos. The applying of Wisdom (Proverbs 8) to Christ came with the Christian philosophers of the second century. Proverbs 8:22 gave all these men a way to produce a "preexistent Son." They did this with the use of allegory, not scripture that interprets scripture. Wisdom in Proverbs 8 is portrayed as a she, and should have never been used in the formulation of the Trinity. Never!

Mistake: Neither Christ nor the Holy Spirit are feminine. To answer Ross, I Corinthians 1:24 contrary to feminine wisdom, is referring to **general wisdom** that can be applied to Christ. The bible speaks of different types of wisdom, including earthly wisdom which is devilish (James 3:15). The scriptures do not tell us that Christ was a woman, nor do they tell us that Christ was devilish! It is important to rightly divide the Word of God.

R.C. Sproul

"Reformed theology is not only systematic but also **catholic**, sharing much in common with other communions that are part of historic Christianity." *What is Reformed Theology?, page 28.*

Major Mistakes

Mistake: Reformed theology does have its share of catholic doctrine. It holds several of its major confessions. It does not have, however, all of Rome's protected non-biblical traditions. Although, views are rapidly changing, there was a time when Protestant and Reformed theology rejected Rome and the Pope as being *the seat of Satan and the antichrist*. Rome opposed and persecuted Christians because they refused most of her pagan applications. She murdered many because they brought the "Word of God" to the masses. Study the lives of such men as "Wycliffe" and "Tyndale." The pope sitting on a throne, selling indulgences was a huge dividing factor. The issue of idolizing Mary as Mother of God and Queen of Heaven, or idols in the church, are other examples.

Mistake: Part of Historic Christianity yes, Biblical Historical Christianity no. True biblical Christianity continues to reform. It does not accept man-made doctrines and traditions. It is not satisfied with the current condition of most churches. It still sees Rome for what it is in the light of scripture.

"For example, the Reformers embraced the doctrines articulated and formulated by the great ecumenical councils of church history, including the doctrines of the Trinity and of Christ's person and work formulated at the councils of Nicaea in 325 and of Chalcedon in 451." *What is Reformed Theology?*, page 29.

Mistake: R.C. Sproul is admitting that Reformed theology in reference to the doctrine of God is not biblical revelation, but a formulation taken from the Catholic Church. This is an embarrassment for those Reformed who claim to be "Biblical Trinitarians." Not all Reformers embraced Catholic doctrine.

That is why they were burned at the stake. Most Reformed theology that we have today is Catholic, including infant baptism and even Protestant Calvinism. Rome murdered innocent people for rejecting her views. The woman that rides the fourth beast in the book of Revelation was drunk with the blood of the martyrs of Jesus.

"When I teach the sacraments, I know many of my students are Baptists and do not embrace the doctrine of infant baptism.' I point out to them that the practice of infant baptism is the majority position in church history among the majority of Christian communions." *What is Reformed Theology?*, page 29.

Mistake: Sacraments? Infant baptism came from the Catholic Church. It is not biblical. That is why the majority of churches practice it. The bible foretold that in the last days they would not uphold sound doctrine. The doctrine of Christ is simple. The gospel according to Mark reads "they that believe and are baptized." The history of how infant baptism acquired a majority position is an embarrassment to those who claim to uphold the bible. If major doctrines can be derived from juggling scriptures that don't directly state the fact, the Church is defenseless against all false doctrine.

Mistake: Being the majority position does not always present a good argument for truth. There are millions of Muslims, Mormons, and others that can make claim to this type of defense. Defending from history that has been corrupted is not a strong argument. The bible should be the only and final source in defining doctrine, not certain periods of history. Now this is the Reformed stance!

Today's Dictionary of the Bible

"Not only is the word "Trinity" not in Scripture, but there is no isolated exposition on this attribute of God in either testament.' 'It is an inferred doctrine, gathered eclectically from the entire Canon." *page 630.*

Mistake: In spite of the Trinity being the foundation of the Catholic Church, most dictionaries of the bible do not include "Trinity" in their reference works. The reason is simply because the Trinity is not a biblical word. The article is right as to the Trinity being inferred doctrine. Inferred doctrine is not "scripture interprets scripture." It is an imitation of the golden rule of the Reformation. It is arriving at a certain conclusion drawn from other evidences that are believed to be related. Admittedly, the church does have a few doctrines that came from such a method, but the ***Major Doctrines*** of the bible are defended directly from scripture. The doctrine of God, for example, is a major doctrine. The bible uses direct verses to reveal who God is and what he is like.

Mistake: When it comes to the Trinity, the scriptures are silent. To prove a Trinity, most will argue that the bible reveals that "the Father is God, the Son is God, and that the Spirit is God." If all three are God, then there must be a Trinity. Wrong. The opposite of this can be inferred. By saying all three are God, a person can arrive at the conclusion that there are three Gods that are a family of one. This is polytheism. One can also arrive at the conclusion that the Spirit is God himself (not another), and Jesus is the visible image of the invisible God. This last option is backed up by direct scripture.

John F. Walvoord

"The question has been raised as to the identity of the One who was on the throne." *The Revelation of Jesus Christ, page 105.*

Mistake: Walvoord does not explain to his readers why the question was raised in the first place. His commentary on the book of Revelation chapter 4 has to do with the fact that ***there is only one throne*** in heaven. It is because of the doctrine of the Trinity and its emphasis on distinction of the persons in the Godhead, that the question is raised. Any Trinitarian would be trapped in this situation because Revelation does not reveal three persons sitting on one throne. The following chapter in which the Lamb would be mentioned, completely contradicts the Trinity in Unity. Walvoord knew that this was the case. That is why he gave several explanations.

"One explanation would have Christ on the throne in chapter 4 and the Father on the throne in chapter 5." *The Revelation of Jesus Christ, page 105.*

Mistake: This is assuming that the persons in the Godhead are *playing musical chairs*. In the Trinitarian view of things, God the Father does not trade places with the Son or the Spirit. The truth of the matter is that the revelation of one throne in heaven for God, goes against the three coequal, coeternal persons.

"The seeming contradiction may also be resolved in the doctrine of the Trinity as Christ expressed it in John 14:9:

Major Mistakes

"He that has seen me hath seen the Father." *The Revelation of Jesus Christ*, page 105.

Mistake: What does this verse have to do with the Trinity? Absolutely nothing. Christ never taught or expressed that there was a Trinity! He claimed, "I and my Father are one." It is Trinitarians such as Walvoord that caused the contradiction in the first place! In the scope of Trinitarian teaching, the Father is not the Son, the Son is not the Spirit, and the Spirit is not the Father. This is a major problem when there is only one throne in heaven. To solve this Trinity dilemma, Walvoord uses a traditionally historical and scriptural defense for Oneness theology, not Trinitarian dogma. For years Trinitarians have erroneously given John 14:9 and other similar verses, a reference to relationship instead of identity. *See next reference, James R. White.*

Mistake: Historically, the simple explanation of 14:9 given by Walvoord was never accepted. This is how they attacked the Oneness biblical defense from the very beginning. So it is quite interesting how a Trinitarian now uses the same application as Oneness proponents. Walvoord's use of John 14:9 unfortunately does not solve the contradiction of the third person of the Trinity. Does the Holy Spirit sit on the throne at any time? Why is the Holy Spirit not mentioned?

Mistake: Stronger argument still, why is the Holy Spirit not worshipped? All the beings in heaven worship the Lord God Almighty (chapter 4). They also worship the Lamb (chapter 5). They never mention or worship the Holy Spirit. They do not acknowledge a Trinity of any sort.

James R. White

"The second clause speaks of three divine persons, not three divine Beings." *The Forgotten Trinity*, page 27.

Mistake: It is interesting that Justin Martyr, Tertullian, Origen, and others did identify the Trinity as separate Beings. White is applying his own definition, which is historically inaccurate. It is a clever technique to insure that Christians will not see through the veil of paganism. White further complicates things by saying on the same page, that he agreed with the *Christian Research Institute (CRI)*, that God is "one what and three who's." The Israelites never prayed to a what!

"The reason is very simple: when you are running for your life, in-depth theological reflection, study, and writing is not a high priority." *The Forgotten Trinity*, page 178.

