

THE GODHEAD LESSON # 5

LOUD CRY OF THE FOURTH ANGEL

REVELATION 18:1-4

INTRODUCTION

“Why will not men see and live the truth? Many study the Scriptures for the purpose of proving their own ideas to be correct. They change the meaning of God's Word to suit their own opinions. And thus they do also with the testimonies that He sends. They quote half a sentence, leaving out the other half, which, if quoted, would show their reasoning to be false. God has a controversy with those who wrest the Scriptures, making them conform to their preconceived ideas.”--Manuscript 22, 1890; 3 SM. 82:3.

In our study this month we will be looking at some of the E.G.W. statements that are used to support the doctrine of the Trinity and how they have been manipulated to present the bias of the compilers of certain books that are compilations of Mrs. White's writings. These are not her actual published writings, they are quotes taken from her writings and can show the bias of the compilers. Many people do not bother to check out the original statements to find out if what has been compiled is a true representation of what she actually intended to say.

Let us pray: Our Father, I ask You to shed Your holy spirit on us that we might understand and comprehend the mysteries of Your spirit today. Please cleanse us from all short comings and grant us the blessing of Your presence. This I ask in the name of Your Son. Amen.

In the excerpt that follows the portion highlighted in yellow is that which is presented in

Evangelism P. 615: 2, and is used to say that Christ is as eternal as the Father and therefore equal in every way as is the Father! While Christ is equal with the father in character and authority, yet he does not assume the permanence.

Everything in red is the portion that was left out of the original document found in ST. Aug. 29, 1900: 14, 15 which shows that Christ did have an origin sometime in eternity past before creation began! This of necessity mandates that Christ is younger than the Father!

"Before Abraham was, I am. *Christ is the pre-existent, self-existent Son of God.*' The message He gave to Moses to give to the children of Israel was, 'Thus shalt thou say unto the children of Israel, I AM hath sent me unto you.' The prophet Micah writes of Him, 'But thou, Bethlehem Ephratah, though thou be little among the thousands of Judah, yet out of Thee shall He come forth unto Me that is to be ruler in Israel; whose goings forth have been from of old, from everlasting.'" {ST, August 29, 1900 par. 13}

NOTE: Everlasting does not always mean with no beginning because in Jonah 2:6 the same word is translated "forever" and means only three days. Which had a beginning. "The basic meaning of olam (#H5769 Strong's) is most distant times." LEXICAL AIDS. Let's continue with Signs of the times, par. 14.

"Through Solomon Christ declared: **The Lord possessed me** in the beginning of His way, before His works of old. I was **set up** from everlasting, (same word olam) **from the beginning**, (beginning of journey, Strong's) **or ever the earth was.**

THE GODHEAD LESSON # 5

When there were no depths, **I was brought forth**; when there were no fountains abounding with water. Before the mountains were settled, before the hills **was I brought forth**. ... When He gave to the sea His decree, that the waters should not pass His commandment; when He appointed the foundations of the earth; **then I was by Him, as one brought up with Him; and I was daily His delight, rejoicing always before Him.**" ("One brought up in training" {Strong's word #H525} Lexical Aids renders it "one brought up a son [in training]"){ST, August 29, 1900 par. 14}. Quoted from Proverbs 8:22-30. (Emphasis added).

"In speaking of His pre-existence, Christ carries the mind back through dateless ages. He assures us that there never was a time when He was not in close fellowship with the eternal God. He to whose voice the Jews were then listening had been with God as one brought up with Him." ("Brought up Means to foster or train: one brought up [i.e. A Son]") from "**COMPLETE WORD STUDY OLD TESTAMENT**" {ST, August 29, 1900 par. 15}. Notice how much was left out of the quote, how it talks of the very beginning of Christ's existence. This is manipulating what E.G.W. actuality meant. This is adding to God's word. They altered the meaning of the statement to convey just the opposite of her intent to show Christ **did have beginning of days**, to mean, Christ did **not** have beginning of days.

