

Philo's Trinity

R. Euresti Jr. M.ED

Scripture references are entirely from the beloved King James Version of the bible. Most quotes on the Apostolic Fathers are taken from the ten volume set of the Ante-Nicene Fathers by Hendrickson Publishers Inc.

Copyright © 2013 by Pastor R. Euresti Jr.

Philo's Trinity

Printed in the United States of America

ISBN # 978-0-615-83550-1

Theological, Historical

Front Cover Design Layout: Ben Briones

Book Cover Photography: Adriana Euresti

For more information write to:

Highest Praise Church

P.O. Box 3242

McAllen, Tx. 78502

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

DEDICATION

*This book is dedicated to all believers who are
hungry for truth.*

To those that read this book and don't know what to do next:

TO THE UNBELIEVER

Turn to the true God of the bible. Call on the name of Jesus. Pray with all your heart. Repent of your sins. Ask the Lord to guide your life from this point on. Find fellowship in a Christian church. Obey the only gospel of Jesus Christ. Make prayer your priority. Support the work of God in whatever capacity is given to you from the Lord.

TO THE BELIEVER

Research the bible. Pray for God to give you wisdom and understanding in the study of God's Word. Review the history of the church, both Christian and Catholic. Study the Reformation period. Research the Ante-Nicene Fathers. Make a decision to stand on God's Word alone. Refuse the traditions of men. Reject all philosophy. The bible states, "Study to show yourself approved unto God."

TO PASTORS, LEADERS, TEACHERS

Pray for God's people. Ask God for true revival. Allow the Holy Spirit to take over completely. Surrender to the truth of God's Word. Don't allow a fear of criticism, or persecution to determine your faith. Follow the teachings of the one and only Church of Acts. Be tolerant and loving with those who oppose and don't understand. Pray earnestly that God's word will increase throughout the world. Pray for America.

Contents

Chapter One: Philo of Alexandria 1

1. More Than One Creator 4
2. Philo's Divine Wisdom Teaching 6
3. Philo's Logos 8
4. Philo's Trinity Revealed 9
5. Philo's Own Soul Revelation 10
6. Philo's Three Days Before the Sun 11
7. Theophilus' Three Days 12
8. Woman Becomes Virgin 13
9. Our Assessment of Philo's Writings 15
10. The Trinity of the Kabbalah 15
11. Mystical and Allegorical Interpretations 16

Chapter Two: Philo, the Church Father 20

1. The Reception of Philo Into Catholicism 23
2. Late Century Cover-up of Philo 27
3. The Torch is Passed On 29
4. Catholic Confession 35

Chapter Three: The Secret Disciples of Philo 38

1. The Epistle of Barnabas 42
2. Justin 44
3. Valentinus, the Gnostic 45
4. Theophilus 46
5. Irenaeus 47
6. Hippolytus 48
7. Back to Tertullian 50
8. Tertullian's Greek Logos 52
9. Clement 54
10. Origen 55

- 11. Novatian 57
- 12. Eusebius' Ecclesiastical History 59

Chapter Four: Father of Orthodoxy 63

- 1. Hagia Sophia 65
- 2. God From God 65
- 3. Trinity Derived From Philosophical Terminology 66
- 4. Trinity Enveloped in Darkness 68
- 5. Teachings Derived From Philo 69
- 6. Philo's Books 72
- 7. The Athanasian Creed Forgery 73

Chapter Five: The Modern Defense of the Trinity 80

- 1. Saying the Doctrine is Biblical 83
- 2. Violation of the Great Commission 88
- 3. Presenting the Fathers as Men of God 91
- 4. The Real Ante-Nicene Fathers 91
- 5. Catholic Creeds instead of Bible 93

Chapter Six: The Missing Piece of the Puzzle 96

- 1. Philo's Contributions 97
- 2. The Apostles were never Greek Philosophers 99
- 3. Conclusion 101
- 4. Worldwide Acceptance of Alexandrian Theology 105
- 5. Today's Modern Deception 107

Notes 113

Introduction

Many are the voices today that contend that the Trinity doctrine is found in the bible. The teaching itself has from long ago been protected and set in what some call the "creeds of the Church." For years, this same issue has been debated over and over by those who are defenders, and those who adamantly oppose its orthodox claims. Why has this subject never been resolved? Why, after much debating, are both sides, those that defend and those that oppose, leaving the debates feeling exactly the same way they came in?

One reason is that both sides are arguing from the bible, and selected scriptures are presented on both sides as evidence. Does the bible teach both sides of the argument? The answer to this question is of course not! Both parties cannot be correct. Someone here is not really playing by the rules. Some of us realize that this ridiculous game will never allow for a resolution.

What is the true origin of the Trinity Doctrine? Is there such a thing when we review the Holy Scriptures? Many would argue that this is the case. They assert with much authority that the Trinity is found in the bible. Is this true? What do religious authorities say about this? Are they all in agreement or disagreement? This is the reason why this book was written. A careful investigation was made of what happened in the timeframe leading up to the early church, during the time of the early church, and precisely after the death of the apostles. The information is incredible.

Going beyond what others have done in researching the Trinity doctrine revealed strong and conclusive evidence that Philo of Alexandria, the Ante-Nicene Fathers, and the Council of Nicaea were absolutely responsible for this teaching to come into the post-apostolic church. It is not a pure biblical doctrine, but more of a wind of doctrine that deceives because of its mixture of philosophical ideas and selected passages of the Bible.

The concept of the Trinity is blatantly pagan. It began in Ancient Babylon and made its way throughout the world. It can be found in the history of most ancient civilizations. The reason that Philo of Alexandria is cited as the one that brought us the Trinity, is for his direct involvement with mixing Greek philosophy with the Holy Scriptures. In other words, Philo connected pagan ideas with the Hebrew books of the Old Testament. Using an allegorical approach, he gave the Holy Scriptures a different interpretation than was previously given by those who proclaimed the one true God.

His writings contain a strange mixture of philosophy and the "Word of God." This dangerous and incorrect combination was brought into the Christian Church by some of the Ante-Nicene Fathers. Before the Council of Nicaea in 325 A.D., the majority of Christians did not accept such false teachings on God. It was after this historic council that orthodox Christianity took a different route. Believers have been living with this decision ever since; spanning even to the time of the Reformation and the beginning of Protestant Churches. What is even worse is the fact that this pagan doctrine has been defended as Gospel truth. All other views have been given the label of heresy. Those who secured this ancient teaching of the gods, were even willing to put to death

anyone who disagreed with such errors in the name of a false Christianity. A flawed Christianity because the true apostles of the Lord never persecuted anyone to defend their beliefs. Christ never commanded for his followers to kill in the name of God.

This pathetic imitation of Christianity would carry over to the Protestant and Reformed Churches. Persons such as Calvin, Luther, and others would be part of a system that would spill blood in the name of their own brand of religion. This heresy of murdering people has been quietly hidden from modern professors of Christ.

Within the following pages, there is a sincere hope to effectively convey to the reader that false doctrine came into the church through two avenues. One, was from men that were members of the church, but rose up to teach false doctrine. Two, philosophical influence from outside of the church that came to be mixed with Holy Scripture.

This is the truth of what really happened in the earlier stage of the church. After the death of the true apostles, the enemy would sow tares among the wheat to create his own version of the gospel. It is only those that are hungry for truth that will come to agree with the findings of this book. Those who are content with modern day views will not appreciate the historical evidence set forth. They will ignore the findings, or attack without any substantial historical knowledge.

Chapter 1

Philo of Alexandria

Why is there so much fighting over the Trinity? The reason that people continue to argue whether the Trinity is in the bible or not, continues year after year because the right questions are not being asked. Going to the direct source of where the word "Trinity" came from will settle the issue once and for all. Those who believe in the Trinity doctrine continue to assert strongly that within this one being of God, there are three persons. Is this definition really in the bible? Can the reader give a specific verse that confirms this statement? The answer is absolutely not.

Most claim that the Trinity is a divine revelation. They are saying that God gave this teaching to men. Did God reveal Himself to the church as a Trinity, or did this teaching start with men that believed other things apart from the bible? After several years of research, the Trinity doctrine was found to be a *formulation* coming directly from men who were followers of Greek philosophy and other anti-biblical ideas. There is a strong reason why the word "Trinity" is not found in the bible.

In other words, the teaching of the Trinity was put together by certain men in the church who did not believe in the writings of the apostles "only." Those men who came after the apostles are referred today by everyone as the Ante-Nicene Fathers. "Ante-Nicene" because their writings came before the council of Nicaea, 325 A.D. and "Fathers" because they were bishops and priests. This book will discuss those men and trace their activities up to this famous meeting. This great get-together of bishops will be mentioned last because it is here that the Trinity was established as the official teaching of the Roman Catholic Church.

Is this the first time that the earliest first century Philo of Alexandria has been associated with the origin of the

Philo's Trinity

doctrine of the Trinity? The obvious answer is no. Throughout the years many historians have written about this unique and legendary Alexandrian philosopher. A *philosopher* is one who offers his own views or theories on a given subject. Somehow Philo has never been officially credited with being the one responsible for the Trinity. Someone might ask, "Why is this book claiming this man as the originator of what is now believed by the majority of churches or denominations?"

This book points directly to Philo because of several things. One reason is that the true story of this man has never really been told. Even though many have written that this philosopher had nothing to do with the Trinity of persons that most people believe today, a closer look at his place in history reveals otherwise. Philo was responsible for teaching the combined "Logos" and "Wisdom" formula that came into the second century churches. A *formula* is a set form of words used to declare something.

It was not Philo and his writings alone, but other religious men that came into the Christian churches with his strange ideas. Men in the church started using Philo's view that throughout eternity God was never alone. He had his Word and Wisdom by his side. What Philo meant by this is that God was not the only "Creator." Even before creation, according to this philosopher, there were other divine beings by God's side.

The connection is made with Philo when his formula that described the Trinity as "God, Word, and Wisdom" appeared within the writings of the Ante-Nicene Fathers. Surprisingly, this is the first place in history where the word "Trinity" was mentioned as a reference to the God of the bible. The bishop or leader of the church who quoted these words was not referring to his own writings, but to those of another. His statements were taken from the views of a Greek philosopher who employed the Old Testament Scriptures with *allegorical* interpretation.

Philo's formula of God, Word, and his Wisdom, was produced from his use of the "allegorical" method. *Allegory* is the opposite of what is "literal" or true. It is giving a simple idea, a symbolic or figurative meaning. It is taking the literal meaning of scripture and giving it a second interpretation. It is also the personification or attributing of life to something that is not a real person or being.

The evidence for making such a direct connection between Philo and the bishops of Rome is unavoidable. It will be proven in this book that reliance on the mystical teachings of a first century philosopher by Catholic priests, is what led these men to believe in a Trinity.

Who was this Philo of Alexandria? He was a Jewish priest of the Hebrew religion who lived in the first century in Alexandria, Egypt (20 B.C. to 50 A.D.). He was a famous philosopher that became popular for his mixing of scripture with mystical applications. He was a renowned leader in what was deemed the "seat of philosophical thought." Rome had at that time three major provinces or regions that consisted of Alexandria and Antioch, with Rome being the first.

None could compare to Alexandria, Egypt the second province of the Roman Empire and the one to have the most powerful schools of learning. What makes it more interesting is that Philo lived at the most incredible time in history. This is the time when Jesus Christ walked this earth, and his gospel was preached in Jerusalem. Philo's writings would appear secretly in the first century right along with the teachings of Christ and the letters of the apostles.

Philo was not a Christian, so his writings were never a part of the early church. His teachings did not form a part of New Testament Scripture. Somehow, Philo's allegory would quietly and secretly appear within the post-apostolic church communities. How did this philosopher's allegorical teachings become incorporated into the churches of that time? There were men in and outside of the church that accepted Philo's

Philo's Trinity

writings as inspired or given from God. Some would later claim that this Philo was not only a follower of Christ, but a well established bishop within the Catholic Church.

These teachings of allegorical interpretation can be seen today in the writings of the most trusted Ante-Nicene writers. These are the priests referred to as coming from an unbroken apostolic line of succession, and considered by many in modern times, as the most authoritative sources.

Could it be possible that the men who are looked upon today as the protectors of apostolic truth would also be blamed for bringing falsehood and deception into the church? This book will sadly expose the Ante-Nicene Fathers and many of their unbiblical claims. The truth must not remain hidden. It must be uncovered, even if it is the view of God that has been defended for centuries. Jesus Christ warned his disciples of the deception of the last days. He forewarned, "Take heed that no man deceive you" (Matthew 24:4).