Mistake: This is the furthest thing from the truth! Their theological viewpoint on the subject of God was quite clear. Jesus taught his disciples for three years. After Christ's resurrection, the apostles willingly did not serve tables so that they could study the scriptures (Acts 6:4). The apostle's admonition was to hold on to the original message and not to be deceived by false apostles and teachers. White, on the other hand, places the Council of Nicaea, 325, as the "immediate refocusing of the church's attention upon the issues of the Trinity and the deity of Christ." So, according to White, Christians did not really know God in the previous centuries. Christian Philosophers, accordingly, gave the Church a better understanding of God than was previously done by the apostles. This is unacceptable!

Major Mistakes

"In fact, the simple citation of the passage, without due regard for its context and meaning neither proves the modalistic viewpoint *nor* the deity of Christ!" *The Forgotten Trinity*, page 158.

Mistake: White comments on page 158, explaining such verses as John 14:9, 10, and John 10:30 as not asserting that the Father and Son are one person. Traditionally, this is what most Trinitarian thinkers have done to these passages. In other words, as stated by Trinitarians, there is never a place in the entire bible where Christ and the Father are one in person. This is not only a wrong interpretation of extremely clear verses, but creates many theological problems such as the one previously presented by Walvoord. Now when Trinitarians teach that Jesus is God, well then, all verses that allude to God are given to Christ. Not a problem.

"The great expositor J.C. Ryle noted, ...it was "I AM" who died for us upon the cross." *The Forgotten Trinity*, page 102.

Mistake: Tertullian attacked the Monarchians of his time because in his view, they made the Father to be crucified. He called them Patripassians. White agrees with Ryle that "I AM" was crucified. Is this not the same application of one God that was historically condemned? Is the Father "I AM?" If the Father is I Am, then White along with J.C. Ryle are crucifying the Father. Worse still, if all of the Trinity is represented in this title (Inseparable Operation), then the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost were all crucified. Of course, it is understood that Jesus is I Am in the flesh. Yet, the application can be interpreted in a wrong way as history proves.

William P. Young

"But doesn't that make four of you?' 'Is she God too?' 'Jesus laughed, 'No Mack.' 'There are only three of us.' 'Sophia is a personification of Papa's wisdom.'" *The Shack*, page 171.

"She's part of the mystery surrounding of Sarayu." *The Shack*, page 171.

Mistake: Although "the Shack" is fictional and supposedly written for Young's children, many Trinitarians have taken this book to heart. Some even claimed to have had a deeper revelation of the Trinity. This book is endorsed by vocal Catholics and silent Protestants alike. A few leaders of Trinitarian organizations have stood against it, while the majority have not. No one is crying out "heresy." Apart from making the Trinity a mixture of male and female characters, the introduction of a fourth has a special twist. She is somehow connected with the Holy Spirit.

Young's careful description of Wisdom (Sophia) is, "a tall, beautiful, olive-skinned woman with chiseled Hispanic features, clothed in a darkly colored flowing robe" (p.152). Although Young's views are totally imaginary, he somehow unveils a special connection with the Catholic Virgins. Those being "Guadalupe," "Lourdes," "Fatima," etc. It is a direct link to the heretical teachings of Montfort, Duff and Kolbe. It is the connecting of the divine Mary with the Trinity. It is none other than the Babylonian Trinity of old. Young's fictional "Sophia" reveals the serious Catholic agenda of the future. Not bad for a book based on fiction, and originally written for children.

Montfort, Duff, and Kolbe were militant Catholic men who promoted the worship and adoration of the "Mother of God" as a central part of Catholic devotion. According to those men, Mary was the *spouse of the Holy Spirit*. Montfort wrote the "True Devotion to Mary" while Frank Duff founded the "Legion of Mary." Kolbe promoted "consecration and entrustment to Mary" and was known as "the Apostle to Mary." Pope John Paul II, the most beloved pope of our time, canonized Kolbe in 1982.

Many of the influential evangelical leaders, including television personalities (Crouch, Graham, Hinn, etc.), pointed to Pope John Paul II, as a great Christian leader. Jesus said it well, "Let them alone: they be blind leaders of the blind." 'And if the blind lead the blind, both shall fall into the ditch" (Mat 15:14). The trinity of Babylon included a "Goddess Mother" who was also a member of the trinity.

In identical fashion, the adored Trinity of the Catholics includes a link between the Trinity and the Mother of God. It is amazing that Protestants cannot see the connection! The lies that came in the second century are still with us today. They have grown to gigantic proportions. Books of the Apocrypha contain similar material. The trinity of these false books included "the father, the mother, and the son." The mother represented the Spirit.

If there is anything that points to the Roman Institution as "Mystery Babylon," it is the doctrine of the Trinity that includes a Goddess Mother. The Apocrypha books reveal that the Catholic Trinity was solely derived from the teaching of Babylon. Catholics have always given Mary a special place within the Trinity. This doctrine will get stronger in the last days. Many will accept this corruption of the biblical Mary.

It is simply baffling as to why so many Protestants and Reformers accept such teachings. They assert to believing in a Trinity because they claim it is a biblical doctrine. There is no doctrine in scripture that refers to God as three persons. They remain completely silent when asked about the 56 times the word "persons" is mentioned in the bible, and how not one of these biblical references is directed towards God.⁴ Incredible!

Chapter 7

A Major Contradiction

Labels are important in everyday use. Imagine buying some object that the makers claim is water resistant, only to have that object completely destroyed with the first drops of water. Household items that have a warning label are to be used with caution, especially among innocent children. Taking medicine at random without a doctor's prescription could land a person in the hospital. People must make sure they read the fine print before they sign the contract. The label placed on a person, place, or thing is crucial to clear understanding. The same applies to the term "Christian." There are many who call themselves Christian in today's modern society.

When one compares what the bible says about early Christianity and then tries to find this same description within those who readily profess, sometimes the label can be rather confusing. This is especially true when the lifestyle of the person is contrary to what the Holy Scriptures reveal. Many today claim to be Christian, but their walk, beliefs, and traditions contradict the entire gospel. They are merely using the name to deceive the simple who have no biblical expertise.

Trinitarians assert strongly that they are monotheistic in faith and practice. They place themselves among others who claim the exact same thing. The truth is that they are the only ones believing such a matter because Non-Trinitarian monotheists disagree. The multiple voices of millions of Muslims, Jews, Unitarians, Oneness, and others, are clamoring against this error. Does the Trinity really teach that there is

one God? It is extremely important to understand that when Trinitarians say that God is one, they mean that God is a "Unity" of one.

Line 3 of the Athanasian Creed clearly stipulates that Catholics must worship "one God in Trinity, and Trinity in Unity."¹ Line 27 again reiterates, "Unity in Trinity, and Trinity in Unity is to be worshipped." Line 28 states, "He therefore that will be saved must thus think of the Trinity." Is this really the faith of one who claims to be a monotheist? When an individual states that there are three persons that make up one God, is this really believing in one God? The answer has to be no. Three persons in the Godhead do not establish the biblical truth of one divine being. The Lord our God is one Lord (Deut 6:4).

These statements leave no room for Trinitarians to worship the Father alone. According to this special Catholic document, all worship conducted must include the unity of persons. This is stipulated directly in the so called Athanasian Creed. Orthodoxy strongly proclaims that God is a Trinity. It stands to reason then, that whenever God is to be worshipped, praised, or prayed to, it must include all three members. Think about this! There was a time when Trinitarian Thinkers were persecuting and killing in the name of the Trinity.

How easily it has been forgotten, that many Christians perished because they did not uphold this particular Catholic foundation. Study the life of *Michael Servetus*, and see how important it was to confess the Trinity to those who were willing to burn Christians at the stake for refusing to do so. Servetus was burned on October 27, 1553. His blood cries out to God like the blood of Abel (Gen 4:10). Research into this incident reveals that many laws were broken in order to

murder this man of God. The same applies to persecution of all Christians. The main message of the gospel was violated when religious men took matters into their own carnal and sinful hands. Are these men innocent before God? They will be tried as murderers on Judgment Day.

Upholding the Trinity in Unity is a most serious of mistakes, especially when one considers the prayers and worship that were made in the Old Testament. Starting with Adam and Eve and all the way to the prophets, worship was directed towards one Lord, not three. There is no devotion recorded in the writings of the Jews where a Trinity in Unity is mentioned. For example, "And the Lord appeared unto Abram, and said, Unto thy seed will I give this land: and there builded he an altar unto the Lord, who appeared unto him" (Gen 12:7). Never once does the Lord of heaven appear unto his people as a Trinity.