NOTE: Let us look at Exodus 23:20 the personal pronoun I, in Exodus 23: 20 is the Father, the angel that was sent was God's dear Son. Here is what it reads. "Behold, I send an Angel before thee, to keep thee in the way, and to bring thee into the place which I have prepared. V. 21. Beware of him, and obey his voice, provoke him not; for he will not pardon your transgressions: for **my name is in him**. (Notice it is the Fathers name that is in Him.) V. 22. But if thou shalt indeed obey his

voice, and do all that I speak; then I will be an enemy unto thine enemies, and an adversary unto thine adversaries. V. 23. For mine Angel (messenger) shall go before thee, and bring thee in unto the Amorites, and the Hittites, and the Perizzites, and the Canaanites, the Hivites, and the Jebusites: and I will cut them off."

This angel was Christ, the Father's only begotten Son, He is that rock that followed Israel. (See 1st Corinthians 10:3, 4) V.3. "And did all eat the same spiritual meat; V. 4. And did all drink the same spiritual drink: for they drank of that spiritual Rock that followed them: and that Rock was Christ."

NOTE: In the quote from Signs of the Times it reads "**I was set up**" if Christ was set up He had to have a beginning of days. "**From everlasting**" sometime in eternity past, or before time as we know it began. Christ received all things from His Father including His pre-existent, self-existence, underived, and un-borrowed life. From His being brought forth "there never was a time when (AFTER BEING BROUGHT FORTH) He was not in close fellowship with the eternal God." The phrase "as one brought up with" (Proverbs 8:30) word #H525 in Strong's and in LEXICAL AIDS is rendered as "one brought up a son" with Him. Therefore this phrase does not destroy the Son-ship of Christ, if a son He must have a beginning of days. He cannot be as old as His Father. If He were the same age (This is what the Trinity doctrine teaches) he could not be His Son. But would be a co-eternal being. Just an associate god with the Father. Thus the love relationship (or personality) that exist between a father and son could not really exist. This belief diminishes their personality and would definitely be less of a traumatic sacrifice on the Fathers part in sacrificing Christ for our redemption. It would only be sacrificing an associate

THE GODHEAD LESSON # 5

not a son, no father, son love relationship. Those who believe that the son and Father are the same age would of necessity also be denying that the Father and Son actually exist thus making it impossible to be saved for in John 17:3 we are told: “And this is life eternal, that they might know thee the only true God, and Jesus Christ, whom thou hast sent.” How can we know Christ if He is not God’s son but only an associate that is sent. This doctrine destroys our salvation. For to know the Son is life eternal. If He is just an associate the Son doesn’t really exist. Furthermore if Christ is not a real son but a co-equal with the Father then we have two Gods not one as is declared in Deut. 6:4, “Hear, O Israel: The LORD our God is one LORD:” Isaiah 45:5 “I am the LORD, and there is none else, there is no God beside me: I girded thee, though thou hast not known me: V. 6. That they may know from the rising of the sun, and from the west, that there is none beside me. I am the LORD, and there is none else.”

We looked at this in lesson # 2 but I want to look at it again because of its importance for us to grasp its significance. In the book entitled “**TRINITY**” by Whidden, Moon, and Reeve. Published by the Review and Harold publishing association. Two statements: the first is found on page 141:3 last part. The author is speaking in reference to Acts 2:36. I quote:

“In English ‘make’ can mean anything from ‘create’ to ‘appoint.’ For instance when you make a cake you are in a sense ‘creating’ it. On the other hand when you make someone a judge or a police officer you are not ‘creating’ them, but ‘appointing’ them to a role. In Acts 2:36 the whole phrase reads: ‘God has made him both Lord and Christ’ (RSV). ‘Christ’ the ‘anointed one,’ is a role or office that the Father appointed the Son to. In Hebrews 3:2 we find the same dynamic at play. Reading verses 1 and 2 together makes it clear that

Jesus is ‘faithful to him who appointed him’ (RSV) to be apostle and high priest. Again, they are roles like those of a judge or a police officer.”