More Than One Creator

It begins with one of many examples that comes from Philo's writing on the "Creation of the World." He wrote, "And he would not err who should raise the question why Moses attributed the creation of man alone *not to one creator*, as he did that of other animals, *but to several*.' 'For he introduces the Father of the universe using this language: 'Let us make man after our image, and in our likeness.'¹ He alludes to Genesis 1:26 as there being more than one Creator. He emphatically implies through this verse that God had assistants (other divine beings) in creation.

He again asserts on page 11, "It is on this account that Moses says, at the creation of man alone that God said, "Let us make man," which expression shows an assumption of *other beings to himself as assistants*, in order that God, the governor of all things, might have all the blameless intentions

and actions of man, when he does right attributed to him; and that his other assistants might bear the imputation of his contrary actions."

No individual had ever attempted such an elaborate interpretation of the Hebrew Scriptures. The reader might do well to notice the word "beings" as the word used to describe other assistants or Creators. This would be the same word used interchangeably with the word "persons" by the Ante-Nicene Fathers. Modern *apologists* or defenders omit this information. They falsely claim that the persons of the Trinity are not beings, covering up the fact that to the Ante-Nicene Fathers, persons and beings meant the exact same thing.

The Jewish community prior to Philo had always interpreted Genesis 1:26 as a "Majestic Plural" or as a kingly announcement unto his angels. This new explanation of the verse would greatly challenge the monotheistic faith of the Hebrews, who held the "Shema" as the main truth of God revealed. The principle verse of the Jewish people cries out, "Hear, O Israel: The Lord our God is one Lord" (Deuteronomy 6:4).

Unbeknown to biblical Christians today, it was Philo of Alexandria who first gave Genesis 1:26 its polytheistic interpretation. This is one of the most used verses in the modern defense of the Trinity. The interpretation given to this portion of scripture in order to defend a second century formulation, came from the eclectic ideas of a Greek philosopher. *Eclectic* means a mixture of different sources. It is important to consider such information since Philo was never a Christian. It is a historical fact that the majority of Ante-Nicene Fathers saw nothing wrong with the mixing of ideas with those of pagan thinkers.

Some of these Catholic Bishops that taught *theology* (study of God), such as Clement of Alexandria, even claimed that philosophy was a gift from God. It is also true that such men loved Philo's writings and quoted from them extensively

Philo's Trinity

as being their very own. When modern Trinitarians defend the Trinity by interpreting Genesis 1:26 as God speaking to the Son and Spirit, they are using the same line of defense as the Jewish Greek philosopher, Philo of Alexandria.

Philo's Divine Wisdom Teaching

One of Philo's strongest doctrines was his teaching on *Divine Wisdom*, implying that this "Heavenly Wisdom" was called by many names. He refers to wisdom in his writings as the "beginning, the image, and the sight of God."² He also alludes to feminine Wisdom as being fond of lonely places, whose symbol is the dove. Wisdom to Philo was at once God and at the same time the possession of God. This corruption of the true wisdom of the bible would go on to become an integral part of the doctrine of the *Gnostics* or lovers of superior knowledge.

It would also make its way into Christianity as the second and later the third "hypostasis" of the Trinity. They meant by this "a real and distinct substance." Philo deified the simple attribute of wisdom when he wrote "the Father is God of the universe, while wisdom is the mother of all things."³ It is important to note that Philo did not have solid biblical ground on which to base his teachings. Even though the bible personifies wisdom as a "she," it does not call her a mother. Proverbs plainly states, "Say unto wisdom, Thou art my sister; and call understanding thy kinswoman" (Proverbs 7:4). If the bible does not call wisdom a mother, then where did Philo find basis for his Divine Wisdom?

Philo found proof for his application of wisdom from the book of "Wisdom," a member of the Apocrypha or lost books. This book was placed in the Old Testament and is still a part of the Catholic Bible. The Apocrypha books were placed in the Septuagint and Latin Vulgate bibles of the Catholic Church. They are not found or accepted in Protestant

bibles. The Wisdom book was also a forgery, for it was not written by Solomon, but by some unknown writer who lived in Alexandria, Egypt. This would have been a Jew who was fluent in Greek, the language in which the book was written. Several scholars attribute the book of Wisdom to none other than Philo. These are some quotes from Wisdom:

God of my fathers, Lord of mercy, you have made all things by your *word* and in your *wisdom* have established man. And I rejoiced with them all, because Wisdom is their leader, though I had not known that she is the *mother* of these. For she is the refulgence of eternal light, the spotless mirror of the power of God, *the image* of his goodness. Or who ever knew your counsel, except you had given Wisdom and sent *your holy spirit* from on high? (Wisdom 9:1,2,17, 7:12, 26).

Please note how all the key words pertaining to Philo's teachings are there: "Word and Wisdom," "Mother," "Holy Spirit," and "Image." Most modern day Trinitarians are not aware of the fact that "wisdom" was referred to as female. Some have heard of the Gnostic teachings that incorporated "Sophia" as a feminine member of their triune God, but have no idea that the same formula was used by the Ante-Nicene Fathers. Trinitarians came up with a Triune Godhead theory by using the same formula that was first used by Philo and the Gnostics.

These mystics loved Sophia (Wisdom), to the point of claiming her as the "mother" and "virgin spirit" that originally gave "spark" to the world. Catholic priests, strangely enough, did not find a problem with using *feminine wisdom* as a member of the Trinity. Why did they do this? Follow along, for in the following chapters the secrets of the Ante-Nicene Fathers will be carefully revealed. Although, many have written books on the Fathers, somehow the raw truth of their ideas have been kept away from the readers. In other words, only certain things are said about these men.

Philo's Logos

In Philo's explanation of Genesis 1:26 we can see how God was referred to as being too good, or holy to be involved with the world. This is the philosopher's pagan view of the "Transcendence of God." The solution to Philo's transcendent God was to have assistants or other divine beings that could take care of earthly matters.

From his eclectic or mixed-up ideas coming from such sources as Greek philosophy, Plato, the well-known Stoics, and then further complicated with the use of the Septuagint, Philo would introduce the "Logos" or second god. Philo, like all the wisdom writers, would identify the Logos with Wisdom found in Proverbs 8:22. Consider the following information:

Philo's influence was incalculable, and Wisdom, as a heavenly power, plays an almost incredible role in the gnostic speculations of the 2nd and 3rd centuries, the Gnostic work, *Pistis Sophia*, probably attaining the climax of unreality. The orthodox Fathers, however, naturally sought Wisdom within the Trinity, and Irenaeus made an identification with the Holy Spirit (iv. 20, 3). Tertullian, on the other hand, identified Wisdom with the Son (probably following earlier precedent) in *Adv. Prax.*, 7, and this identification attained general acceptance. So the book of Proverbs 8:22-30 became a locus classicus in the Christological controversies (an elaborate exposition in Athanasius, *Orat.* ii. 16-22), and persisted as a dogmatic proof-text until a very modern period.⁴

Comment on Philo goes further with another source. The article points out, "Philo's ideas of the Logos/Wisdom are also indispensable for New Testament studies, probably most directly and dramatically in the interpretation of the Gospel of John, especially the Prologue (1:1-14).⁵ Having identified the Word (Logos) or reason of God with Wisdom, Philo would advocate for his followers to ignore the feminine description of wisdom to continue with his allegorical conclusions.

Wisdom to Philo was both feminine and masculine because of the connection with the Logos. Using Proverbs 8, combined with the Apocrypha writings, both Philo and the Ante-Nicene Fathers would place Wisdom with the "Logos" as a second god that existed with God before creation. Proverbs 8:22 is a direct reference to a symbolic or figurative wisdom. This chapter does not make wisdom into a real divine being or person. Sadly, this would not stop certain Catholic theologians from applying this feminine concept to Christ and then later to the Holy Spirit.

These attributes rendered "divine beings" by the once famous Alexandrian philosopher, would be both separate and yet one and the same. According to one of several well-cited encyclopedias, "the 1st century Jewish Hellenistic Philosopher, Philo Judaeus employed the term "Logos" in his effort to synthesize Jewish tradition and Platonism." According to Philo, "The Logos is a mediating principle between God and the world and can be understood as God's Word or the Divine Wisdom, which is immanent in the world."⁶ *Attributes* of God are not persons, but qualities that belong to God.

This combination of Logos and Wisdom would give the unsuspecting Christian world the teaching of the "Eternal Son" who would later be deemed coeternal and coequal with the Father and the Spirit. The Greek Logos of Philo and the Ante-Nicene Fathers would replace the simple Word or Logos that was used by the Apostle John in the opening of his most famous gospel.

Philo's Trinity Revealed

Philo actually called the Logos, "The likeness of the second God who is the Word of the other."⁷ It was mentioned earlier that Philo called Divine Wisdom "the image of God." By combining Word and Wisdom, Philo was calling the Logos a second God. In other words, this philosopher was the first to

Philo's Trinity

call the spoken word a separate divine being apart from God. This information was accepted by the Ante-Nicene Fathers.

Philo appoints two angels, placing these Cherubim in a form of a triangle with the Lord standing above both of them. He attains this by allegorizing the Ark of the Covenant and the mercy seat. The angels were to Philo, the symbols of the one true God with his two most important powers. He emphasized carefully that the middle *person* of the three was the Father of the universe.⁸ In other words, Philo used the word "person" to describe his trinity, the same as modern day Trinitarians.

How did Philo come up with such doctrines? Where in the Old Testament Scriptures did he find such interpretations to such plain text? The truth is that Philo did not acquire his information from the *Torah* or first five books of the Old Testament. It did not come from his Hebrew upbringing or religion. In another part of his writings, he reveals how he came up with this incredible interpretation of the angels as equal persons with God the Father.

Philo's "Own Soul" Revelation

Philo tells his readers that from his *own soul* that was frequently seized with divine inspiration he was told, "In the one living and true God there were two supreme and primary powers."⁹ This is extremely shocking information! The Trinity was revealed to Philo, not from God or the Holy Scriptures. It came from his own soul. He was told by his own soul that God who had always been one, was now several persons.

This is how the idea of the Trinity came into Philo's world. Accepting this thought or idea would cause Philo to betray his Jewish heritage. What kind of divine inspiration was Philo talking about if he was not a follower of Christ? He was talking about a divine inspiration that came from Gnosis or mystical knowledge.

Philo's experience with his inner or outer voice was not harmless, it was a deception. It was a severe contradiction to God's word. The bible teaches all believers: "The heart is deceitful above all things, and desperately wicked: who can know it?" (Jeremiah 17:9). This self-revelation within time would create a different God than the one proclaimed by all previous followers of the Holy Scriptures.

History would reveal men such as: Ignatius, Clement of Rome, Justin, Theophilus, Irenaeus, Hippolytus, Tertullian, Cyprian, Firmilian, Clement of Alexandria, Origen, Novatian, Athanasius, and countless others as being participants in a constant circle of lies. It is the Catholic Fathers that can be blamed for this wicked and perverse doctrine to have ever been considered as gospel truth.

Philo would call God and his two supreme powers by many names, yet his strongest teaching would center around calling those distinct powers, God's Word and Wisdom. His allegorical applications would disclose his use of "Logos and Wisdom" together, while in other segments of his writings, they would be separate. His allegorical views at times seemed contradictory since these symbolic thoughts have no rules of interpretation. It is the individual that uses this approach who decides what the meaning will be.

Philo's Three Days Before the Sun

Philo continues with his topic about God and his two supreme powers in his "Who is the Heir of Divine Things." On page 290, he relates how God "allotted three days to eternity before the appearance of the sun." Philo's intention in mentioning these special three days was to promote his belief that these were a declaration of God and his two powers. He likens "time and eternity" as being the two primary powers of God. He portrays one as, "the beneficent power." He calls the other, "the chastening power."

Philo's Trinity

Philo again uses the example of the "mercy-seat" and the "two cherubim" to continue describing God as three. He adds to this that God and his two powers are not only distinct as mentioned earlier, but equal.¹⁰ This is the exact definition that modern Trinitarians give to their doctrine of God. The persons in the Godhead are not separate, but distinct. The Athanasian Creed makes the "persons in the Godhead" to be equal. Both trinities have *persons*, *distinction*, and *equality*. This is not a mere coincidence. If the reader is not convinced, the next example should be far more compelling.

Theophilus' Three Days Before the Luminaries

The very first place in the history of the church where the word Trinity is mentioned is in the little known writings of "Theophilus of Antioch." This is yet another fact that has been carefully omitted by most Trinitarian defenders. On page 101 of the second volume of the Ante-Nicene Fathers, it is clearly recorded. When using the word Trinity for the first time, *Theophilus* was describing the three days before the sun that Philo had mentioned in his belief of God and his two equal powers. Theophilus called them, "the three days which were before the luminaries."