Elohim is never revealed as a plurality of three divine persons. The servants of God are never seen constructing an altar of three or one altar representing three. This alone is enough to destroy this false concept of the Trinity in Unity. The lie of using "Elohim" as a plurality of persons has circulated for many years. Ask any Jewish person that follows their faith. They will educate anyone on the right use or definition of Elohim as pertains to God.

When it comes to the New Testament, the same truth applies. Every single time that men or women worship God, it is to the one and only eternal God of creation. Jesus spoke these incredible words, "But the hour cometh, and now is, when the true worshippers shall worship the Father in spirit and in truth: for the Father seeketh such to worship him" (John 4:23). Such a powerful truth as this, contradicts the Athanasian

Creed. There is no room here for a Trinity in Unity or a Unity in Trinity to be worshipped. Christ's words contradict the Athanasian Creed.

The places in holy scripture where you see the Father speaking, the Holy Spirit descending (like a dove), and Jesus coming out of the water, are manifestations of one God. This portion of scripture does not involve any worship of a Trinity. Jesus never taught the Jews after this occurrence, that there was a Trinity, or that three persons must be worshipped. Why? One would think, that in the way that Trinitarians abuse this passage, this would have been a great place to introduce the Trinity. It never happened, even though this was at the very beginning of Christ's ministry! See the gospel of Mark, chapter one. Then go to chapter twelve, verse 29. The Lord Jesus continues to uphold Deut 6:4 even after he was baptized!

The answer is obvious, there is no Trinity in heaven to be worshipped. The verse in the New Testament that declares, "For there are three that bear record in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost: and these three are one" (1 John 5:7), has been challenged by many historians and theologians as a 16th century interpolation.² Before this timeframe, there are no manuscripts that have this verse. Whether you agree or not, there are valid reasons why many argue against this passage. The only thing that this clever activity of placing commentator's "notes as scripture" reveals, is that there were certain men in history who violated the Lord's admonitions in Revelation 22:18, 19. They added to the Word of God.

Adding to the words of scripture seriously placed a deadly curse on those men that claimed to be Christian. It also uncovers a secret agenda that was brought into the church, and that men will stop at nothing to see these lies perpetrated as

Major Mistakes

gospel truth. This practice of taking away or adding words to the bible, especially the New Testament, is still going on with all the new bible versions placed before the public. It can still be observed that men are trying to create proof for the Trinity doctrine. In the past, men persecuted Christians because of the Trinity. Today, they are changing religious historical books, and bringing out new bible translations that match their theology. Bible believing Christians must be aware of such things!

Again, we remind the reader that when Trinitarians say one, they do not really mean one, but a unity of three persons who together make up one unit. The Ante-Nicene Fathers, including Tertullian, referred to them as "beings." Today some call it a "What, and three Who's." This is not taught in the bible. Scripture does not teach that God is a thing (what). The God that the prophets and apostles served, was not an impersonal God. On another note, how can there be three coequal, coeternal divine persons that are God, yet it is still only one God? The answer, they are referring to a team, group, or alliance of celestial beings. There is no family of gods, except in Greek philosophy.

This is the same language that was used by the Stoic philosophers of old. This was the national philosophy of pagan Rome for many years. It is polytheism. To them God was the substance, and all beings that emanated from this substance were one and the same. Research on the word "substance" as it relates to God will reveal much. Studying the same word in the bible will yield conclusive evidence in favor of the Oneness or Monarchian faith.

The problem came from the very beginning with the application of a triune formula in baptism. Certain infiltrators

pretending to be biblical Christians brought in a myriad of false teaching. These men erroneously misinterpreted Matthew 28:19 to be in the names instead of name. Tertullian later stated that they did not baptize into a "unipersonal God" but unto three persons. **3.623**. They would baptize three times, and in three names of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. As mentioned before, this was also done in the nude. In other words, they were made to acknowledge a Triune God right from the beginning of their (Christian?) walk.

This type of philosophy is not really monotheistic but polytheistic. If Trinitarian teaching began with three persons to be mentioned at baptism, shouldn't they acknowledge all three persons together in worship and prayer? The Apostolic Tradition, written by the first Anti-Pope in history stated, "I consent to Thee, O Father, Son, and Holy Ghost."³ This is not praying according to the bible. If anything, this type of prayer by Hippolytus reveals the erroneous mindset of the earliest Ante-Nicene Fathers. This is not biblical Christianity.

ATHANASIAN CREED

1. Whosoever will be saved, before all things it is necessary that he hold the catholic faith;
2. Which faith except every one do keep whole and undefiled, without doubt he shall perish everlastingly.
3. And the catholic faith is this: That we worship one God in Trinity, and Trinity in Unity;
4. Neither confounding the persons nor dividing the substance.
5. For there is one person of the Father, another of the Son, and another of the Holy Spirit.
6. But the Godhead of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit is all one, the glory equal, the majesty coeternal.

Major Mistakes

7. Such as the Father is, such is the Son, and such is the Holy Spirit.
8. The Father uncreated, the Son uncreated, and the Holy Spirit uncreated.
9. The Father incomprehensible, the Son incomprehensible, and the Holy Spirit incomprehensible.
10. The Father eternal, the Son eternal, and the Holy Spirit eternal.
11. And yet they are not three eternal but one eternal.
12. As also there are not three uncreated nor three incomprehensible, but one uncreated and one incomprehensible.
13. So likewise the Father is almighty, the Son almighty, and the Holy Spirit almighty.
14. And yet they are not three almighties, but one almighty.
15. So the Father is God, the Son is God, and the Holy Spirit is God;
16. And yet they are not three Gods, but one God.
17. So likewise the Father is Lord, the Son Lord, and the Holy Spirit Lord;
18. And yet they are not three Lords but one Lord.
19. For like as we are compelled by the Christian verity to acknowledge every Person by himself to be God and Lord;
20. So are we forbidden by the catholic religion to say; There are three Gods or three Lords.
21. The Father is made of none, neither created nor begotten.
22. The Son is of the Father alone; not made nor created, but begotten.
23. The Holy Spirit is of the Father and of the Son; neither made, nor created, nor begotten, but proceeding.
24. So there is one Father, not three Fathers; one Son, not three Sons; one Holy Spirit, not three Holy Spirits.
25. And in this Trinity none is afore or after another; none is greater or less than another.
26. But the whole three persons are coeternal, and coequal.

27. So that in all things, as aforesaid, the Unity in Trinity and the Trinity in Unity is to be worshipped.
28. He therefore that will be saved must thus think of the Trinity.
29. Furthermore it is necessary to everlasting salvation that he also believe rightly the incarnation of our Lord Jesus Christ.
30. For the right faith is that we believe and confess that our Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of God, is God and man.
31. God of the substance of the Father, begotten before the worlds; and man of substance of His mother, born in the world.
32. Perfect God and perfect man, of a reasonable soul and human flesh subsisting.
33. Equal to the Father as touching His Godhead, and inferior to the Father as touching His manhood.
34. Who, although He is God and man, yet He is not two, but one Christ.
35. One, not by conversion of the Godhead into flesh, but by taking of that manhood into God.
36. One altogether, not by confusion of substance, but by unity of person.
37. For as the reasonable soul and flesh is one man, so God and man is one Christ;
38. Who suffered for our salvation, descended into hell, rose again the third day from the dead;
39. He ascended into heaven, He sits on the right hand of the Father, God, Almighty;
40. From thence He shall come to judge the quick and the dead.
41. At whose coming all men shall rise again with their bodies;
42. and shall give account of their own works.
43. And they that have done good shall go into life everlasting and they that have done evil into everlasting fire.
44. This is the catholic faith, which except a man believe faithfully he cannot be saved.

Creedal Mistakes

Athanasian Creed

In order for things to be laid flat on the table, the Athanasian Creed must be directly scrutinized, especially the first beginning statements. To be saved, one does not need to hold the Catholic faith. The central message of the gospel is "For God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life" (John 3:16). It is Christ that saves, not the Church!

Deut 6:4-5

Hear, O Israel: The Lord our God is one Lord: And thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thine heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy might.

Contradiction: Line 17 states that "the Father is Lord, the Son is Lord, and the Holy Spirit is Lord; and yet they are not three Lords, but one Lord." They are implying that God is one in Unity. These three Lords do not blend into one, or disappear to leave only one God. They are there as three coequal, coeternal persons, who together make up one God.

John 4:24

God is a Spirit: and they that worship him must worship him in spirit and in truth.