Notice the subtle wrong application of “make” in this explanation! In Strong’s the word is #G4160 and can also mean “to endow a person or thing with a certain quality”. Also “the producing and bringing forth something which, when produced, has an independent existence of its own.” Is not this a more consistent understanding in connection with the context of the verse? Christ was endowed with these qualities at his birth (when He was begotten) of the Father. It is not a role He has been appointed to, it is who He is. As for Hebrews 3: 2 the word “appointed” is also word #G4160 with the exact same meaning. So you can readily see that it is all in how you interpret words, the improper understanding can lead to wrong conclusions! Context, context, context, is the key to proper definition!

Now let us look at the second quote from the book “**TRINITY**” it is found on page 243:1, 2:

“Each (members of the trinity) has eternally preexisted—that is, there has never been a time in eternity past when they did not coexist, and there will never be a time when they will cease to exist.

While the three divine persons are one, they have taken different roles or positions in the Godhead’s work of creation, redemption, and the loving administration of the universe. The father has assumed overall leadership, the son has subordinated himself to the leadership of the father, and the spirit is voluntarily subordinate to both the father and the son.”

NOTE: What a statement this is. “There has never been a time in eternity past when they did not coexist.” I want you to think about that statement: if Christ has existed as long as the Fa-

THE GODHEAD LESSON # 5

ther then Christ cannot be begotten. To be born one has to have parents. Is this not also true with God. Yes, if there is a real Father who has a real Son how can they both be the same age. It is not rational to believe that the father and son are co-eternal. Not only that, if they are coeval or coetaneous there cannot be a father or a son. The same thing holds if they are all three equal and are just **role** playing at being a father or son, or holy spirit. That destroys the concept of a real Father, a real Son, or a real holy spirit. It means these three gods **are just actors** who are pretending to be father, son, and holy spirit. What does that belief do to the love relationship (or the **personality** of God) between Father and Son? This destroys the truth of Christ being the Son of God. It also destroys the truth that Christ the only begotten Son being the rock upon which the church is built! (See Matt. 16: 17, 18). How can the **Rock exist** if there is **no begotten Son?**

If this is believed there is no solid footing for the statement in John 17: 3. "And this is life eternal, that they might know thee the only true God, (Father) and Jesus Christ, (Son) whom thou hast sent." It was also demonstrated in Lesson # 2 that Christ has been the Father's Son from before creation. Can you see this trinity doctrine destroys the promise of salvation?

Let us go to another statement from the compilation, Evangelism, to see if it conveys the true sentiments of the original author. It is found in Evangelism page 616. Here is the original quote in its entirety, I will highlight the part from Evangelism where Fromm and the compilers placed a period instead of a comma. The yellow highlight is the statement given in Evangelism without the context.

MR 7 PAGE 298: 3 "He (Christ) would build a wall around us, to keep us from transgres-

sion, so that His blessing and love may be bestowed on us in rich measure. This is the reason we have established a school here. The Lord instructed us that this was the place in which we should locate, and we have had every reason to think that we are in the right place. We have been brought together as a school, and we need to realize that the holy spirit, (no capitalization in original) who is as much a person, as God is a person, is walking through these grounds, that the **Lord God** is our keeper, and helper. He hears every word we utter and knows every thought of the mind."--MS 66, 1899, p. 4. (Talk, April 15, 1899).

Notice it is the Lord God who is the Spirit walking through the grounds who listens to our words and knows our thoughts. Also there is a period in Evangelism after the word "grounds" where Ellen White used a comma in the original. This is a perfect example of what Ellen described about quoting half a sentence when if the whole sentence were quoted it would show their reasoning to be false.