This is gripping information! In the very first place in church history where the word "Trinity" appears, the bishop of Antioch was referring to the writings of Philo. Both agreed that the three days before the sun or luminaries were types of the Trinity. Both revealed their belief in one God as having a triune nature. Theophilus wrote that "God, His Word, and His wisdom" made up the Trinity. He goes on to say in the same letter that when God said, "Let us make man" he was referring again to his own Word and Wisdom. Incredible!

More importantly, Theophilus was not the first or the only follower of Philo. Men such as *Ignatius*, *Clement*, *Justin*,

and *Irenaeus* had committed the same tragic mistake. How could this have happened? This is what the apostles warned about as coming into the churches of the New Testament. Here is the main reason for the prophecies given in Matthew 24, Acts 20, Jude 4, and other related places of scripture.

The Apostle Peter wrote prophetically: "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 bible is our source in revealing the conspiracies of the last days.

Jude wrote about certain men coming into the church: "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" (Jude 4). Jude cautioned that the doctrine of *one God would be denied*. This advice cannot be ignored.

The Apostle Paul admonished the elders of Ephesus: "Also of your own selves shall men arise, speaking perverse things, to draw away disciples after them" (Acts 20:30). Not only would evil deception come from the outside, but also from within, instigated through some of the church leaders themselves. The timeframe for this occurrence was carefully marked by the apostle: "For I know this, that after my departing shall grievous wolves enter in among you, not sparing the flock" (Acts 20:29). Paul's departure came when he was beheaded while captive at Rome in 67 A.D.

Woman Becomes Virgin

One of the very first false doctrines to come into the churches after the death of the apostles, was that Mary, the mother of Jesus remained a virgin before, during, and after giving birth to her son. *Perpetual Virginity* is the teaching that

Philo's Trinity

Mary remained a virgin forever. This idea was presented with the first letters of the Apostolic Fathers. You can clearly see this teaching in the writings of Ignatius of Antioch, and throughout the writings of many of these priests. Where did these men get the idea that Mary, the mother of Jesus, would remain a virgin, even after delivering her first begotten?

In his books on Allegorical Interpretation (I-III), Philo mentions interestingly, "the Goddess always a virgin." Philo believed that just like men could make a virgin into a woman, so could the uncreated God "make a woman into a virgin."¹¹ He taught this in reference to the soul, however, it is quite obvious to see how the Fathers took that allegory and applied it to the "Virgin Mary."

It was Rome's successors to the apostles of Christ, who would present Mary as "ever virgin." This was contrary to the early church and the true men of God. Philo foolishly alluded to his God as being powerful enough to sow the ideas of "immortal and virgin virtues" in a woman. He mentioned God as being able to transform in this chosen or selected woman the appearance of virginity.

This is one more doctrine that connects Philo with the Apostolic Fathers of the Catholic Church. These wicked and perverted doctrines of Philo found a place with certain men that claimed to be members of the *Christian community*. That is why the Word of God, the bible, is filled with so many admonishments against false teachers and false prophets.

The deceptions that came into the church hundreds of years ago, are ever so present in our modern theology. There are many who refer to the Trinity as a biblical doctrine. It is in reality a mixture of scripture and allegorical applications. Christians, for many years have been under a misguided notion that the Trinity of modern denominations is a revelation found conclusively in the bible. Many of these defenders are ruthless in their defense. Not because of their intelligent and biblical stance, but because they are stubborn.

Our Assessment of Philo's Writings

The conclusion of all this information is that this unique philosopher was really twisting the verses of the Old Testament to make them fit his own occultist persuasions. It is extremely difficult to accept that anyone within the Christian community of faithful believers would use his mystical ideas to teach anything, let alone Christian doctrine.

The religious leaders that were using Philo's beliefs as Christian, were either extremely inadequate at interpreting the bible, or were basically of the same occultist leanings that stand contrary to rightly dividing of the Word of truth. Philo's allegorizing of scripture was a technique to create and invent ideas that would appear to be found in God's Word.

To those who are spiritually wise or discerning, was it really Philo's soul that was telling him these things? Who told this man that with God there were two supreme and primary powers? The voice (inner or outer) was telling him that God was a trinity, contrary to his own Jewish heritage. This was the point of no return for this Jewish Hellenistic philosopher.

What was Philo's background at the time of his soul revelation? Most Christians do not have a clue that Philo was also a devout follower of what is known today as the Jewish Kabbalah. It is the opposite of sound biblical teaching. This is dealing with a deceptive form of the occult. Philo's use of philosophy would be linked to that of Jewish mysticism.

The Trinity of the Kabbalah

Edersheim, in his book "The Life and Times of Jesus, the Messiah" wrote that Philo plainly took his main ideas of the Logos, God and Wisdom emanations from the Kabbalah's En-Soph and Sephiroth.¹² This author explains that the Logos of Philo was not the identical Logos of the bible. All the characteristics of the Greek Logos relate perfectly with the

Philo's Trinity

Jewish Kabbalah, and not the biblical Logos of both Jewish and Christian believers. *Kabbalah* refers to occult traditions.

The Theosophical Glossary classifies the Jewish Greek philosopher, Philo of Alexandria, and the members of the Therapeutes, as being good Theosophists.¹³ The glossary even states that Philo had no rival in "esoteric knowledge" for several ages. When one studies the modern teachings of the Kabbalah and the "Tree of Life," it is astounding to learn that the formula for their mystical god is also a trinity.

Unbelievably, their once hidden trinity of god also includes "Wisdom" as one of its members. The god of the Kabbalah, to our amazement, is referred to as the "Supernal Triad." The prescription (formula) used to teach the beginning of all creation is "Keter," "Chokmah," and "Binah."¹⁴ The word "Chokmah" simply means wisdom in Hebrew, or Sophia in Greek. Keter refers to the unknowable God. So the god of the occult is represented by God (Keter), Wisdom (Chokmah), and Knowledge (Binah). These could easily be substituted for God, Word, and Wisdom.

Chokmah and Binah in their mystic religion, would be portrayed as different, yet one and the same. In any case, these two powers or gods of the occult emanating from the Keter, would always be seen together. *Emanating* means to flow out or come forth from a source of origin. In like manner, Philo would teach that his Divine Wisdom and Logos were separate, but yet the same. The god of the Kabbalah, the unknown Keter would come to reflect Philo's view of the transcendent God. This would be the God that is uninvolved in creation. God was unknowable and unreachable. Unfortunately, this is the God that many profess today.

Mystical and Allegorical Interpretations

If Philo's method of interpretation majored in allegory, why would some of the Catholic Fathers claim his Logos as

being identical to that of John's Logos? The Greek Logos of Philo was one and the same with Heavenly Wisdom. To Philo, Wisdom was a real power separate from God, and at the same time the same as God. Aligning this mystic Wisdom with the Logos gave Philo a second God that existed along with God in creation.

This was a total contrast from the Logos mentioned in the gospel of John's first chapter. John's Logos was the simple spoken "Word" of God as used in the Old Testament. There was never a connection with a mystical "Divine Wisdom." There is no proof in the entire New Testament letters that wisdom and logos together were ever a divine person separate from God. The Apostle John wrote that the "Word was God."

The feminine wisdom found in Proverbs 8 was never a real divine being or person that represented Christ. It was and is a personification of just one of the many "attributes" of God. There are multiple qualities or examples of God's character: Holiness, Righteousness, Wisdom, Grace, Faithfulness, Love, Self-existence, Justice, Mercy, Judgment, and the list goes on. The inspired writer of Proverbs was simply contrasting the evil woman of chapter 7 with God's attribute of wisdom.

Solomon, the believed author of Proverbs wrote about wisdom and understanding: "Say unto wisdom, Thou art my sister; and call understanding thy kinswoman: That they may keep thee from the strange woman, from the stranger which flattereth with her words" (Proverbs 7:4-5). This style of writing in Holy Scripture is known as personification of God's attributes. Note that in the book of Proverbs, it is wisdom and understanding together, not wisdom alone. Philo, who called wisdom a mother, overlooked the lesson that wisdom was a sister and understanding a kinswoman. Philo, instead preferred the Apocrypha book of Wisdom, where it mentions *mother*.

Philo and the Ante-Nicene Fathers allegorized Wisdom as a divine being, yet, clearly seen in this well-liked passage, they did not allegorize "Understanding." It is understanding

Philo's Trinity

that undeniably puts forth her voice: "Doth not wisdom cry? and understanding put forth her voice" (Proverbs 8:1)?

There was no allegorizing of "prudence." It is in this much quoted chapter that wisdom is described as *dwelling with* prudence. If one attribute is made into a person, then all of the attributes must be made into divine beings. This type of interpretation is philosophical jargon or pagan occultist ideas that skillfully pick and choose certain scriptures to accomplish their errors. The Trinity is an allegorical view of divinity.

Philo's confused statement of having received divine inspiration from his own soul was *self-delusion*. Sadly, this delusion of self became the deception of countless numbers of professors of religion. The truth of the false and pagan trinity is out. The secret code has now been decoded. Some will not receive this researched information for it will destroy their erroneous faith. This questions their otherwise perfect church group, religious affiliation, or esteemed denomination.

The teachings of Philo are false and they must be eradicated from the church. False religion will never correct its errors, but those who love the Lord and the Holy Scriptures must do something about this for the sake of truth. Sincere professors of the gospel might struggle at first with the false applications given previously to key verses. This happens to some because of the many years of deception. It takes time to reprogram or unlearn certain errors. Once believers acquire their second wind, they will search the scriptures with renewed strength. This will then bring joy into the heart of the believer. The mystery of God the Father and the Lord Jesus Christ will become blessing upon blessing. May the Lord God be praised!

It must be understood that Philo's way of interpreting scripture was never correct. Making the *reason*, *word*, and *wisdom* of God into other beings or persons is not what the bible calls rightly dividing the Word (II Timothy 2:15). When a serious researcher gets to the root of Trinitarian thought, this

is exactly what they will find.

In applying Stoic theory to his "soul" revelation, God according to the Alexandrian philosopher would remain one and at the same time three. Philo's own writings on "reason," "word," and "wisdom," would never disappear. These special books belonging to Philo would mysteriously be preserved, making their way even to our present time. All of Philo's writings have been preserved since the first century, while other later writings, those that disagreed with the Trinity doctrine are nowhere to be found.

There are many voices that have been crying out against the *paganizing of Christianity* for centuries, only to be silenced with clever arguments from Catholic and Protestant theologians. Church history has been altered to appear in favor of the Trinity. Some are completely blind to the fact that the early church of Jerusalem was never the church of Rome.

The apostle taught that the error of most Christians is in thinking that they can add to the words of Christ. This is a most serious mistake. Paul wrote, "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 Timothy 6:3-4). These second century Christian philosophers thought they were wiser, contrary to God's word: "For the wisdom of this world is foolishness with God." 'For it is written, He taketh the wise in their own craftiness" (1 Corinthians 3:19).

Chapter 2

Philo, the Church Father

If Philo of Alexandria was never a Christian, how did his ideas coming from other philosophers such as the Stoics and Plato make their way into a movement that preaches only the gospel? Philo's ideas were brought into the Christian churches by men that came after the death of the apostles of the Lord Jesus Christ. History reveals that there were certain key leaders that were responsible for these pagan teachings to be considered. These leaders held positions as church bishops and priests. The time has come to unmask these men.

Some would have us believe that Philo of Alexandria had nothing to do with the doctrine of the Trinity. They argue that Philo's ideas were too "abstract" or too far from reality. They claim that his teachings had no connection with Catholic dogma. The argument falls short in view of the history and writings of the Ante-Nicene Fathers. There is a direct and consistent connection with Philo and the Catholic Church.

The priest's number one assignment was to preach the one and only gospel of Galatians 1:8. Instead they chose to teach their own man-made traditions. They rejected the warnings of scripture, and for that matter, the admonitions of Christ. They rebelled against the true apostles and overlooked the many prophecies that apostasy would come in the latter days. They felt that a more allegorical type of interpretation was needed in order to go deeper into the mysteries of God.

How did the church arrive at their belief in the doctrine of the *Eternal God Son* when it is nowhere to be found in scripture? How did the wrong teaching that the Holy Spirit

was distinct from God, take its place in the creeds of Rome and Protestants alike? Are these doctrines really found in Holy Scripture? A strong and enduring research of the bible will destroy any of these superficial claims.