Contradiction: According to the Trinity, the Father is a Spirit, the Son was bodiless in eternity past, and the Holy Spirit is a distinct Spirit. This makes three Spirits in eternity. It is a

compound unity. The bible speaks about worshipping only one person, which is Spirit.

Rev 10:6

And swore by *him* that *liveth forever* and ever, *who created heaven*, and the things that therein are, and the earth, and the things that therein are, and the sea, and the things which are therein, that there should be time no longer.

Contradiction: Line 10 says the Father eternal, the Son eternal, and the Holy Spirit eternal, and yet they are not three eternals, but one eternal. Again, contrary to the bible, they mean one "Unity" of persons or divine beings. There is only one Creator who lives forever and ever!

Heb 1:3

Who being the brightness of his glory, and the express image of his person, and upholding all things by the word of his power, when he had by himself purged our sins, sat down on the right hand of the Majesty on high;

Contradiction: Line 4 states "neither confounding the persons, nor dividing the substance." While Trinitarians love the word "Persons," the bible adamantly points to person always in the singular sense. Jesus is the express image of the Father's person. Jesus taught that seeing him was seeing the Father. Researching the origin of the word "Person" brings us to Philo. He was never a Christian, yet his description of the Godhead was that the Father was the middle person of the other two. He was suggesting that his equal powers were second and third persons.

Major Mistakes

Isa 9:6

For unto us a child is born, unto us a son is given: and the government shall be upon his shoulder: and his name shall be called Wonderful, Counselor, The mighty God, *The everlasting Father*, The Prince of Peace. Check out Rev 21:6, 7.

Matt 1:18

Now the birth of Jesus Christ was on this wise: When as his mother Mary was espoused to Joseph, before they came together, she was found with *child of the Holy Ghost*.

Contradiction: Line 24 says "so there is one Father, not three Fathers..." The Trinity makes each person in the Godhead "distinct." That presents a major problem. If the persons are distinct, than there are three Fathers. Jesus is the everlasting Father. Jesus was the child of the Holy Ghost. This makes the Holy Spirit a Father.

Col 1:15

Who is the image of the invisible God, the firstborn of every creature:

Contradiction: Line 22 states "the Son is of the Father alone; not made nor created, but begotten." All people born into this world are made and created. Jesus was born into the human race. When the Ante-Nicene Fathers used the Trinity formula of "God, Word, and Wisdom," some explained Wisdom as being Christ, others that Wisdom was the Holy Spirit. All of them cited erroneously that Wisdom was created. This

contradicts the Athanasian Creed. This is why Christians must demand to know who wrote the Athanasian Creed, and where did they get their unbiblical ideas?

Gal 4:6

And because ye are sons, God hath sent forth the Spirit of his Son into your hearts, crying, Abba, Father.

Contradiction: Line 24 says "So there is one Father, not three Fathers; one Son, not three Sons; one Holy Spirit, not three Holy Spirits." Another way Trinitarian Thinkers are saying this is "the Spirit is not the Father, and the Spirit is not the Son." The bible never claims the Spirit as being distinct from the Father or the Son! Direct scriptures tell the biblical Christian that the Holy Spirit is the Spirit of the Son. Joel's prophecy of the pouring out of the Spirit reveals the Holy Spirit to be the Father's Spirit. There is no verse that claims the Holy Spirit to be another Spirit other than God's Spirit. Teaching on the third person of the Trinity is defective.

John 14:28

Ye have heard how I said unto you, I go away, and come again unto you. If ye loved me, ye would rejoice, because I said, I go unto the Father: for my Father is greater than I.

Contradiction: Line 25 says "in this Trinity none is afore or after another; none is greater or less than another." Tertullian certainly believed that the Son was less than the Father. **3.603.** In eternity, the Father would still be greater than the Son, simply because of rank. A son can never be the same as his father. The word "begotten" indicates a coming after.

Major Mistakes

1 Tim 3:16

And without controversy great is the mystery of godliness: God was manifest in the flesh, justified in the Spirit, seen of angels, preached unto the Gentiles, believed on in the world, received up into glory.

Contradiction: Line 35 states "not by conversion of the Godhead into flesh, but by taking of that manhood into God." God did become a man! That is what makes up the mystery of godliness.

Luke 11:2-4

And he said unto them, When ye pray, say, Our Father which art in heaven, Hallowed be thy name. Thy kingdom come. Thy will be done, as in heaven, so in earth. Give us day by day our daily bread. And forgive us our sins; for we also forgive every one that is indebted to us. And lead us not into temptation; but deliver us from evil.

Contradiction: From Genesis to Revelation, prayer and worship is offered up to one person, the Father. As stated at the beginning of this chapter, the Athanasian Creed stipulates that "Trinity in Unity" is to be worshipped. It is a major contradiction! When worship is addressed to the Father alone, how is this a worship of the Trinity? It is the Trinity dogma that stresses that "the Father is not the Son, and the Son is not the Spirit." If Trinitarians maintain that the Father is God, the Son is God, and the Spirit is God, then they must worship all three coequal persons simultaneously.

Contradiction: The teachings of the "Divine Economy" and "Inseparable Operation" are inventions to explain difficult passages that address God alone. Study the meaning of the words "God," "Holy," and "I Am." It is impossible to fit three persons in the revelation of one God.

Worship of the Father

Why does the bible teach over 300 times in the New Testament, to pray, worship, and honor the Father? While the false Athanasian Creed states that the Trinity in Unity must be worshipped, there are no verses of scripture that even come close to this type of worship. If a Trinitarian were to pray or worship the Trinity, he or she would be completely contrary to what the Holy Bible teaches on worship. Most interesting still, is the fact that when most Christians pray or worship, they do it the biblical way. The majority of Christians follow the bible and pray to the Father, in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ. The Spirit is not even mentioned. This then, leads to one conclusion.

Most Christians are Trinitarian in theory, but not in practice. It is highly hypocritical to claim to believe that God is three coequal, coeternal persons, and not to pray to them simultaneously. Praying to the Father, in the name of Jesus, is not praying to a Trinity. According to the dogma of Trinitarians, the Father is not the Son, and the Son is not the Spirit. So, when prayer or worship is made unto the Father, these Christians are leaving out the Son and the Spirit. This is a tremendous contradiction in faith and practice. This argument was used by Cyprian in 257 A.D. to attack baptism

in Jesus name. He claimed that those baptized in this way were leaving out the Father and the Spirit.

How can praying or worshipping one person of the Trinity, constitute praying or worshipping all three? When this argument was presented to Trinitarians, the answers given were never satisfactory. Some claimed that they were still praying or worshipping the Trinity simply because they were praying "to the Father, in the name of the Son, by the help of the Holy Spirit." They were reminded that they were **addressing only one member of the Trinity**. Line 19 tells us "For like as we are compelled by the Christian verity to acknowledge every Person by himself to be God and Lord." There is no recognition of every divine person, when prayer or worship is directed towards one person in the Godhead.

If the Son is God and is distinct from the Father, he must be worshipped along with the Father. If the Holy Spirit is God, then he too must be worshipped along with the Father and the Son. Not to do so, would be highly disrespectful to a Triune God. It contradicts the very faith that they profess. It carries, according to the Athanasian Creed, the sentence of perishing everlastingly. See line two. How can this situation be acceptable to a Trinity of Persons? Again, praying or worshipping only "God" and saying that the individual is worshipping the Trinity is wrong. The doctrine of **Inseparable Operation** does not teach that the three persons are always working together. Those who use this argument pick and choose the verses themselves.

To a Biblical Christian, praying to the Father alone, satisfies the demand for worship of God. Since there are no distinctions when the Father is worshipped, the Son is being worshipped. When the Father is worshipped, the Holy Spirit is

being worshipped. Praise God! Most Christians have been practicing true Oneness theology without even knowing. They worship God as the Father, pray the "Our Father," and sing mostly to God as Father. Of course, most Christians sing to Jesus or about Jesus, because as the Church knows, Jesus is the image of the invisible God. Rarely, does a Church sing to the Holy Spirit or about the Spirit, unless they want revival.

Now, when it comes to the Trinity, 99.9% of the time, the Trinity is never worshipped. The reference here is not to Oneness Churches, but to Trinitarian Churches who claim to be orthodox. Biblically, when a person prays to God, he is addressing the Father, or the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. When prayer is made unto the "Lord" it is with the knowledge that it is only one Lord (Deut 6:4). There is no confusion as to what Lord the believer is worshipping. Believers know instinctively that they are praying to one Lord.