Here is another from Evangelism page 616 & 617. "The Holy Spirit has a personality, else He could not bear witness to our spirits and with our spirits that we are the children of God. He must also be a divine person, else He could not search out the secrets which lie hidden in the mind of God. 'For what man knoweth the things of a man save the spirit of man, which is in him; even so the things of God knoweth no man, but the Spirit of God. (Which is in Him)'"--MS 20, 1906.

The scripture is from 1st Corinthians 2:11. The translation in Phillips Modern English makes this verse more clear: "For who could really understand a man's inmost thoughts except the **spirit of the man himself?** (The word spirit means mind) How much less could anyone understand the thoughts of God except the **very Spirit of**

THE GODHEAD LESSON # 5

God? (Spirit here is also mind). V 12. We have now received not the spirit (mind) of the world but the **spirit (mind) of God himself...** Notice it is the spirit (or mind) of God. The definition of spirit is breath, wind, and **mind**. (Strong's word # H7307 & G4151). "This translation makes it clear that the spirit is the very spirit (or mind) of God not that of a separate person in the Godhead but the mind and breath (the person) of the Father and the Son. It is important that all the context of a specific text is considered before we form our understanding of what the text is saying!

"The Power of God in the Third Person.-- The prince of the power of evil can only be held in check by the power of God in the third person of the Godhead, the holy spirit."--Special Testimonies, Series A, No. 10, p. 37. (1897)

Here is a quote from **YI June 29, 1893: 8** showing that it is Christ as the holy spirit that is present to hold in check the evil.

YI June 29, 1893: 8 "**There is no power in you apart from Christ**, but it is your privilege to have Christ **abiding in your heart by faith, and he can overcome sin in you**, when you cooperate with his efforts, putting your will on the side of God's will. He says, 'I have overcome the world.' In him you lift up the banner as one who conquers. 'We are more than conquerors through him that loved us.' You may have a constant testimony in your life to the power of the grace of Christ, and may understand what **the operations of the Spirit of God are**. You may be living epistles, known and read of all men. You are not to be a dead letter, but a living one, testifying to the world **that Jesus is able to save.**"

If there is no power in you "apart from Christ" then the Holy Spirit and Christ would have to be the same person. In the overall context of Ellen White's writings it is evident that the Holy

Spirit is none other than Jesus Christ Himself as the comforter. In John 14: 16 it says "I will send you another comforter". In verse 18 Jesus said "I will not leave you comfortless, I will come to you." This can mean nothing else but that Christ is the comforter, in fact Sister White says exactly the same thing in Signs of the Times. "Said Christ: The Comforter, which is the Holy Ghost, whom the Father will send in My name, He shall teach you all things, and bring all things to your remembrance, whatsoever I have said unto you." ST July/14/1898:2

Again in **Christ Triumphant**. "And the Holy Spirit is the Comforter, **as the personal presence of Christ** to the soul." CTr chapter 12, under heading "**the Holy Spirit helps discern truth from error.**"

In "**Reflecting Christ**" we see this "Let them study the seventeenth of John, and learn how to pray and how to live the prayer of Christ. **He is the Comforter.**"

In "**You Shall Receive Power**" we read "the Holy Spirit is **the Comforter**, as **the personal presence of Christ to the soul**. "**YRP**. Under heading "**filled with the spirit**"

God's Amazing Grace" "There is no comforter like Christ, so tender and so true." AG. Chapter 178: 3.

There are two text from Holy Scripture that must be considered before any study of the trinity can be complete. They are Matthew 28: 19, and 1st John 5:7. We will consider Matthew 28: 19 the great commission first. V.19 "Go ye therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost: V.20 Teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you: and, lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world. Amen."

THE GODHEAD LESSON # 5

The Bible Commentary 1919 page 723:

Dr. Peake makes it clear that: "The command to baptize into the threefold name is a late doctrinal expansion. Instead of the words baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost we should probably read simply-"into My Name."