It is here that modern scholars have made mistakes in their investigation of Philo. These errors are clearly seen as coming from a lack of biblical proficiency. For example, some of these well accepted religious authorities emphasized in their writings that the most beloved Apostle John, and Philo of Alexandria drew their startling conclusions of the "Logos" from similar backgrounds. Although Philo was Jewish, his contradictions are clearly self-evident stemming from his passion for Plato, the Stoics, and Jewish mysticism.

When you study the lives of the apostles of Jesus Christ, there is no Greek philosophy involved. Only men that are ignorant of the teachings of Christ could conclude such a thing. Christ claimed that his authority did not come from human wisdom, but from God. The bible states, "If any man will do his will, he shall know of the doctrine, whether it be of God, or whether I speak of myself" (John 7:17). The origin of philosophical ideas mixed with scripture identifies Alexandria (Philo's home), as its main source, not the early church.

It can be traced back to Philo, the rising star of that time, who was also known as *Philo Judaeus*. It can be proven effortlessly by the writings of the Ante-Nicene Fathers. It was these religious men that continually praised and exalted the teachings of Philo in their very own works. It is these same lessons that gave these Catholic men their Ante-Nicene ideas of a preexistent or eternal Son. Philo's writings also allowed these leaders to see the Trinity in a few but selected scriptures.

How did the Roman Catholic Church come to believe

Philo's Trinity

in such a separation of Father, Son, and Holy Spirit as three distinct persons? How did they change the majority view of the *Monarchians* who believed that God had always been one, moving by His Spirit (Holy Spirit), and then manifesting in the flesh (the Son)? After all, God had always revealed "Himself" in Old Testament times through special appearances known as "theophanies." These were never seen as other divine persons.

Why would the Catholic Church in its pre-developed stage alter the application of baptism in the name of Christ to be done three times, and in three names for each individual candidate? Why did they cover up the fact that Catholic water baptism in Rome, at the turn of the century, was done in the nude? Water baptism without wearing clothes was applied to all "women, children, and men." This shocking practice was revealed within the third century writings of Hippolytus and the rediscovered "Apostolic Tradition."

Why is the Apostles' Creed, which is non-apostolic, but created by Rome, now the main symbol that is used by most Christian denominations? The venerated Apostles' Creed is 100% Catholic as revealed in their catechism: "It is the ancient baptismal symbol of the Church of Rome.' 'It's great authority arises from this fact: It is the Creed of the Roman Church, the See of Peter, the first of the apostles, to which he brought the common faith."¹

A quick scan of the Holy Scriptures does not reveal Peter as the first pope of Rome. If you study Peter's method of baptism, it is completely different than that of the institution that came after the destruction of Jerusalem. Peter and the rest of the apostles baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ. It was the Apostle Peter that commanded born again believers to be baptized in the name of the Lord: "And he commanded

them to be baptized in the name of the Lord. Then prayed they him to tarry certain days" (Acts 10:48).

Was there ever a time when the apostles baptized children and adults in the nude? This practice was never a part of the early church. The ritual was traced back to the Gnostics and some of their peculiar practices. This nude baptism is never mentioned today, and no explanation is ever given.

The Reception of Philo Into Catholicism

The fact that some teachers today emphatically deny any connection with Philo of Alexandria and those leaders that represented the second century church, can easily be disputed. According to our most recent researched information, Philo the Alexandrian philosopher and his mystical writings were well received by a certain group of bishops. Those ideas were brought into the church and taught as biblical revelation. Several sources tell us that Philo was even proclaimed to be a "Christian" by certain Church Fathers.

The author of "Philo, in Early Christian Literature" informs us that Philo of Alexandria was also known as *Philo Christianus*. Men such as Eusebius, Jerome, and Ambrose with a host of others, are cited as presenting this delusion. These men lied about their information in order to convince others about their unbiblical doctrines.

With such information some scholars agree that Philo was instrumental in the beliefs of the Ante-Nicene Fathers. Many Catholic bishops did mention him at different intervals or time periods. The guarding and maintaining of Philo's

Philo's Trinity

writings reveal the popularity of Philo among many of the leading priests. The fact that years and years gone by did not minimize the influence of this Jewish philosopher, but rather increased it among his successors is strong evidence. How important was Greek philosophy to these religious bishops? Without Philo's revelation there would have been no Trinity.

Think about Philo's influence from bishop to bishop, as the formal opening ceremony of the modern Olympic games. The runner with the torch starts at a given point; he then runs and passes the torch to someone else. This is a prime example of what happened with Philo's interpretations. The fact that some bishops and priests were more discreet by plagiarizing Philo's works, is unavoidable information.

Some earlier Fathers who mentioned Philo by name:

- Ignatius
- Justin
- Clement
- Origen
- Eusebius
- Didymus
- Gregory
- Ambrose

Recent scholars have omitted *Justin Martyr* as having mentioned Philo specifically by name. Research shows Justin as being one of the strongest links with Philo. For the record, Justin Martyr called Philo, "a wise and esteemed man." More interesting is the fact that Ignatius, the second bishop of

Antioch also mentions Philo. The difference is that he refers to this Philo as "Philo of Cilicia."

A diligent search was conducted for any information on this individual, but none was found. Some would argue that this is another Philo, but there are many doubts with much of this conflicting "scholarly" information. If Ignatius was to be included, Philo's name would have been on the lips of these bishops from the 1st century all the way to the 5th. Philo's writings were passed on with key people that even surpassed the council of Nicaea. Discussions of Philo's involvement with the Trinity have reached even to modern times.

There was an unbelievable "addiction" to Philo the Christian. If anything, Philo was more of a follower of "Plato" than a follower of Christ. The phrase, "Either Plato philonizes or Philo platonizes" was commonly said of Philo by more unbiased sources. He was well known by many as "the second Plato." If this philosopher was never a Christian, then why did so many of the Catholic bishops adopt his theories? Philo's identity was changed to that of being a disciple of Christ.

Research uncovered the mistaken idea of the Catholic priests that there was "some truth in pagan thinkers." This was an accepted teaching by the Ante-Nicene Fathers. The doctrine of Christ does not allow for such error! This is not pure biblical exposition. Why did they claim this Philo as a fellow priest? Now this question reveals who these men were, as well as their true motives in the church.

Philo stands alone in history as the first to cross over with his ideas of pagan Greek philosophy mixed together with Jewish or Hebrew Scriptures. This is what his entire collection of writings disclose. He did this methodically through the technique of "allegorizing scripture." Incredibly, one of the

Philo's Trinity

many Catholic Fathers would later be referred to also as Philo Christianus. *Ambrose* earned this title because he borrowed from Philo's writings in 600 places.²

This shattered the previous record held by *Clement of Alexandria*, who made good use of 300 in his "Stromateis."³ Clement was the second president or leader of the theological school of Alexandria. This would be the same school that would be represented at the council of Nicaea. Philo's Greek Logos would be celebrated within the doctrines of an eclectic school of philosophy and theology, which would then be later combined into one system, representing the fully developed State Church of Rome.

It was Philo's teaching on the Greek Logos and Divine Wisdom that the priests of the major provinces of Alexandria, Antioch, and Rome, accepted as excellent explanations of the Logos of John 1:1. There are of course many other passages that were tied into Philo's allegorical interpretations. Many would ask, "Was this a conspiracy or a complete theological blunder on Rome's part?" It was probably both. In today's layman terms, Philo's finger-prints were all over the Trinity dogma. His lessons on the mystical Logos/Wisdom gave the Catholic priests sufficient theory to relate this idea to the "incarnation of Christ."

The Son of God became the second God, the mediator, and messenger that Philo had introduced into the world as a necessary emanation of a transcendent God. It is correct to say that Philo Judaeus did not give us all the theories relating to the Christian Trinity; for it was none other than the Ante-Nicene Fathers which included *Tertullian*, who developed his theories into what would later become Catholic theology. The question should be asked, "What happened to Philo the bishop

and his major contributions to the Trinity?

Late Century Cover-up of Philo

What is even more interesting, is what happened to Philo's recognition in later centuries as a fellow Trinitarian. Philo lost his popular place in the Catholic Church not because of the fact that he never really was a Christian, but because they had to cover up his "pagan" non-biblical teachings. This had to be done in order to prevent Reformers and Protestants from learning the truth of the pagan Trinity. Most Christians do not know that during the Reformation of the 16th century there were some who severely questioned this doctrine.

The connection of this once acclaimed and respected philosopher had to be detached from the Universal Church for quite obvious reasons. The threat to Rome's reputation would be that this major and central doctrine of the Trinity would be exposed as the biggest non-biblical "secret" of the Catholic Church to date. If Christians found out about such things, there would be a complete severing with Rome.

One most insightful historical source entitled the first chapter of his book, "How Philo became a Church Father, Honoris Causa." The author Runia, aware of Philo's Jewish past, writes in his book, "Yet three centuries later Philo was regarded as an important witness to the beginnings of the church, and by the end of the Patristic period he had virtually achieved the status of a Church Father."⁴ Runia comments further that some extracts concerning this famed Philo, were titled under the heading "Philo the bishop." All the early fathers spoke so well of this first century figure, that Philo's true status as a Non-Christian became blurred.

Philo's Trinity

Two theories can now be assumed from this important information. Philo's works were so loved and accepted, that several bishops simply lied about his participation in church, including his vocation of being a pagan Greek philosopher. Theory number two is a bit more drastic. Philo played an important part in the foundation of the Catholic Church and was instrumental in its beginnings and formulation. For dire theory number two, Eusebius and his Ecclesiastical History will be examined in greater detail. The information found in this source will probably be shocking to sincere believers.

On page 31 Runia titles his section, "How Philo lost his status as honorary Church Father." He further comments, "According to Billings, the 17th century was dominated by a discussion on the orthodoxy of Philo's views on the Trinity."⁵ Historians attacked Philo's character as being a Platonist and never a true representative of orthodoxy. Agreeably, they were one hundred percent correct!

The author informs us that, "From this time onwards Philo gradually loses his status as an honorary Church Father and theological authority, and comes to be studied primarily as a rather unusual author from the Greco-Roman World."⁶ Thus, the story of Philo became obscure and distant from today's knowledge of the origin of the Trinity doctrine. Most modern Trinitarians, especially Protestants, have never really heard of Philo the secret "Catholic Bishop" who met Peter in Rome.

The history of the Catholic Institution is riddled with so many former problems of this kind. Take for example, the "Donation of Constantine," or the problem with "Galileo." To others it would be the alliance with "Hitler," and the notorious "ratlines." An alphabetical list could be made to present all this information as circumstantial evidence. That is not the

central idea of this book. The primary aim is to uncover what prevents millions from believing in the correct view of God that is represented in scripture.

The later centuries would have the church demote this philosopher to his former pagan status and as never having any influence whatsoever within the Catholic Church. With this previous hidden information, Catholics and Christians do not have an idea about the once famous Philo Christianus. In this day and age, Philo is mentioned occasionally, but never as the one who contributed to the Catholic foundation.

The Torch is Passed On

The writings of the Ante-Nicene Fathers disclose much borrowed information on the allegorical applications of the famed Philo Judaeus. Apart from references made about Philo, the Catholic bishops were clear on the preexistence of Christ as being both "the Word and Wisdom." From Ignatius to Athanasius, it is a notable distinction. A major teaching of the Trinity is that the Son was present with the Father during the creation of all things.

Sources agree as to there being a correlation between one of the earliest Catholic bishops, Ignatius, and that of Philo of Alexandria.⁷ It is said that Philo was well represented in the writings of Ignatius. History shows that Ignatius was the first to mention the name "Katholicos" (Catholic) in his writings.

The Didache or the "teaching of the twelve" had the distinction of being one of the earliest Apocrypha books of the New Testament. Within its pages are found contrary teachings to that of the bible, but familiar teachings to that of Ignatius and the Catholic Church. Most of the practices found in the Didache are still seen today within this religion.

Philo's Trinity

Another early father Justin Martyr, was credited with being one of “the first of the Church Fathers to bring classical scholarship and Platonic philosophy in contact with the Christian theology.”⁸ In the literary works of the Ante-Nicene Fathers, Justin wrote, “We now tell to you what you can also learn from others, and especially from those wise and esteemed men who have written of these things, Philo and Josephas, and many others.”⁹

The translators of the Apostolic Tradition tell us that *Hippolytus* was the “chief contemporary teacher of another view that had been elaborated at Rome some fifty years before by Justin Martyr.”¹⁰ The flaming torch of Justin, that well known Christian philosopher, was passed on to Hippolytus.