To be a truly biblical Christian, one has to pray in the name of Jesus. The focus is one God alone. The angel of Revelation told the Apostle John to "worship God" and only him alone. This is what the Savior taught his disciples. Start with chapter eight of the gospel of John, and work your way until you get to chapter fourteen. You will find many interesting verses between these seven chapters. Jesus stated, ***I and my father are one*** (John 10:30). In reference to the Father, Jesus said, "...and from henceforth ye know him, and have seen him" (John 14:7). In the following verse (9), Jesus plainly states, "...he that hath seen me hath seen the Father."

PhD's majoring in "Trinitarian Theology" are restating Augustine's theory that all members of the Trinity do all things together in harmony. As mentioned previously, this is known as the "Inseparable Operation" of the Trinity. When it comes

Major Mistakes

to verses such as those mentioned in the gospel of John, this philosophical theory does not work. The bible states, "For in him dwelleth all the fullness of the Godhead bodily" (Col 2:9). It is important to bring to mind that Trinitarians teach that there are three persons in the Godhead. Christ never taught that within his person there was dwelling a Father, Son, and Holy Spirit.

To protect themselves against this error, these doctors of "Trinity" theology state that in the incarnation "we cannot say that the Father became incarnate or begotten." In other words, the Trinity members operate together only in certain situations, but not always. This is a huge flaw in Trinitarian doctrine. Christ never claimed to be the image of the invisible "God, the Son." He never spoke and said that if you saw him, you saw the "Eternal Son" or the Holy Spirit. He strongly professed many times that *the Father was dwelling in him*.

The Trinity is occasionally mentioned only to reinforce what Trinitarians believe, but never really worshipped. The bible addresses the Almighty God as the Father, not as "the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit." There is no instance of worship where the Trinity is addressed before and after the Lord Jesus was on earth. This presents a major problem for Trinitarian Thinkers. The Triune God is never worshipped, prayed to, or even mentioned in both the Old Testament or the New Testament. As mentioned previously, not even after Jesus' baptism was the Trinity declared.

Incredibly, the book of Revelation, the last book of the bible, does not reveal a Trinity of any sort. Jesus, as the Lamb of God, is not sitting on his own throne. *Jesus sits on his Father's throne*. See book of Revelation, 3:21, 4:2, 5:13, 7:10, 7:17, 12:5, 22:1, 22:3. The significance of this is catastrophic

to the Trinity. The Holy Spirit is not worshipped in the book of Revelation. He is not even shown to sit on any throne. Neither the Apostle John, nor the angels, nor the beasts around the throne, exalt the Holy Spirit at any time. He is not even mentioned. There is no attempt to worship the Spirit. ***The Athanasian Creed contradicts the book of Revelation.***

All Catholics, including their beloved popes, will be in total shock on Judgment Day when they realize that there is only one throne in heaven. Especially, after they taught their members that the "Queen of Heaven" is next to the throne of the Son pleading for those who pray the rosary. It will take more than the rosary to get a soul into heaven. The book of Revelation reveals that this is a lie that has been perpetrated against the true gospel of our Lord and Savior. Millions of sincere Catholics have been lied to about seeking refuge in the Mother of God.

Who Do You Worship?

As a biblical Christian you must pray and worship the Father in the name of Jesus Christ. The last part of the following verse says, "...do all in the name of the Lord Jesus, giving thanks to God and the Father by him" (Col 3:17). If you pray to the Father in the name of Jesus, congratulations, you are practicing the faith of a biblical Christian who believes in one God. Trinitarians have been arguing for centuries that Oneness believers are heretics. How can Oneness believers be heretics if they are worshipping the one God of the bible, and following the directives of scripture? Oneness believers profess that Jesus truly is the Son of the Living God!

Catholics have an enormous problem with prayer and worship when it comes to the one only God. They have such complicated notions of who to pray to and worship. Though there are intelligent Catholics who live in denial, the majority of Catholics pray and worship a multi-lineup of divinities. Many pray to saints, angels, or the blessed Mother. Some of their children were required to pray at night to "Jesus, Mary, and Joseph." Like going to a "cafeteria" they can select their own choices or preference. They can deny this to those who have never been Catholic. When a person is born and raised Catholic, the story is different.

Just examine the many kinds of candles purchased at local stores, and you'll get the picture. Especially in third world countries, the worship of the "Madonna" is at the peak of idol worship. There are special ceremonies and special occasions when these false deities are worshipped and celebrated. The most popular are those that celebrate the multi-national "Virgin" represented differently in all the countries of the world. Even with all these activities in plain sight, many deny that they are disobeying God. What blindness! Worshipping idols of Mary is the epitome of self-delusion. Even though she was supposed to be Jewish, her appearance to the world conveniently comes as being French, Mexican, African, and Oriental, just to name a few.

Those supposedly "Christian Pastors" who renounce Protestantism and return to the idolatry of the Catholic Church, were never really saved, or they form part of the counter-reformation initiative. One of the best reasons that they give for doing this, is that they found the Catholic Church to be the true and original Church. Its sacraments and writings by the Ante-Nicene Fathers, convinced these so-called Pastors

that they needed to return to Rome. They should have studied the countless forgeries and lies propagated by these same historic figures. Their research was extremely superficial to overlook such conflicting evidence.

They should have studied their bibles. Here is why. Reviewing the names and titles given to Mary certainly proves their ignorance. Both the "Litany of the Blessed Virgin and Litany of Loreto," address Mary with many false titles. The "Morning Star," "Glory of the Holy Spirit," and "Throne of wisdom," are cited among many others. The bible reveals that Jesus Christ is the only bright and morning star (Rev 22:16). It is not Satan (most modern bible translations), nor is it Mary (Litany of Loreto).⁴ Jesus did not fall from heaven! It was Lucifer. Isaiah reads, "How art thou fallen from heaven, O Lucifer, son of the morning" (Isa 14:12)! Read the NIV or any other new translation. Prepare to be shocked!

So who do you worship? Who you worship determines what you believe. It is as simple as that. While many claim to believe that God is a Trinity of persons, their prayer life and worship reveal otherwise. The truth is that the majority of Christians pray to one God. They pray to the Father, in the name of Jesus. This is biblical. Some say "thank you, Jesus." This is great! The bible teaches that Christ's disciples prayed in the name of Jesus. They also called on the "name of the Lord." Some spoke directly to Jesus and asked, " Lord, what will thou have me to do?" This is referring to the Apostle Paul in Acts 9.

Ananias was asked by the Lord to go and pray for Saul. He hesitated at first by saying, "And here he hath authority from the chief priests to bind all that *call on thy name*" (Acts 9:14). Ananias' statement reveals that Christians

would pray directly to Jesus, calling on his name. Praise God! When Stephen was being martyred, he saw *the glory of God*, and Jesus standing on the right hand of God. When he was dying he prayed, "Lord Jesus, receive my spirit" (Acts 7:59). He did not pray "Father, Son, and Holy Ghost" receive my spirit. He prayed to Jesus because Jesus is *the brightness of his glory*! See Hebrews 1:3. Praise the Lord!

The angels and all residents of heaven worship the Lord God Almighty: "And the four beasts had each of them six wings about him; and they were full of eyes within: and they rest not day and night, saying, Holy, holy, holy, Lord God Almighty, *which was, and is, and is to come*" (Rev 4:8). At the very beginning of the book of Revelation we see the connection: "I am Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the ending, saith the Lord, which is, and which was, and which is to come, the Almighty" (Rev 1:8). This is a reference to Jesus Christ!

At the time that the Apostle John hears, "I am Alpha and Omega, the first and the last" he turns around and sees, "And in the midst of the seven candlesticks one like unto the Son of man, clothed with a garment down to the foot, and girt about the paps with a golden girdle" (Rev 1:13). The key here is "which is, and which was, and which is to come." Notice the clause, "like unto the Son of man." This has been a blind spot for many who advocate that Jesus was just a man or a second God.

The word of the living God is wonderful! "Thus saith the Lord the King of Israel, and his redeemer the Lord of hosts; I am the first, and I am the last; and beside me there is no God" (Isa 44:6). The statement, "beside me there is no God" is mentioned many times throughout the scriptures. See

Isa 44:8, 45:5, 45:21, Dt 32:39, 1Ki 8:23, Hos 13:4. Verses such as these are a direct contradiction to the doctrine of the Trinity, which claims a God the Son, and a God the Holy Spirit. Jesus asserts in the New Testament to be the first and the last. See Rev 1:8, 1:11, 1:17, 21:6, 22:13. This leaves no room for mistakes or wrong interpretations.