"A History of the Christian Church:"

On page 61 Professor and Church historian Walker, reveals the true origin and purpose of Matthew 28:19. This Text is the first man-made Roman Catholic Creed that was the prototype for the later Apocryphal Apostles' Creed. Matthew 28:19 was invented along with the Apocryphal Apostles' Creed to counter so-called heretics and Gnostics that baptized in the name of Jesus Christ! Marcion although somewhat mixed up in some of his doctrine still baptized his converts the Biblical way in the name of Jesus Christ. Matthew 28:19 is the first non-Biblical Roman Catholic Creed! The spurious Catholic text of Matthew 28:19 was invented to support the newer triune, Trinity, doctrine. Therefore, Matthew 28:19 is not the "Great Commission of Jesus Christ." Matthew 28:19 is the great Catholic hoax! Acts 2:38, Luke 24:47, and 1 Corinthians 6:11 give us the ancient original words and teaching of Yeshua/Jesus! Is it not also strange that Matthew 28:19 is missing from the old manuscripts of Sinaiticus, Curetonianus and Bobiensis?

About these historical facts. Catholic Cardinal Joseph Ratzinger has this to say: He makes this confession as to the origin of the chief Trinity text of Matthew 28:19. "The basic form of our (Matthew 28:19 Trinitarian) profession of faith took shape during the course of the second and third centuries in connection with the ceremony of baptism. So far as its place of origin is concerned, the text (Matthew 28:19) came from the city of

Rome. The Trinity baptism and text of Matthew 28:19 therefore did not originate from the original Church that started in Jerusalem around AD 33. It was rather as the evidence proves a later invention of Roman Catholicism completely fabricated. Very few know about these historical facts."—INTRODUCTION TO CHRISTIANITY BY JOSEPH RATZINGER. PAGE 82, 83. THE 1968 EDITION.

"The Demonstratio Evangelica" by Eusebius: Eusebius was the Church historian and Bishop of Caesarea. On page 152 Eusebius quotes the early book of Matthew that he had in his library in Caesarea. According to this eyewitness of an unaltered Book of Matthew that could have been the original book or the first copy of the original of Matthew. Eusebius informs us of Jesus' actual words to his disciples in the original text of Matthew 28:19: Quot. "With one word and voice He said to His disciples: "Go, and make disciples of all nations in My Name, teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you." That "Name" is Jesus.

Now let us go to the second text that is used to prove the trinity doctrine. It is 1st John 5:7 "For there are three that bear record in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost: and these three are one."

The following is adapted from the book entitled GOD (1938, by Paul S. L. Johnson), pages 476-478, 516-518, available from Laymen's Home Missionary Movement, P.O. Box 679, Chester Springs, PA 19425. For more information about the trinity and oneness doctrines, see: <http://reslight.addr.com/1-trinity.html>

Regarding 1 John 5:7, 8, Paul S. L. Johnson states: "Assuming that these text were genuine, it would not prove that the Father, Son and Holy Spirit are one God; for the Greek word for

THE GODHEAD LESSON # 5

'one' here is 'hen,' and is neuter; and the masculine word Theos (Greek God) cannot be supplied after it; for the Greek word for one in that case would have to be he is (masculine for one). Nor can the Greek word for being (ousia) be supplied after it, because ousia is feminine, which would require the feminine of one, mia. If the passage were genuine we would have to supply a neuter noun, e.g., like pneuma (disposition), after hen in this text even as we have to do so in John 10:30: 'My Father and I are one' (hen) disposition. It could not be Theos (God) or ousia (Being), which would respectively require the masculine heis and the feminine mia."

-- Ephanty Studies in the Scriptures, Vol. I - God, page 477 we read:

"The Father, Son, and Holy Spirit are one in disposition, one in heart, mind, and will; but not one God. The Bible nowhere states that there are three persons in one God. Nor does it ever say that there is a being called God who is more than one person. In the Bible, one person IS one personal being, and one personal being IS one person always, and never more than one.