Still further proof comes from another source that tells us that Justin’s view of the “logos” (as he saw as a rational power and a rational being), claimed acceptance in the church with such men as Theophilus, Clement of Alexandria, and by his own master Irenaeus.¹¹ Others were influenced also such as Athenagoras, Origen, and Athanasius.¹² While it is true that Philo's writings deeply influenced Justin Martyr, the majority of believers did not accept a second God theory. Many of them were biblical Christians that professed the good news of the gospel. They were against the use of Greek philosophy.

Previously mentioned as one of the strongest links to Philo Judaeus' teachings, were the three days that Theophilus referred to as a type of the Trinity. These were the identical days Philo of Alexandria wrote about in his “Who is the Heir of All Things?” According to the writings of both bishop and pagan philosopher, these were three special days given by God in eternity before the start of time.¹³ This is where the formula of the Trinity first appears in historical Catholic writings, or “in” the letters of Theophilus.

The triad of "God, His Word, and Wisdom" was the formula that connected the Ante-Nicene Fathers with Philo. Theophilus goes on to describe the three days exactly as Philo had done previously. Philo explains time and eternity as two other equal powers along with God. The three days before the creation of the sun that Philo spoke about, are the identical days mentioned before the creation of the luminaries dictated by Theophilus.

In Tertullian's writing "Against Praxeas," he admits that the reason of God they understood to be the "Greek Logos." He uses the identical language to that of Philo when he introduces his similar "reason" terminology. This likeness in philosophical language did not stop Tertullian or his followers from accepting such pagan ideas. They embraced them! The same identical allegorical concept was applied by this special group of Catholic Fathers to the Logos or word, which they interpreted to be a second being or God "in the beginning with God."¹⁴

Second century documents from the Christian Church of Alexandria also reveal many similarities between Christian Egyptian thinkers and Philo. Rare Documents such as: "The Sentences of Sextus," "The Teachings of Silvanus," and "The Authentikos Logos," are further proof of the passing of the torch.¹⁵ These documents prove Philo's major influence in the schools of Egypt. One of the strongest advocates of Philo by far, was the second leader of the Alexandrian theological school, Clement of Alexandria.

He mentioned Philo by name and borrowed from his writings a multiple number of times. Clement's work indicates that he had access to all of Philo's writings. These were the same books that were taken by Clement's successor, Origen, to

Philo's Trinity

his library in Caesarea. There is no doubt that Origen was just as infatuated with Philo as his former teacher. The evidence keeps mounting up even higher.

The late second century and the early third century reveal many schisms in Rome due to conflicts in doctrine. The majority of Christians in that city, as stated previously, were Monarchian or believers in one God. Included in this group, were some of their popes: Victor I, Zephyrinus, Callistus, and Stephen I, just to name a few. Due to the conflict of different schools fighting for supremacy, Hippolytus asserts that it was because of the two popes Zephyrinus and Callistus, that the Monarchian school of Rome prevailed. The school represented the major view of the people of Rome at that time.

He wrote that Callistus prior to being the successor to Zephyrinus, was the "Champion" defender of what he called "these wicked tenets." He was also the sole person responsible for perverting Sabellius.¹⁶ When have we heard or read that Sabellius was a disciple of the Roman Pope? Furthermore, that the pope was the strongest defender of the Monarchians is not something that you read about in today's history of the Trinity. Trinitarians are incorrect in their history books when they state that poor *Sabellius* sneaked into the church to teach heresy.

The minority of the religious people at that particular time were known as schismatic (division causing) Trinitarians. This of course, included their contentious and overzealous leaders. Tertullian claimed that they were constantly accused of believing in two and three gods, but that didn't seem to discourage them. Other examples of such stubborn individuals were such bishops as Cyprian and Novatian. These earliest *apologists* of the Greek Logos eventually divided the Church to start their own. They were known in history as Anti-Popes.

Bishop Hippolytus being the first Anti-Pope in history, reveals much about his struggle to indoctrinate others with the Greek Logos coming from Justin and Philo.

Novatian, another Anti-Pope, wrote his "De Trinitate," a treatise on the Trinity. From Novatian we get a glimpse of how the Greek Logos had been totally incorporated into this new philosophy of God. His reference to John 1:1 as the second God or the preexistent Son, is most revealing. This is the same interpretation that modern Trinitarians are still using in their arguments.

A most damning evidence about Philo's influence in the Catholic Church is found in the "Ecclesiastical History" of *Eusebius*. He tells us, "Since the work of which we now speak, and which was subsequently composed by him at a late period, evidently comprehended the regulations that are still observed in our churches, even to the present time."¹⁷ Eusebius was pointing undoubtedly to the Catholic Church as observing or following Philo. Eusebius actually praises his writings.

Eusebius goes on to actually name every single work that was produced by this Alexandrian philosopher, further concluding with the idea that Philo "venerated and extolled the apostolic men of his time." The apostolic men that Eusebius was referring to were those of the community of ascetic believers that came from Alexandria. These men and women lived in sacred homes which they called "monasteries."

The Council of Nicaea also reveals much information on the teachings that came from Alexandria, the home of Philo. Arius who also lived in Alexandria, disagreed strongly with Philo's major influence of the Trinity and the "begotten God." This was the teaching expounded by Alexander, the bishop of Alexandria at that time. This is what caused the 1st

Philo's Trinity

historical council to be convened under the Roman emperor Constantine. The deacon Athanasius would prove to be at this convened council, a most illustrious defender and promoter of the Trinity. His participation would later earn him the supreme and coveted title of the "Bishop of Alexandria."

It would be none other than the deacon Athanasius and the wisdom teaching derived from Proverbs 8 that would come to defeat Arius. Constantine would be highly influenced by the teaching that Christ was the preexistent Word and Wisdom. Few people understand that Athanasius was a strong defender of the school of Alexandria. This was the theological school that reflected the ideas of Pantaenus, Clement, and Origen. These men were mentioned previously as upholding and applying the writings of Philo. Many other convened councils would follow the pattern of Nicaea.

The Oxford dictionary cites, "The classical doctrine of the incarnation, took shape under the controversies of the 4th and 5th centuries, formally defined at the council of Chalcedon in 451 A.D.' 'It was "molded by the diversity of tradition in the schools of Antioch and Alexandria, the one stressing the human aspects of the Incarnate Christ, the other, under the influence of a Platonizing philosophy, His divinity."¹⁸ The Oxford dictionary was right on target with this conclusion.

Though it took several centuries to finalize the creedal doctrine of the Trinity, it was through Alexandria's eclectic theology that the "God Son" or as Chalcedon described it, "God the Word, twice begotten" that the Church would be forced to accept. The most serious "Anathemas" or curses of the second council of Constantinople (553 A.D.) are still with us to this day. According to their philosophy, he was "first begotten of the Father, before all times, non-temporal and

bodiless."¹⁹ The summary of all said is the true, but sad story of the Trinity that is ignored or neglected by most Trinitarians.

Catholic Confession

The Catholic Encyclopedia openly confirms their use of the Greek Logos: "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."²⁰ Saying that we can best learn the theory of the Logos from Philo, is admitting that it is the Greek Logos that was used to bring about the Trinity.

Protestant Trinitarian Theologians do not readily admit to this, while others, understanding the contradiction between philosophy and scripture, adamantly deny the link altogether. If Philo's Logos is presented as the interpretation to John 1:1, then the literal and historical approach to this verse has been violated. John 1.1 does not speak about two Gods!

It must then be proven that the apostles, contrary to all their inspired writings, were the best of Greek philosophers. This would be an impossibility because the apostles were against all types of philosophy. 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" (Colossians 2:8).

Runia in his "Philo in Early Christian Literature" gives us a startling comment on Philo: "The final result we reach, therefore, is somewhat paradoxical, Philo made a contribution to the evolution of Christian doctrine which helped to turn

Philo's Trinity

Christianity into a religion very different from the way his own Judaism developed.' 'It was not a coincidence that Philo found his future in the Christian church."²¹

Again, the author establishes a final conclusion in the following statement: "Philo's adoption by the Church fathers was an important event.' 'It ensured the survival of his works, and did not leave Christianity untouched in the process."²² To reject at this point, that Philo's influence was foundational would be a disgrace for those who deny his involvement. Putting your head in the sand will not work at any time.

There is no doubt that Philo's religious discourses and philosophical ideas were spread out throughout the Roman Catholic Church by certain bishops and priests. Agreeably, the writings of Philo on the subject of the Trinity were well accepted by some of the now famous Catholic Fathers.

Brown, as cited by Runia certainly agrees with this notion: "If Philo had never existed, we would know a lot less about the background of the Gospel's thought, and the interpretation of the Gospel by the Church fathers would not have been the same."²³ It must be well understood that this statement refers only to the Catholic view of the gospel and not Christianity as a whole. History reveals quite a number of Christians who were persecuted for not accepting the Trinity or belonging to this particular institution of the state.

If the theory of the "Logos" can best be learned from Philo Judaeus, as the Catholic Church asserts, why do some contemporary theologians deny the connection? There are several Christian writers that obstinately deny that the Logos of Philo was used to bring about the Trinity doctrine. As anyone can see, they were and are totally mistaken. These respected Christian apologists must repent of their false

information that has been propagated for so many years within the Christian community.

The Catholic Church admits to the Logos of Philo, but will they admit that the Trinity also came from him? Modern Christianity has no knowledge of the Trinitarian formula used by the famed Ante-Nicene Fathers. They don't know about Theophilus and Philo's three days as a type of the Trinity. They ignore the formula of God, Word, and Wisdom.

The Greek "Logos" of Philo the second Plato, is the undisclosed application given to scripture. This is not sound doctrine, nor is this New Testament teaching. Theology mixed with philosophy is not what Jesus meant when he said "search the scriptures." Peter wrote in his first epistle, "As newborn babes, desire the sincere milk of the word, that ye may grow thereby" (1Peter 2:2). He was not suggesting to study Greek philosophy.

The book of Proverbs teaches the precept, "Add thou not unto his words, lest he reprove thee, and thou be found a liar" (Proverbs 30:6). Chapter 22 of Revelation also warns against adding or taking away from the words of scripture. Verses 18 and 19 disclose information that is crucial to all Pastors, churches, and denominations:

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 (Revelation 22:18-19).

Chapter 3

The Secret Disciples of Philo,

A More Expanded View

Chapter 3 will appear to be a repetition of the previous chapter. The persons and books discussed in chapter two will now include a more extended explanation. Ignatius is first-off mentioned as the first recognized Catholic writer and the first Trinitarian philosopher within the church communities. He was about the age of 32 when he took office in 67 A.D. His role as a leader was seen as crucial because most historians including Catholic ones, directly attribute to this bishop, the implementing of change within church ministries. Evident in his writings is his view of a single bishop having equal authority with Christ. He was one of the first in presenting the false view that Mary remained a virgin, even after she gave birth to Jesus.

One of the reasons why Ignatius was believed to be a Trinitarian was his wrongful view of water baptism. The bishop's interpretation of Matthew 28:19 is recorded in his chronicles as, "Not unto one person having three names, nor into three persons that became incarnate, but into three possessed of equal honour."¹ Even as early as this bishop was in office, his belief in a God that was three coequal persons is clearly seen. Ignatius acquired this version of three coequal beings from Philo, who taught this earlier in the first century.

The Catholic author Hans Kung in his book "The Catholic Church," admits that in the beginning of the early church "one visibly belonged to the faith community of those who believed in Christ if one was baptized in the name of

Jesus and took part in the thanksgiving meal in memory of him."² Kung does well in admitting the truth of original baptism. In the bible, baptism was always applied in the name. This is what the bible teaches. Proof texts are: Acts 2:38, 8:16, 10:48, 19:5 etc. On page 18 he again reveals the truth of original water baptism. Kung says of the Apostle Paul, "He administered baptism in the name of Jesus and celebrated the ceremonial meal in his memory."³

The Roman Pope, Stephen I, around 257 A.D. wrote to the bishops, "The name of Christ is of great advantage to faith and the sanctification of baptism.' 'So whoever is anywhere baptized in the name of Christ, he immediately obtains the grace of Christ."⁴

Where did Ignatius get his own unbiblical ideas? It was within his multiple writings that he revealed his interpretation of the Logos by calling it "God the Word" and "the only begotten God and Wisdom" (volume I, page 82). Here is the startling connection to the mystic writings of Philo. It was Philo's teaching that the Greek Logos was the "Word and Wisdom." The belief that the Logos was a second person or God, is seen within the scope of his numerous letters.