Carefully consider this verse: "And he said unto me, It is done.' ***I am Alpha and Omega***, the beginning and the end.' 'I will give unto him that is athirst of the fountain of the water of life freely.' 'He that overcometh shall inherit all things; and ***I will be his God***, and ***he shall be my son***" (Rev 21:6-7). There are strong implications with this particular portion of scripture. Why was this single verse overlooked by the red letter edition people? Why do multiple commentaries of the bible omit any information or explanation of such a revealing statement?

The red letter edition of the bible is wonderful. It is a great help to know the words that Jesus Christ spoke. In the case of this last mentioned verse, something becomes very self evident. While all other verses that state "I am Alpha and Omega" are presented in red letters, Rev 21:6 was not afforded this luxury. Any casual reading of this text would go unnoticed. When a person is a serious searcher for the truth of God's word, then the story is different. It was Jesus who was speaking in this passage. This verse goes parallel with Isa 9:6. Jesus is the everlasting Father! Praise our wonderful God! Many commentaries were sought out for an explanation, none was found. Only one, Barnes Notes, explained that it was Jesus who was speaking. They did not explain the "Father" part of the text.

If theologians would heed the words of Christ, instead of the ideas of pagan philosophers, millions would understand the gospel including Jews and Muslims. He said, "I and my Father are one" (John 10:30). Jesus was not referring to relationship but to identity. What was the reaction of the Jews when they heard this? "The Jews answered him, saying, For a good work we stone thee not; but for blasphemy; and because that thou, being a man, makest thyself God" (John 10:33). Christ was indeed making himself out to be God, ***God the Father.***

For Jesus to say many times over that if you saw him you were seeing the Father, is proof enough. Hebrews 1:3 declares that Jesus is the "express image of his person" referring to God. Christ is not the second person of the Trinity, he is the first and only person of the Father. The bible speaks about the glory of God. Again, Hebrews 1:3 states that Jesus is "the brightness of his glory." When we behold God's glory in heaven, we will behold Jesus right in the center of that glory. The same thing applies to God's throne. The bible says, "For the Lamb which is in the midst of the throne shall feed them, and shall lead them unto living fountains of waters: and God shall wipe away all tears from their eyes" (Rev 7:17).

Who wrote the revered Athanasian Creed anyway? What council was convened publicly to agree on such a mixed up confession? The answer is none. Ask Trinitarians about this! Demand an answer. Don't accept an "I don't know" statement. It is to the advantage of sincere people that love God to pray and worship correctly, after all, the "Blessed Trinity" started out as a philosophy, and it will always be a philosophy coming from pagan Greek sources. The precise information found in the first three centuries is undeniable.

The quotes presented by Trinitarian Thinkers are most revealing of the mistakes found in Trinitarian doctrine. May this book open the eyes of many sincere and honest Christians.

It takes a special breed of men and women to stand above the crowds. It was this sort of individual that came face to face with the Roman Church and its many abuses. History dispels that it was through growing dissatisfaction with the errors and false practices of Rome that certain men were willing to cry out "it is enough." Reformation fires started because of such things. Some through the treachery of Rome's concealment of the "Word of God" were led to the fact of "Sola Scriptura." Others were driven to such actions, as in the case of Luther, to nail on the door of the Church, the 95 errors and excesses of the Roman Catholic Church. It was the selling of indulgences that led to "justification by faith."

Now, in this time of false religious unity, it is the hypocritical stance of many, that is making biblical Christians extremely dissatisfied. Once again, a blatant disregard for the truth of scripture is paraded among Evangelicals and Catholics without any real scrutiny. It is wrong to assert that Christians come in all flavors! There is only one type of Christian that is authentic. This is known as the biblical Christian. The false claim that unites many a Christian Church with the Catholic religion is that of the Trinity doctrine. It is a fake unity based on a bogus foundation. Christians who adhere to this kind of unity are being lined up for the end-time one world religion.

This book was written with the intent of helping those Christians who are most sincere and truthful in their walk. There have been many lies perpetrated throughout history to claim an unbiblical orthodoxy. Most average Christians have unknowingly swallowed certain teachings that are frankly

Major Mistakes

upright contradictions to what the bible teaches as truth. They trusted their denomination, their leaders, and their exposition of what they thought was sound biblical doctrine. May God help those who really want to know the truth! This can be accomplished by researching religious history, studying the earliest Ante-Nicene Fathers, and comparing "Scripture with Scripture." Pray for the guidance of the Holy Spirit. Fasting and prayer is recommended!

It is difficult to believe or understand that for centuries what theologians called a revelation concerning the Trinity, was really a fictitious and allegorical doctrine. Make no mistake about it! The foundation of the Trinity is derived from allegory. It came into the churches through men who made use of allegory and personification. Attributes of God were made into persons or beings in the Godhead. The Ante-Nicene Fathers were the ones to bring this deception into the church communities of their time. These men did not use the simple "logos" of the bible. Instead, they applied the ideas connected with the pagan Greek logos of philosophy.

Philo the Greek philosopher, has been rejected by most respected Trinitarian scholars as having anything to do with the origin of the Trinity. Yet, the writings of the fathers are filled with his mystical theories. This includes Philo's method of interpretation of certain passages. Any Christian who is not into researching these things would be vulnerable to those teachers who are telling the world a different story. That is why the Trinity doctrine has maintained a major place in Christian circles. The truth has been covered up under what was back then, the Roman law. Protestants and Reformers incredibly, would drink of the same golden cup held by the woman who rides the beast (Rev 18).

Catholics have given Christians and the entire world, for that matter, an altered history that for centuries has concealed their major mistakes. Indeed, the Trinity doctrine is one of the greatest mistakes committed by the religious elite. Throughout history, biblical Christians have been socially and physically assaulted. From the beginning those believers who refused to accept the concept of God being three persons brought horrific consequences. This religious institution has never been sympathetic to any persons who disagree with her manmade doctrines and traditions.

Rome has never been held accountable for the serious crimes she has committed over and over again. She has never been punished! She has dealt ruthlessly with all who will not negotiate with her religious products. The Oneness people especially, have been labeled as heretics, members of a cult, Jesus only, Patripassians, followers of Sabellius, and others. They have been victimized to the point that they are not accepted in today's Christian circles. All of this is done while Rome holds its head up high. It loves to parade its excesses of gold, jewels, wine, and Babylonian garments. She lives in extravagant luxury while she tells the world to take care of the poor. Most denominations praise and exalt Rome as though her self-delusion is really the approval of God.

Churches continue to uphold her philosophical creeds, telling their misguided members that this is historical biblical Christianity. They foolishly maintain Catholic Rome as the supreme authority. The Apostle Paul wrote accurately about this. His letter to the Thessalonians reads, "Who opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God, or that is worshipped; so that he as God sitteth in the temple of God, shewing himself that he is God" (2 Thess 2:4). As the Apostle

Paul predicted, the pope sits on a throne to this day. "For the mystery of iniquity doth already work: only he who now letteth will let, until he be taken out of the way" (2 Thess 2:7).

Babylon will fall! The Word of God does not fail. It is foretold, "And he cried mightily with a strong voice, saying, Babylon the great is fallen, is fallen, and is become the habitation of devils, and the hold of every foul spirit, and a cage of every unclean and hateful bird" (Rev 18:2). The Whore will be judged: "For true and righteous are his judgments: for he hath judged the great whore, which did corrupt the earth with her fornication, and hath avenged the blood of his servants at her hand" (Rev 19:2).

The antichrist will ultimately get what he deserves: "And then shall that Wicked be revealed, whom the Lord shall consume with the spirit of his mouth, and shall destroy with the brightness of his coming" (2 Thess 2:8). They have made a rock (stone) with their own hands. See Daniel 2:34, 47. One day the stone made *without hands* will strike at the kingdoms of the world and will destroy them. One day a kingdom will be set up where righteousness shall rule and biblical truth will be exalted. Biblical Christians are waiting for the day when the stone will become a great mountain that will fill the whole earth. In the meanwhile, the Church must continue preaching and teaching the truth of God's word: "One Lord, one faith, one baptism" (Eph 4:5).