"It was Satan who, in producing a counterfeit for everything in the Bible, counterfeited the true God as one being composed of three persons. This unbiblical, unreasonable and un-factual distinction between the words *person* and *being* when referring to a personal being should be avoided. It is surely an error invented by Satan to deceive -- a work of darkness, a self-contradiction, which no one can understand or explain, while Bible doctrines are all explainable and understandable.

"Additionally, we might say, if the logic were valid that the Father's, Son's and holy spirit's oneness in 1st John 5: 7, 8 must be that of being, we would have to say that Paul and Apollos were

one being (1 Corinthians 3: 6-8)! Of course they were two separate beings. Hen being used of them in 1 Corinthians 3:8 (not mia, which would be necessary to agree with the feminine ousia, being) proves that their oneness was not one of being but of spirit, disposition (Acts 4:32; 1 Corinthians 1:10; Ephesians 4:3-6,13; Philippians 1: 27; 2: 2; 4: 2) Hence 1 John 5:7,8 does not by the Greek word hen prove that the Father, Son and holy spirit are one being any more than 1 Corinthians 3: 8 proves by the word hen that Paul and Apollos were one being; but the same word and form of that word, proving Paul and Apollos to be one in heart, mind and will, gives presumptive evidence that the same word and form in John 10:30 proves the same of the Father and Son.

"But we have more than presumptive proof of this. When Jesus prayed (John 17:11,21,22) that all of the saints may be one (hen, not heis, nor mia) he did not pray that they be all one being, which would be nonsense, but that their unity may be one in mind, heart and will. Since the oneness for which He prayed for them was not a oneness of being, the oneness between Him and the Father cannot be that of being, because Jesus in John 17:11, 22 prays that the oneness for which He prayed on their behalf be patterned after the oneness that exists between the Father and himself: 'That they may be one as we are.' Hence the oneness between the Father and Jesus is not one of being, but one of mind, heart and will. More over Jesus defines this oneness in verse 21 as follows: 'that they all may be one, as thou, Father, art in me and I in thee (Jesus was in the Father) that they also may be one in us . . . that they may be one, even as we are one.' Thus these verses prove that the same kind of oneness as exists between the saints, also exists between the Father and son and vice versa. Therefore, since the oneness that exists between the saints is not one of being, but one of

THE GODHEAD LESSON # 5

heart, mind, and will, the oneness that exists between the Father and Son is not one of being, but one of will, heart, and mind.

“Furthermore, if the Father and the Son were but one being, they could not be the two beings bearing required witness, as John 8:17, 18 says they were, since the law required at least two different beings to be witnesses sufficient to establish a matter. But since they gave sufficient witness, they must be two beings. Therefore their oneness is not that of being. It must be that of mind, heart and will. Accordingly, John 10:30 does not prove the Son's equality with the Father. Rather, it proves the Son's subordination to the Father.

“John 17:21, which shows the kind of unity that exists between them to be connected with the Son's being in the Father, implies that the Father is the Son's head that the Son is His in the sense that believers are Christ's, in subordination to him. Thus Jesus must be subordinate to the Father (1 Corinthians 3:23; 11:3), even as the headship of Christ makes the Church subordinate to Christ (Colossians 1:18; Ephesians 1:22, 23; 4:15; 5:23, 24, compared with Colossians 3:19).”

We have already seen that Sister White in EW 1882. End of 2300 days, Page 54:1, has stated that the Father and Son, have distinct and separate bodies.

This is just one more point that makes it obvious that the Trinity doctrine is not true because it teaches that the Son and the Father are the same person (being) when they are not!

Let us pray:

Oh, Father grant us understanding that we might receive the truth! May Your holy spirit lead us into all truth. We ask this in the name of Your dear Son. Amen.

That God will lead us into all truth is my prayer,

Virgil

**IF YOU WOULD LIKE TO RESPOND IN ANY WAY
PLEASE WRITE TO THE LOUD CRY OF THE
FOURTH ANGEL'S MINISTRY AT:**

T.L.C.F.A.M.

P.O. Box 2894

H'VILLE, NC. 28793-2894