Ignatius' theology came from another source than that of the holy bible. It was the Greek Logos of philosophy that became the only begotten God and Wisdom. It was Philo's revelation and Alexandrian thought of a trinity of beings, that was adopted by Ignatius. This is the only logical connection. It is within Ignatius' term in office that the Apocrypha writing "the Didache" became popular among the people. Somewhere between 80 to 120 A.D. followers received this written work as "the teaching of the twelve apostles". This was a document that was never written by the original and true apostles.

Philo's Trinity

The document addressed an already existing group that followed many of Ignatius' ideas. The Didache promoted the ideas of confession of unlawful acts in church, a bishop having equal authority with the Lord God, repeating the "Our Father" three times a day, fasting on Wednesdays and Fridays "unlike the hypocrites, who fast on Mondays and Thursdays," and not engaging in sexual relations with children. This catechism that falsely represented the true apostles, came from the regions of Alexandria or Antioch.

This manual of religious instruction outlined for the leaders to baptize three times and in three names. The formula for baptism suggested "pouring" where there was no running water.⁵ The same interpretation was given to Matthew 28:19 by both Ignatius and the Didache. Instead of baptizing in the "name" as directed by this verse, they wrongly advocated to baptize in the names, plural.

The bible teaches baptism as identification with Christ: "Buried with him in baptism, wherein also ye are risen with him through the faith of the operation of God, who hath raised him from the dead" (Colossians 2:12). Catholic theologians of the second and third century rejected baptism into the death of Christ and upheld the Didache. Rome will not deny that they changed the earlier baptism in the name of Christ to that of the Trinity.

How could baptism be applied "in" the Trinity when the early church clearly existed without this formula? It would take many years for doctrinal development of such a theory. History would expose a different baptismal formula to that of the bible. It would make its way from Egypt to the other provinces of Antioch and Rome. It would come to be known as Catholic or Universal baptism.

This can be further attested by studying the writings of the Catholic Fathers. When the Ante-Nicene Fathers referred to baptism, they used "names" instead of name. To give one of many examples of this error, Tertullian writes: "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 the mention of each individual name.'"⁶ This is not baptism in the singular name. This is the formula used previously by Ignatius and the Didache.

Please note Tertullian's use of *Persons* in this passage. His use of this expression would also be used interchangeably with the word "beings." Philo, the philosopher did the exact same thing in his allegorical vision of God as three. In volume three, page 607 of the writings of the Ante-Nicene Fathers, Tertullian makes a most revealing comment. In his dialogue on the prologue of John 1:1, "The Word was God," he concludes the discussion with "then you have two Beings." So when Tertullian referred to Persons in baptism, in his mind *they were not three Persons, one Being*.

Tertullian's beliefs and practices would filter into the churches of Rome bringing much conflict. Some Catholics would mistakenly proclaim his view of baptism against other churches as being the most original. When studying the "Seventh Synod of Carthage" for example, or Cyprian and the bishops of Africa, their writings expose their incredible hatred of what they called "heretical" baptism. They were completely opposed to the churches that baptized into the death of Christ.

It is here that pride in the Catholic Church is noted in their writings. A strong spirit of division now separated the people completely. Pope Stephen I, the leader of the church of

Philo's Trinity

Rome at that time, did not agree that baptism in the name of Christ was heretical. He ordered Cyprian and the African bishops not to rebaptize in the Trinity formula. Their failure to comply with the mandate of the "head bishop of Rome" forced Pope Stephen to "excommunicate" all the bishops of Africa.⁷

This is history that is not currently taught by any books that teach in favor of the Trinity doctrine. The examples of Tertullian, Cyprian, and Pope Stephen were used here in order to reveal change. It is important for the reader to know that bishops such as Cyprian revealed a spirit of superiority against all other churches. It is at this moment in time that the Catholic Church is proclaimed as the only church. Baptism in the Triune formula was declared by these evil men as the sole representation of Catholic orthodoxy.

When Trinitarian defenders teach on the origin of the Trinity, they usually trace back only as far as Tertullian. It is a mistake and very poor research. It is an embarrassment for today's Christian apologists to inform their congregations that this is where the teaching first started.

The Epistle of Barnabas

The book of Barnabas must be included here because of its alluding to the Son's existence since creation. Along with the Didache, this is one of the very first Apocrypha books of the New Testament. It connects the teachings of Philo with that of the Catholic Church. This false book is still defended today by the Roman Institution, even though Barnabas did not write it. Both the Didache and the epistle of Barnabas are hailed as being important. Why would the Catholic Church put

such value on books that have been falsified as to their true authorship?

They claim in the *New Advent Catholic Encyclopedia* that the epistle of Barnabas along with the "Didache" must be included with the writings of the Ante-Nicene Fathers.⁸ The reason is obvious. The false epistle of Barnabas includes the same identical doctrine coming from Alexandria: "Consider this, my brothers: if the Lord allowed himself to suffer for our sake, even though he was the Lord of the entire world, the one to whom God said at the foundation of the world, "Let us make a human according to our image and likeness," how then did he allow himself to suffer at the hands of humans?"⁹

How did the writer of this forgery come up with the idea of the Son existing at the foundation of the world? The answer is that the Greek Logos of Philo had already been presented in the first century. The Alexandrian philosophers had taken up this "reason" of God and had applied it to the Son of God. If God's reason, word, or wisdom was alongside of God, then the Son was with God at creation.

This is seen in the following chapter 6, verse 12, that reads, "For the Scripture speaks about us when he says to his Son, Let us make the human according to our image and likeness, and let them rule over the wild beasts of the land and the birds of the sky and the fish of the sea." The unknown writer of Barnabas reminds us again, "He said these things to the Son."¹⁰

This type of conversation between divine beings is seen throughout the writings of the Ante-Nicene Fathers. It is this group that promotes the *Eternal Son* or the Greek Logos as the reason, word, or wisdom of God. These Apocrypha books are maintained and defended to convince the unwary

Philo's Trinity

masses and give some kind of written proof. Old manuscripts provide a false validity; a proven method for deception.

Justin

Justin was known as a Christian philosopher within the developing church communities. He would eventually travel to Rome and establish his own school of Christian philosophy. Taking his cue from Philo's distinct powers with God, Justin wrote that there was a *rational power* that was called Wisdom and Logos. He further concluded that this rational power was numerically distinct and also a *rational Being*. He was another God and Lord, subject unto the Maker of all things.¹¹

Study the writings of Justin (volume I). His recorded eclectic thoughts can be seen as being accepted in the writings of many, including the bishops Hippolytus and Tertullian. It was Hippolytus who expounded Justin's views on the Logos while in Rome about 200 A.D. The majority of Christians of that particular time did not agree with Hippolytus, and for that matter, they neither agreed with Tertullian.

The philosophy of the Trinity doctrine coming from Alexandria was not accepted in the beginning by Rome's fragmented Christian communities. Justin's teaching on the Greek Logos was so despised that a certain group of believers identified as the "Alogi," did not accept the Logos teaching at all. Even Rome itself had much trouble with this philosophical application, partly due to the fact that Christians at this time were Monarchian, not Trinitarian. Research of the writings of Tertullian or Hippolytus will confirm this matter. Tertullian asserted that the majority accused him of having several gods.

Studying the works of Trinitarian historians for the most part, reveals a total different rendition of what had been stated directly in the writings of these men. Most of these respected authorities ignored serious incriminating facts found in the literary works of the fathers. As avid defenders of the Greek Logos, both Tertullian and Hippolytus left the Roman Catholic Church. Others, such as Cyprian and the bishops of Africa strongly opposing baptism in the name of Jesus, were excommunicated by the pope of that time. Without the Ante-Nicene writers, none of these facts would ever be known.

Valentinus, the Gnostic

Valentinus was another strong connection with Philo. His doctrine as a Gnostic corresponds directly with the first century teachings of that most esteemed philosopher of Alexandria. The famed Valentinus was born and raised in the same city. He joined the Christian church and was even a teacher among the Egyptian assembly of believers. He later moved to Rome and even made an attempt of becoming the Roman bishop or pope of his time. He lost by a very narrow margin. Tertullian wrote that Valentinus went on to start his own school.

His doctrine was a reflection of Philo's wisdom. Proof of this can be seen in his belief of three hypostasis or natures of God that were also mentioned in Philo's "Questions and Answers, IV, 2." Philo also mentioned, "the Lord God of three natures" in his book entitled, "On the Change of Names."¹² Gnostics were better known for exalting Divine Wisdom as a feminine member of the Trinity. Reading such books as "the

Philo's Trinity

Gospel of Truth" proves this point. Since wisdom was already described as being feminine in gender, the notorious Gnostic sect proclaimed the Holy Spirit as Sophia the "Mother."

Theophilus

Theophilus' historical introduction of the word Trinity as previously mentioned, was the unveiling of "God, His Word, and Wisdom."¹³ This is the first place in the writings of the Fathers where the word trinity or triad is mentioned. Therefore, this is a most important declaration. Things get a little bit more tricky with this triadic formula and the bishop of Antioch. Theophilus was also known for applying Philo's interpretation with regards to "Wisdom" or Sophia, to that of the Holy Spirit.

The writings of Theophilus declare that the Word or Logos was separate from Wisdom. The Word indeed was the second God, but Wisdom was now the third person of the Godhead. Wisdom to Theophilus was not Christ, it was the Holy Spirit. This of course contradicted his earlier fellow priests with their Logos/Wisdom connection as referring to the Son. Why did Theophilus and others, refuse to apply wisdom to the Son? Could it be that they were applying Wisdom to both? Either way, the secrecy of the bishop's formula led to the same application previously revealed by Philo.

This would come to prove just how false this religious philosophy really was. The concept of Word/Wisdom was applied to Christ almost unanimously by the majority of Ante-Nicene Fathers. Theophilus concluded along with Irenaeus and others, that wisdom (an attribute) was none other than the

Holy Spirit. Theophilus even claimed that the Word or Logos was emitted simultaneously with Wisdom (Holy Spirit). Who do modern theologians side with, Tertullian or Theophilus?

This did not seem to be a problem with any of the bishops. There is no arguing within the father's letters over this important matter. The issue does not even appear in any of their discussions. How could one concept represent one person of the Trinity, then completely change to be the other person? This is not only false teaching in the church, it is completely senseless theology.

Irenaeus

Similarly, Irenaeus spoke about Wisdom as being the Holy Spirit: "I have largely demonstrated that the Word, namely the Son, was always with the Father.' 'Now, that Wisdom also, who is the Spirit, was present with Him before all creation, He declares by Solomon: "God by Wisdom founded the earth, and by understanding He has established the heaven." 'By His knowledge, the depths burst forth, and the clouds dropped down the dew." And then again, "The Lord created me the beginning of His ways in His work.' 'He set me up from everlasting, in the beginning, before He made the earth.' 'There is therefore one God, who by His Word and Wisdom created and arranged all things.'" ¹⁴

Irenaeus believed as Theophilus, his fellow priest, that "Wisdom was the Holy Spirit." Somehow this ridiculous error passed by as a mere insignificant difference and nothing more. It really went unnoticed by the writers. Why would this be? In a theological application, this is an enormous problem. How

Philo's Trinity

could Wisdom be connected directly with Christ, and then completely shift to become that of the Holy Spirit? This is an absurd contradiction to the theory of distinctions.

The verses used to prove the existence of the Logos with God at the beginning of creation, would now be used by these bishops to prove the existence of the Holy Spirit as also being with God in the beginning. This is known as deceptive manipulation of scripture. It is an insult to intelligence, and an insane mockery of true biblical interpretation. This is false doctrine at its best. This type of wicked application is seen in the secret formula of god found exclusively in the mystical Kabbalah. From the Keter emanates the Chokmah and Binah, which exist together, but never apart. According to occultists, you cannot have one without the other.

Hippolytus

Hippolytus, as previously mentioned, is best known for the *Treatise on the Apostolic Tradition*. One of Hippolytus' principal sayings was, "Wisdom has built her house.' 'By this, he means Christ, the Wisdom and Power of God the Father."¹⁵ History reveals that this bishop took his beliefs directly from Justin Martyr. This was mentioned earlier, as the passing of the torch. Philo's ideas would continue spreading throughout most Christian communities by using this method. Bishop Hippolytus taught similar to Justin that the "Unique Divine Nature was capable of real distinctions within itself."¹⁶

He also emphasized the formula that "God possessed within Himself His Logos, His divine innate Wisdom or Word, as it were latent from all eternity."¹⁷ He learned from

Justin that at a rare point in infinite time, "God manifested His Word to Himself and by the Word created all things." Thus, he concluded that the "Word was truly God, within and of the One Divine Nature, but "another" over against the Father by Whom and from Whom He was manifested."¹⁸

What many Christians do not know about Hippolytus is why he became the first Anti-Pope in history. Hippolytus left the church because the popes of his time did not agree with the Greek Logos. The Popes at that time were not willing to accept his Trinitarian philosophy. The majority living in Rome at that time were Oneness believers, as admitted by Tertullian. They accused Tertullian of having three gods.