If the reader does not know Jesus as personal Savior, the time is now. Turn to God with all of your heart. Repent and believe the gospel. Believe and receive Jesus into your heart. Ask the Lord to change your life and give you a new beginning. Learn to be obedient to His voice, and follow the leading of the Holy Spirit. Make the bible your number one

source of information. Join a bible proclaiming church. Study diligently. Research every church doctrine. Please study to show thyself approved unto God (2 Timothy 2:15). Learn to rightly divide the word of truth. Reject doctrine that is solely based on one scripture reference.

Here are some summary notes to consider about this book. Chapter one revealed that the Trinity doctrine came within a cluster of false teaching, through the infiltration of false teachers. Second century men would change the meaning and application of baptism, alongside of a false rendering of the definition of logos. Instead of using the biblical logos or word, men would make use of the Greek Logos of pagan philosophy. Chapter two would also expose the Trinity as an allegorical invention that made use of God's attributes. These attributes were deliberately made into eternal divine beings who stood side by side with the Creator.

Chapter three uncovered the most incredible truth that biblical men outside and within the Catholic church would defend the true teaching of one God. They would do this in opposition to other Catholic men who were introducing the Trinity as a new philosophy to be accepted by all Christians. Trinitarians would not succeed with this venture until Rome lost its leaders, and the new popes would persecute and turn against the majority of Non-Trinitarians. The fourth chapter disclosed how Trinitarians gained total control over other church communities through the help of the Roman Emperor. By creating a so-called Christian State/Religion, all opposition to the Trinity would be officially silenced.

Chapter five and six record the multiple mistakes made by Trinitarian Thinkers. The mistakes are serious and difficult to overlook. While chapter five deals with the first minds of

Major Mistakes

Trinitarianism, chapter six relates how this doctrine developed over the years. Modern defenders do not stay within the actual writings of their predecessors, but find it ever so harmless to change and adapt the original teaching to that of their own preference. Over the years, a pattern has developed so as to maintain the doctrine ever so pertinent to modern intellectual demands. Chapter seven brings forth the charge that although the dogma is proclaimed, it is not practiced. Worship and prayer are never directed at three coequal, coeternal persons. Instead they pray to one divine Person in the name of the other. The third Person is usually neglected.

If the reader disagrees with the findings of this book, the way to counter is by researching those things mentioned in each century. The correct process in rejecting this material is by proving that the contents of this work are flawed. Name calling and attacking with the same old arguments, is not at all the wise thing to do. Christians do not persecute Christians! The carnal thing to do is to brand someone a heretic and then disregard the compilation of facts provided. This is really the way that things have been done in the past. The persecuting spirit attacks regardless of whether the person is right or wrong.

If God has granted the reader's eyes to be opened, then the mission of this book has been accomplished. It is important to know that all the research for this work was undertaken with utmost dedication and desire for God's truth. This endeavor is not the work of a novice, or some member of a group who wishes to expound their nonconformist ideas. It is the serious labor of many years of research. While those who do not accept correction will compare this book to trash, it is a Pastor's work of love for those in the church whose soul cries

out for truth. May God grant every single reader of this book to see and understand the lies, forgeries, and errors that came many years ago to present a Hellenized gospel, instead of the everlasting gospel of Jesus Christ. The truth of God will be found only in the Holy Bible, never in manmade creeds or traditions.

Notes

Chapter 1

1. Arnold, Marvin M., D.D., Th.D., *Apostolic History Outline* (Michigan: Arno Publications, 1985) AD 33-100, section on AD 66
2. LaHaye, Tim, *Revelation, Illustrated and Made Plain* (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Zondervan Pub. House, 1980) 38
3. New American Bible, *The New Catholic Translation* (Catholic Press: Thomas Nelson Inc., 1987)
4. Ante-Nicene Fathers (Peabody, Massachusetts: Hendrickson, Publishers, Inc., 1995) 1.62
5. Strong, James, *The New Strong's Exhaustive Concordance of the Bible* (Nashville, Tennessee: Thomas Nelson Publishers, 1990) 1231
6. Runia, David T., *Philo in Early Christian Literature: A Survey* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1993.) 89
7. Works of Philo, Translated by C.D. Yonge (Hendrickson Publishers, 1993) xii
8. Works of Philo, 385, 747, 343
9. Hislop, Alexander, *Two Babylons or the Papal Worship Proved to be the Worship of Nimrod and His Wife* (SOHO Square, London: Kessinger Publishing, 1932)
10. Works of Philo, 83, 290, 421
11. Kung, Hans, *The Catholic Church, a Short History* (N.Y. New York: Random House Publishing, 2003) 22

12. Edersheim, Alfred, *The Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah*. Part IV, WM.B. (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1980) 31

13. New Advent Catholic Encyclopedia, *Pope Anacletus*, online. www.newadvent.org. (1 Jan. 2015)

14. Works of Philo, 290

Chapter 2

1. Ehrman, Bart D, *Lost Scriptures-Books that did Not Make It into the New Testament*, (New York, New York: Oxford, University Press, Inc., 2003)

2. Ibid., 70

3. Hoeller, Stephan A., *Gnosticism, New Light On The Ancient Tradition Of Inner Knowing* (Wheaton, Ill.: Theosophical Publishing House, 2002) 47

4. Ibid., 113

5. Ibid., 96

6. Edersheim, Alfred, *The Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah*. Part IV, WM.B. (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1980) 44, 45

7. International Standard Bible Encyclopedia, *Wisdom* (Chicago: Howard-Severance Company, 1915)

8. Montfort, St. Louis De, *True Devotion to Mary* (London, UK: Catholic Way Pub., 2013) 1, 25

9. Eusebius, *Ecclesiastical History* (Peabody, Massachusetts: Hendrickson Publishers, Inc., 2011) 51

10. New Advent Catholic Encyclopedia, *The Logos*, online. www.newadvent.org. (1 Jan. 2015)
11. Kung, Hans, *The Catholic Church, a Short History* (N.Y. New York: Random House Publishing, 2003) 41
12. Works of Philo, Translated by C.D. Yonge (Hendrickson Publishers, 1993) 83
13. Blavatsky, H.P., *The theosophical glossary* (Los Angeles, California: Theosophical Pub. House, 1918) 235
14. Works of Philo, 11
15. Ibid., 11
16. Berkhof, Louis, *The history of Christian doctrines* (Carlisle, Pennsylvania: The Banner of Truth, 1997) 58
17. Works of Philo, 290
18. Beisner, E. Calvin, *God in Three Persons* (Eugene, Oregon: Wipf & Stock Publishers, 1984) 23
19. Ross, Bob L., *The Trinity And The Eternal Sonship Of Christ* (Pasadena, Texas: Pilgrim Publications, 1993) 57

Chapter 3

1. Edersheim, Alfred, *The Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah*. Part IV, WM.B. (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1980) 48
2. Ruckman, Peter S., *The History of the New Testament Church* (Pensacola, FL: Bible Baptist Bookstore, 1982) 106
3. Runia, David T., *Philo in Early Christian Literature: A Survey* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1993.) 138, 295

4. Apostolic Tradition of ST Hippolytus of Rome, Edited by Gregory Dix (Ridgefield, CT: Morehouse Pub., 1992)
5. Ehrman, Bart D, *Lost Scriptures-Books that did Not Make It into the New Testament*, (New York, New York: Oxford, University Press, Inc., 2003) 23
6. Works of Philo, Translated by C.D. Yonge (Hendrickson Publishers, 1993) 421
7. Ibid., 386
8. Mellor, Ronald, *The Goddess Roma* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1975)
9. Beisner, E. Calvin, *God in Three Persons* (Eugene, Oregon: Wipf & Stock Publishers, 1984) 107

Chapter 4

1. Works of Philo, Translated by C.D. Yonge (Hendrickson Publishers, 1993) 5, 6, 29, 32, 47, 84, 293, 385, 386, 421, 668, 747
2. New Advent Catholic Encyclopedia, *The Logos*, online. www.newadvent.org. (1 Jan. 2015)
3. Works of Philo, 209
4. Ibid., 668
5. Beisner, E. Calvin, *God in Three Persons* (Eugene, Oregon: Wipf & Stock Publishers, 1984) 118
6. Eusebius, *Ecclesiastical History* (Peabody, Massachusetts: Hendrickson Publishers, Inc., 2011) 40
7. Lewis, Brenda Ralph, *A Dark History: The Popes* (New York, NY: Metro Books, 2009)