Needless to say, bishop Hippolytus reveals much in his Apostolic Tradition. It exposes some of Rome's bishops at about the year 200 A.D., as baptizing candidates in a totally unbiblical way. They would require all candidates, "men, women, and children" to disrobe in front of them. Then the incorrect formula of baptizing three times and in three names was applied to each individual candidate.¹⁹

History would reveal that a totally wrong application of baptism, derived from a false conception of God, would lead to error. Baptizing in the nude might seem comical to some of today's theologians, but it was an abomination in the eyes of a holy God. This not only reveals a false and cultic theology, it reveals corrupt men in the church. This cannot be Christianity, but rather the rise of an impersonating religious cult. Following a counterfeit baptism would blind Tertullian along with Hippolytus, Cyprian, Firmilian, and several others, to quote viciously in their writings, that their Popes and fellow Catholics were "heretics." They would not hold back from bringing division along with confusion and betrayal.

Philo's Trinity

Catholics calling each other heretics is not something that you commonly read about. The Trinity, since its inception into the church, has brought much conflict and division. It would also produce within time, a state religion that would enforce its strange worship of the three in unity. Countless biblical Christians would be persecuted by Rome for rejecting what would become, the central doctrine of the Catholic Church.

Back to Tertullian

Tertullian the bishop of Carthage wrote, "...the very Word Himself, who is spoken of under the name of both Wisdom and Reason." He again wrote, "For if indeed Wisdom in this passage means to say that She was created by the Lord with a view to His works, and to accomplish His ways, yet proof is given in another scripture that all things were made by the Word, and without Him was there nothing made." He continues, "Thus it is evident that it is one and the same power which is in one place described under the name of Wisdom, and in another passage under the appellation of the Word."²⁰

So according to the one and only Tertullian, Wisdom and Word constituted the second person of the Trinity. His application of the Logos would always be connected to Divine Wisdom. How does Tertullian's view of Wisdom relate to that of Theophilus or Irenaeus? This is a most serious mistake that cancels out the Trinity's distinction of persons. If the Holy Spirit is not Wisdom, then how was the Spirit separated to become the third person? It is without doubt, the Trinitarian view that separates God from his very own Spirit.

His use of the term "power" to describe both Wisdom and Word as one, is very revealing. It was Philo who called his trinity, God and his two supreme powers. Note also that Tertullian was quoting from a bible translation that says, *Wisdom was created*. It is most interesting that this statement is not found in the King James Version of the bible. It is found in the Apocrypha book of Sirach.

This is one of several books in the Old Testament Apocrypha that are found exclusively in the Catholic Bible. Sirach 1:4 teaches us: "Before all things else wisdom was created." This is not what the book of Proverbs instructs about wisdom. This is a direct contradiction to the Athanasian Creed which claims all three members of the Trinity as "uncreated."

The books of the Apocrypha gave the fathers enough theory to support their doctrine. At the same time these books created multiple problems in their theology. Problems that have been hidden, yet never resolved to this day. Most modern Trinitarians have no idea that these books were used.

Most Christians do not know that the teaching of the preexistent Son was not taken from the biblical definition of the "Logos" found in John 1:1. They read into the passage because of a preconceived idea that was placed there by their first Christian instructors. The torch was passed on.

Modern apologists have relied on today's ignorance of the extensive ten volume writings of the so-called fathers to claim that the Trinity is biblical. Tertullian's strange quote that wisdom was created has tremendous implications in the modern teaching of "the three persons of one substance." A created wisdom contradicts the coequal, coeternal doctrine making it invalid. Being created is the opposite of being the one and only Creator.

Philo's Trinity

Wisdom applied to Christ would make him a created person and not coeternal. Wisdom applied to the Holy Spirit would also make the Holy Spirit a created person. Tertullian's synopsis that the Word (Logos) and Divine Wisdom (Sophia) were one and the same power, would lead to the same exact conclusion. If the Word / Wisdom (person) was created, how could Christ be coeternal? How can any sincere Christian theologian ignore such blatant errors by the man most consider to have given us the doctrine of the Trinity?

If we reconsider Tertullian's statements throughout this chapter, the mistakes are incredibly serious. None of the combinations mentioned by the fathers have any true or correct application. Using allegorical interpretation caused these men to waver from Holy Scripture. Using the Greek Logos as the Logos of John 1:1 completely discredits the integrity of the Apostle John and it changes the gospel. Indeed, modern Christianity has been given another gospel.

Tertullian's Greek Logos

Tertullian wrote, "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; although it would be more suitable to regard Reason as the more ancient."²¹ The Greek Logos has always been a major component of the Trinity. Although modern apologists have kept this a secret, it is now being exposed to all. The Greek Logos has no place in true biblical Christianity.

An in-depth study of the Logos in modern Trinitarian literature, revealed that no reference was ever made to the Greek Logos. The discussions always centered around the prologue of John's gospel, never the philosopher's version. Trinitarians were totally convinced that the Apostle John was referring to the Logos as a second God instead of God Himself. The end of the verse states "the Word was God." It does not imply that the Word was also God, or that the Word was another God. The passage is clear on the subject.

Today's Trinitarian theologians are somewhat deceitful when they declare that in the one being of God, there are three persons. It is morally wrong to assert this definition with such authority when the former Catholic Fathers were saying that being and person meant the same thing.

The revealing doctrine of the Ante-Nicene Fathers exposes the Trinity as three beings that united made up the God of philosophy. Biblically, there is only one person in the Godhead: "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).

The references to God throughout the entire bible are in the singular masculine gender. God is referred to as "Him, He, His, and so on. The Holy Scriptures never address God as three persons, beings, entities, or anything of the sort. There are attributes and there are manifestations of the one true God that have been fabricated into other divine beings. The bible teaches that Jesus was a *manifestation* of God: "And without controversy great is the mystery of godliness: God was manifest in the flesh ..." (1 Timothy 3:16). The mystery was that the Son of God was also the "Almighty" (Rev.1:8).

Clement

Clement wrote, "And He is called Wisdom by all the prophets."²² Clement of Alexandria became the main leader of the Theological School of Alexandria in 202 A.D. What was the theology of that historical school? It was a reflection of eclectic philosophical thought mixed with the bible and Christian doctrine. Philo's work can be found well represented in Clement's "Stromateis." It was mentioned previously that Clement borrowed from Philo in 300 places. This is a total obsession with the philosopher of Alexandria.

All these Catholic Bishops were serious about Philo's teachings. With the exception of Ambrose, none were more assertive than Clement. This is the one thing that stands out about this self-proclaimed "Gnostic" of the theological school of Alexandria. This is downplayed by today's scholars as simple "knowledge." They claim that Clement was not really a Gnostic. The bishop's writings prove that he was. Many of the Ante-Nicene Fathers were also of this persuasion.

That there were also inclinations towards Gnosticism cannot be disputed. Clement teaches us in his writings, "The Father in loving became feminine."²³ He adds to this, "In His compassion to us, he became Mother." This is strong evidence that these leaders of the Church and school were not just entertaining Gnostic ideas, they were expounding them. The data includes many of the Ante-Nicene Fathers, along with Tertullian.

This famous bishop believed that God had a "womb." Tertullian wrote with special reference to God, "...because alone begotten of God, in a way peculiar to Himself, from the

womb of His own heart-even as the Father Himself testifies: "My heart" says He "hath emitted my most excellent Word."²⁴ Tertullian's use of the word *emitted* is to be questioned. The Gnostics were better known for their doctrine of emanations.

The scripture reference that was used by Tertullian is not found anywhere in the bible. The statement, "the womb of His own heart" is false. Unfortunately, Tertullian is not the only one with such inaccuracies. Why would such men use questionable material to prove their points? The Ante-Nicene Fathers according to modern view, were men that defended the gospel. We might add at this point that Tertullian left the Catholic Church and became a member of the Montanists at some point in his career. Upholding the doctrine of the Trinity brought many divisions to the third century church.

Origen

Most would agree that Origen was the best teacher to have ever come out of the school of Alexandria. Origen wrote in reference to the Son of God: "The Firstborn, however, is not a different person by nature than Wisdom.' 'They are one and the same.' 'We must not regard Wisdom and Righteousness as females, simply because of their feminine name and grammatical gender.' 'For these things are in our view the Son of God.'²⁵ This quote from Origen reflects the allegorical teachings that came from the theological school of Alexandria. This is what this book has stated all along. When combining Logos and Wisdom, the feminine gender of wisdom was quietly ignored. This would not take place in pure and biblical doctrine. This false allegorical interpretation is rejected.

Philo's Trinity

Origen played a serious part in the revision of scripture (Hexapla). How did this famous bishop's career flourish at the very end? It did not. Origen was ex-communicated from the Catholic Church for several false and heretical doctrines. This reveals much information about the men that were behind the institution that now claims to be superior to all churches.

This was the end result for the bishop that practiced emasculation in order to comply with his interpretation of Christ's teachings. He believed strongly that he was fulfilling the sayings of Matthew 18:8 when he cut off a certain part of his body. The verse reads, "Wherefore if thy hand or thy foot offend thee, cut them off, and cast them from thee: it is better for thee to enter into life halt or maimed, rather than having two hands or two feet to be cast into everlasting fire" (Matthew 18:8).

His lack of knowledge in rightly dividing scripture is clearly seen with his advice to a fellow Catholic. He unveils Alexandrian theology in this way, "To this end, 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, take what will serve to explain the sacred scriptures."²⁶ This is not how believers study the bible! Scripture interprets scripture.

This particular type of biblical interpretation reveals the Alexandrian philosopher's eclectic method of establishing doctrine. It is dangerous and a false approach to studying the Holy Scriptures. Paul's instructions were, "Study to shew thyself approved unto God, a workman that needeth not to be ashamed, rightly dividing the word of truth" (2 Timothy 2:15).

Origen's comment on *extracting* from the philosophy of the Greeks as a *preparation* for Christianity is shocking

information. The Apostolic Fathers were dependent on pagan Greek philosophy to interpret scripture. This would explain the many pagan beliefs and practices that are seen up to this day in the modern Catholic Church. It also explains why so many years of study are required for the office of the bishop.

Novatian

While living in Rome, Novatian wrote "A Treatise of Novatian Concerning the Trinity." Even a brief look at this work reveals much error concerning the doctrine of the Trinity. We wonder if this is one of the reasons that this Anti-Pope is rarely mentioned. His work dates at or before 250 A.D. Though, Novatian mentions the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, he did not believe that they were coequal and coeternal. He made the Son to be less than the Father.

He described the Holy Spirit as being less than the Son. Incredibly, most of his arguments came from "the Word that proceeded from the Father." Novatian's reasoning about these points is so contrary to modern ideas about the Trinity, that some examples must be given.

Novatian argued that the Son who is "before all time, must be said to have been always in the Father." He continues, "Because it is essential that He who knows no beginning must go before Him who has a beginning." By this Novatian was affirming that Christ had an *origin*.²⁷

Shockingly, Novatian makes a startling, yet revealing statement: "For if He had not been born--compared with Him who was unborn, an equality being manifested in both--He would make two unborn beings, and thus would make two

Philo's Trinity

Gods." Novatian continues with his line of thinking: "Had He been invisible, as compared with the Invisible, and declared equal, He would have shown forth two Invisibles, and thus also He would have proved them to be two Gods."

How could Novatian be completely contradicting what would later be called the much acclaimed Athanasian Creed? He also stated, "If incomprehensible, if also whatever other attributes belong to the Father, reasonably we say, He would have given rise to the allegation of two Gods, as these people feign." Novatian argues that "Christ is not unborn, but He is of the Father, because He is begotten, whether as being the Word, or as being the Power, or as being the Wisdom, ..." ²⁸

Be aware of the word "Power" for this ties in to Philo's trinity and his declaration of two equal powers. Novatian makes it clear that if the Son is made equal to the Father, then there is no longer one God but two. In reality, this is exactly what they did with the Athanasian Creed, the one that came *secretly after* the Nicene Creed.

Again, it is important to understand the use of persons and beings by these Ante-Nicene Fathers. The writings of these so-called fathers reveal much in this area. In their vast contemporary theological books, theologians are stating a complete misrepresentation of what these Catholic writers held as truth. This reveals a subtle and deceptive inclination on the part of today's apologists. Although they will deny this, the facts are evident.