8. LaHaye, Tim, *Revelation, Illustrated and Made Plain* (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Zondervan Pub. House, 1980) 37, 44
9. Rives, Standford, *Did Calvin Murder Servetus?* (Charleston, South Carolina: BookSurge Publishers, 2008)
10. Calvin, John, *Institutes of the Christian Religion* (Edinburgh: Henry Beveridge, 1845) ch 13, sec 19
11. Sproul, R.C., *What is Reformed Theology?* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Books, 2005) 28, 29
12. Hunt, Dave, *A Woman Rides the Beast* (Eugene, Oregon: Harvest House Publishers, 1994) 14
13. *Ibid.*, 15
14. *Ibid.*, 65
15. Chick, Jack T., *Alberto Series* (Ontario, Calif.: Chick Publications, 1979) 32
16. Hislop, Alexander, *Two Babylons or the Papal Worship Proved to be the Worship of Nimrod and His Wife* (SOHO Square, London: Kessinger Publishing, 1932) 3
17. Hunt, Dave, 5, 539

Chapter 5

1. Ante-Nicene Fathers (Peabody, Massachusetts: Hendrickson, Publishers, Inc., 1995)
2. Works of Philo, Translated by C.D. Yonge (Hendrickson Publishers, 1993) 83
3. Strong, James, *The New Strong's Exhaustive Concordance of the Bible* (Nashville, Tennessee: Thomas Nelson Publishers, 1990)

4. Works of Philo, 668
5. New Advent Catholic Encyclopedia, *The Logos*, online. www.newadvent.org. (1 Jan. 2015)

Chapter 6

1. Ehrman, Bart D, *Lost Scriptures-Books that did Not Make It into the New Testament*, (New York, New York: Oxford, University Press, Inc., 2003) 3
2. Works of Philo, Translated by C.D. Yonge (Hendrickson Publishers, 1993) 668
3. Hunt, Dave, *A Woman Rides the Beast* (Eugene, Oregon: Harvest House Publishers, 1994) 347
4. Strong, James, *The New Strong's Exhaustive Concordance of the Bible* (Nashville, Tennessee: Thomas Nelson Publishers, 1990) 817

Chapter 7

1. Creeds of The Church, PC Study Bible formatted electronic database (Biblesoft, Inc., 2006)
2. New International Version, 2002 Edition (Zondervan, 2002) 1953
3. Apostolic Tradition of ST Hippolytus of Rome, Edited by Gregory Dix (Ridgefield, CT: Morehouse Pub., 1992) 35
4. Corner, Dan, *Is This The Mary Of The Bible?* (Washington, PA: Evangelical Outreach, 2004) 54, 55

Sources

Akin, Jimmy, *The Fathers Know Best* (El Cajon, California: Catholic Answers, Inc., 2010)

Ante-Nicene Fathers (Peabody, Massachusetts: Hendrickson, Publishers, Inc., 1995)

Apostolic Tradition of ST Hippolytus of Rome, Edited by Gregory Dix (Ridgefield, CT: Morehouse Pub., 1992)

Arnold, Marvin M., D.D., Th.D., *Apostolic History Outline* (Michigan: Arno Publications, 1985)

Baker, Robert, *A Summary of Christian History* (Nashville, Tennessee: Broadman & Holman, 2005)

Beisner, E. Calvin, *"Jesus Only" Churches* (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Zondervan Publishing House, 1998)

Beisner, E. Calvin, *God in Three Persons* (Eugene, Oregon: Wipf and Stock Publishers, 1984)

Benedict XVI, *The Fathers* (Our Sunday Visitor Publishing Division, 2008)

Berkhof, Louis, *The history of Christian doctrines* (Carlisle, Pennsylvania: The Banner of Truth, 1997)

Blavatsky, H.P., *The theosophical glossary* (Los Angeles, California: Theosophical Pub. House, 1918)

Brown, Harold, *Heresies* (Peabody, Massachusetts: Hendrickson Publishers, 2007)

Catechism of the Catholic Church, Pope John Paul II (New York: Doubleday Publishers, 1995)

Chick, Jack T., *Alberto Series* (Ontario, Calif.: Chick Publications, 1979)

Clarke, Adam, *commentary on the holy bible* (Kansas City, Kansas: Beacon Hill Press, 1979)

Conner, W.T., *Christian Doctrine* (Nashville, Tennessee: Broadman Press, 1978)

Corner, Dan, *Is This The Mary Of The Bible?* (Washington, PA: Evangelical Outreach, 2004)

Creeds of The Church, PC Study Bible formatted electronic database (Biblesoft, Inc., 2006)

Driscoll, Mark & Gerry Breshears, *Doctrine, What Christians Should Believe* (Wheaton, Illinois: Crossway, 2010)

Edersheim, Alfred, *The Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah*. Part IV, WM.B. (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1980)

Ehrman, Bart D, *Lost Scriptures-Books that did Not Make It into the New Testament*, (New York, New York: Oxford, University Press, Inc., 2003)

Eusebius, *Ecclesiastical History* (Peabody, Massachusetts: Hendrickson Publishers, Inc.)

Gruits, Patricia Beall, *understanding God and His Covenants* (Rochester, Michigan: PeterPat Publishers, 1985)

Hislop, Alexander, *Two Babylons or the Papal Worship Proved to be the Worship of Nimrod and His Wife* (SOHO Square, London: Kessinger Publishing, 1932)

- Hoeller, Stephan A., *Gnosticism, New Light On The Ancient Tradition Of Inner Knowing* (Wheaton, Ill.: Theosophical Publishing House, 2002)
- Hunt, Dave, *A Woman Rides the Beast* (Eugene, Oregon: Harvest House Publishers, 1994)
- International Standard Bible Encyclopedia (Chicago: Howard-Severance Company, 1915)
- James, Norman H., *The Christian Life Series* (Springdale, PA: Whitaker House, 1995)
- Jefford, Clayton N., *The Apostolic Fathers, An Essential Guide* (Nashville, Tennessee: Abingdon Press, 2005)
- Kung, Hans, *The Catholic Church, a Short History* (N.Y. New York: Random House Publishing, 2003)
- LaHaye, Tim, *Revelation, Illustrated And Made Plain* (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Zondervan Publishing House, 1975)
- Lewis, Brenda Ralph, *A Dark History: The Popes* (New York, NY: Metro Books, 2009)
- MacArthur, Jr. John F., *Charismatic Chaos* (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Zondervan Publishing House, 1992)
- Mellor, Ronald, *The Goddess Roma* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1975)
- Montfort, St. Louis De, *True Devotion to Mary* (London, UK: Catholic Way Pub., 2013)
- Moody Publishers, *What Christians Believe* (Chicago, Illinois: Moody Publishers, 1951)

Morey, Robert, *The Trinity, Evidence and Issues* (Iowa Falls, IA: World Bible Publishers, Inc., 1996)

New Advent Catholic Encyclopedia, *The Logos*, online.
www.newadvent.org. (1 Jan. 2015)

New American Bible, *The New Catholic Translation* (Catholic Press: Thomas Nelson Inc., 1987)

New International Version, *NIV 2002 Edition* (Zondervan, 2002)
1953

Pearlman, Myer, *Knowing The Doctrines Of The Bible* (Springfield, Missouri: Gospel Publishing House, 1937)

Rives, Standford, *Did Calvin Murder Servetus?* (Charleston, South Carolina: BookSurge Publishers, 2008)

Rose Publishing, *Christianity, Cults & Religions* (Torrance, California: Bristol Works, Inc., 2008)

Rose Publishing, *The Trinity* (Torrance, California: RW Research Inc., 2005)

Ross, Bob L., *The Trinity And The Eternal Sonship Of Christ* (Pasadena, Texas: Pilgrim Publications, 1993)

Ruckman, Peter S., *The History of the New Testament Church* (Pensacola, FL: Bible Baptist Bookstore, 1982)

Runia, David T., *Philo in Early Christian Literature: A Survey* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1993.)

Sproul, R.C., *What is Reformed Theology?* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Books, 2005)

Strong, James, *The New Strong's Exhaustive Concordance of the Bible* (Nashville, Tennessee: Thomas Nelson Publishers, 1990)

Today's Dictionary of the Bible (Minneapolis, Minnesota: Bethany House Publishers, 1982)

Walvoord, John F., *The Revelation of Jesus Christ* (Chicago: Moody Press, 1980)

White, James R., *The Forgotten Trinity* (Minnesota: Bethany House Publishers, 1998)

Works of Philo, Translated by C.D. Yonge (Hendrickson Publishers, 1993)

Young, William P., *The Shack* (Newbury Park, California: Windblown Media, 2007)