Up to this point it has been shown that the Ante-Nicene Fathers were not applying only scripture verses to their teachings. Some of the statements used were questionable. It shows a definite departure from biblical Christianity. A departure that has never been exposed.

Eusebius' Ecclesiastical History

When one reads book two of Eusebius' Ecclesiastical History, Philo Judaeus is deliberately mentioned along with the apostles of Christ. Why would this be? Philo and the *Therapeutae* were mentioned even before the apostles Paul and James. The author, in his recount of religious history had no trouble describing Philo as an important teacher: "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."²⁹

It is most interesting to note how Eusebius writes about Philo's philosophical ideas: "The author, who was copious in language, comprehensive in thought, sublime and elevated in his views of the sacred Scriptures, made his exposition of the sacred books equally distinguished for variety of matter and manner."³⁰ One can tell just from this quote, that Eusebius saw Philo's books to be equally important as the inspired writings of the apostles. Be aware of the "elevated views of scripture," and also a "man most distinguished among many of our own."

Both Eusebius and Philo agreed that the ascetic monks of Alexandria (*Therapeutae*) were Christians even though they were not called by that title. Eusebius states, "That Philo, when he wrote these statements, had in view the first heralds of the gospel and the original practices handed down from the apostles, must be obvious to all."³¹ Is it true? Why would Eusebius state such a thing? Were the ascetic *Therapeutae* the first heralds of the gospel? Was this ever what some call pure Christianity? Were they really practicing traditions handed down from the apostles?

Philo's Trinity

Eusebius' conclusion is impossible! Philo said of these separated people, "The whole time between the morning and evening, is a constant exercise; for as they are engaged with the sacred scriptures, they reason and comment upon them, explaining the philosophy of their country in an allegorical manner."³² Eusebius would go on to refer to this strange group as the "Alexandrian Catholic Church."

These first century disciples who followed allegorical interpretation of scripture were the same that practiced a different Christianity. By mixing a combination of philosophy with the scriptures, this special group of disciples came to believe in traditions not found in sacred scripture. Their understanding of the bible was a corrupted one. These ascetic practitioners were said to live in "monasteriums." These men and women renounced people that were not like their own. Their strange beliefs were a mixture of Hinduism, Buddhism, and Oriental mysticism.

This special people were the identical ones that Philo had described as, "This kind of men is everywhere scattered over the world." Philo also stated that "they abound in Egypt, and particularly about Alexandria."³³ Could this be the reason they were called "Catholic" or universal?

This allegorical and philosophical form of Christianity would spread throughout the churches of Rome and Antioch. Men of this type of discipline (sect) would filter into the church of Rome and other Christian churches. Egypt is also the origin of the lost books of the "Apocrypha." Books which were forged by some unknown writers of Alexandria in the name of the apostles. These forged scriptures bearing the names of the apostles contained false and unbiblical doctrines. These teachings would be accepted by many.

Such were the books, the "Didache," and the book of "Barnabas." Many of the most cited Ante-Nicene Fathers held to these unbiblical views. Their writings disclose much in their interpretation of scripture and also in the way they lived their monastic lives. They practiced the priesthood, and many approved of the abstinent way of living.

The Ante-Nicene Fathers were Catholic leaders who followed the teachings of the Catholics of Alexandria. Again, this is the title by which Eusebius referred to them. They were "eclectic philosophers" who did not hold to scripture alone. Eusebius the historian, speaks well of Philo and his books. His agreement with Philo on his views that the Therapeutae were the earliest of apostolic believers, is unfounded. They were drastically different in so many ways. Mentioning that Philo met the Apostle Peter in Rome is most revealing of Eusebius. He undeniably placed Philo of Alexandria with the beginnings of the Catholic Church.

The early believers contrary to those who practiced allegorical interpretations, were to give themselves entirely to the study of the Holy Scriptures. The Apostle Paul's advice to Timothy is strikingly clear: "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 Timothy 4:16). The Apostle Peter warned his fellow Christians about certain men who were twisting the scriptures and specifically the writings of Paul.

According to scripture, deception of evil men came early. Peter wrote of these men: "As also in all his epistles, speaking in them of these things; in which are some things hard to be understood, which they that are unlearned and unstable wrest, as they do also the other scriptures, unto their

Philo's Trinity

own destruction" (2 Peter 3:16). In Peter's era of preaching, evil men were already corrupting the words of the apostles.

Many of these successors to the apostles were teaching unwary listeners their own brand of the gospel. This did not start in modern times, it took place in the first century right along with the formulation of the New Testament. After the original apostles were martyred or put to death, history reveals the commencement of Catholic theology. From 67 A.D. when the Apostle Paul was beheaded, the most noted second bishop of Antioch was placed in office. Ignatius, who is credited with the first references to Catholics, held his tenure for 40 years.

It is believed that the Apostle John died in 100 A.D. His writings that are singled out as the gospel of John, I John, II John, and III John are extremely important. It is the most amazing book of Revelation where the apostle discloses the messages to the seven churches. It is within these seven messages that the Lord reveals the men and the many false doctrines that would come to invade Christianity. A deep study of those doctrines as revealed in scripture, will unveil the truth of what really happened after the death of the apostles.

Chapter 4

Father of Orthodoxy

All previous chapters in this book are important in proving that Philo's Trinity was the accepted view by some of the bishops of Rome. The climax of Philo's Trinity would come with the Council of Nicaea of 325 A.D. It would be here that the "Nicene Creed" would be proclaimed as the central doctrine of the Roman Catholic Church. It would also be the instrument used to persecute those who dared to stand against it. The result of that historic meeting overseen by Constantine, the Roman emperor, would become a deathblow to true believers everywhere. The disciples of Christ would be forced to compromise or be handed over to the Roman authorities. With the state government taking over the Christian Church, spiritual disaster would follow.

What happened at the council of Nicaea? How did the Trinity doctrine become the central teaching of the Catholic faith? It would all start with the men who were present at the first historical ecumenical council sponsored by Rome. There were of course, many that would attend the meetings.

From Eusebius' Ecclesiastical History we learn that bishops came from various cities and territories, the sum of about 318. Eusebius mentions that the pastors of three major churches previously founded by the apostles of Christ, were also present: "Macarius, bishop of Jerusalem, Eustathius of Antioch, and Alexander of Alexandria."¹ Eusebius relates in his history that all of this started with an earlier dispute in Alexandria (Egypt), between Alexander the bishop, and a bishop by the name of Arius. The problem came when Arius

Philo's Trinity

contended publicly with Alexander on the subject of "three divine persons, and the Trinity in unity."²

Arius' argument was that "if the Father begat the Son, the latter must have had a beginning." Arius was not teaching something new. He was repeating the sentiments of many of the fathers before him. Unbelievably, Tertullian and Novatian had identical views in reference to the Son's origin. Friction was created to the point that Constantine was notified, and the plans for the very first church council would become a reality.

Alexander's theology was a mirror reflection of that of Alexandrian philosophy. Philo's Greek Logos had the bishop convinced: "If the Son is the Word, Wisdom, and Reason of God, how can there be a time when he was not?" 'It is the same as if they said there was a time when God was without reason and wisdom.'³ This is one of the funniest quotes ever!

The man who would debate and be most convincing at the council would be a deacon by the name of Athanasius, a devoted follower of Philo: "In the Nicene Age, under the shaping influence of the powerful mind of Athanasius, and, to a lesser degree, of Basil and the two Gregories, the Logos-doctrine attained its final form in the triumphant statement of the Nicene Creed which declared the essential unity, but, at the same time, the personal distinction of the Father and Son."⁴

Constantine the emperor, would eventually side with the Alexandrian school of thought thereby leaving the Arians in temporary desolation. The great Athanasius, centuries later, would be deemed "the Father of Orthodoxy." The more accurate history of the church reveals that Arius would be back ten years later, Athanasius would be ordered to leave. Arian doctrine would prevail for over 40 years.

Hagia Sophia

After the council of Nicaea, Constantine would move from the ancient city of Rome to what would eventually be called "Constantinople." Constantine, his sons, and his many followers would go on to construct the principal Catholic Church building that would remain the largest for a thousand years. What was the name of that religious structure? It was referred to as "Hagia Sophia," or Holy Wisdom.

Wisdom was a member of the Trinity! It was also Philo's favorite doctrine. Although, it is difficult to assess all things that were discussed and debated in the first historic council, it can be summarized wisely that Constantine was made to believe strongly in "Divine Wisdom." Why would they name the largest Cathedral with a name that is rare today? It was the teaching expounded by Trinitarian theologians of that time. It was God, Word, and Wisdom that gave them the concept of a Triune Deity. A basic formula that has been kept quietly hidden from the majority of modern day Trinitarians.

God From God

Some believe today that the Nicene Creed is a picture of perfection. Churches of different denominations tend to use this creed when conducting water baptisms and as a necessary commitment to memorization by most believers. They do this of course, because they believe that this creed is derived from scripture. Its contents reveal otherwise! Just like Constantine's Hagia Sophia represented the false theology of that time, a closer look at the creed of Nicaea reveals even more.

Philo's Trinity

The authorized Nicene Creed is not openly biblical but philosophical. It generally reflected the eclectic mind of the philosophers of that time and nothing more. Case in point, is the phrase in the second paragraph, "God from God, Light from Light." The origin of this statement was taken directly from the writings of Philo Judaeus.

Philo writes on this subject in his book, "On Rewards and Punishment" page 668: "But these men have arrived at the real truth, who form their ideas of God from God, of light from light."⁵ This is incredible! Not only did the Ante-Nicene Fathers borrow from the Alexandrian philosopher in their formulation of the Trinity, but they also cited his very own statement and made it a part of their historical creed.

This is how important this man and his Platonic ideas would be held by those Catholic bishops. These are the men that gave us the authorized Nicene Creed and the major doctrine of the Trinity. Can there be any doubt at this point of how important the writings of Philo were in the development of Catholic Theology? To deny this connection, is to be totally blind to the truth!

Trinity Derived From Philosophical Terminology

The most important handbook of faith and practice, the endorsed Catholic Catechism states, "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" or "hypostasis," "relation," and so on.' 'In doing this, she did not submit the faith to human

wisdom, but gave a new and unprecedented meaning to these terms, which from then on would be used to signify an ineffable mystery, infinitely beyond all that we can humanly understand."⁶

"Certain notions of philosophical origin," are definitely not what today's modern Christian denominations are claiming as the origin of the Trinity of three persons. The strongest of arguments made incessantly by such major groups as Baptists, Methodists, Church of Christ, Assemblies of God, and other denominations, is that the Trinity is found directly in the bible.

Why then, did the Roman Catholic Church invent its own philosophical terminology? Why was biblical language not considered instead? After all, this is what Reformed and Protestant Christians claim as the true origin of their Trinity in unity. It is important to remember that Protestants were not around when this dogma was put in place, so their defense is meaningless. The Trinity did not come from scripture. Using unique terminology from their "human" philosophy, Catholics created their very own mystery. They made up their own definitions! It was "infinitely beyond human understanding" because their "notions" did not exist before.

That is the reason that the "Blessed Trinity" cannot be understood by most educated people. The Trinity is a created concept that has no origin in the scriptures. The Trinity can be found in paganism, where it fits perfectly. Please take note of the words, "person," and "substance" for these are defended by today's modern apologists as spiritual descriptions or terms that should be used by all believers. Contradicting the Catholic Catechism, they did "submit the faith" to human wisdom! Philo was the first to use the word *person* in relation to God. Catholics did not come up with these words!

Trinity Enveloped in Darkness

Consider another statement about the Trinity by the New Advent online 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."⁷ Is there something wrong with this statement? What was the Vatican Council thinking?

The bible contradicts the Vatican Council by saying, "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). There is no darkness in God! It is the Trinity mystery that is enveloped in a kind of darkness. This is because of its unbiblical nature. It has a deceptive connection with the "wisdom" used by *Philo*, *the Gnostics*, and the *Kabbalah*. This is the doctrine of Mystery Babylon. Christians have been deceived into accepting philosophy, vain deceit, and the traditions of men. It has been upheld as a doctrine of the bible for many years.

Jewish mysticism had quite an interesting origin. The Jews that learned these occult traditions were at one time residents of Babylon. They were taken there after the mighty Babylonian kingdom subdued Jerusalem and Judah under its power. The great "Babylonian Captivity" started in the late 597 B.C. It ended in 538 B.C. Once they were free to go, the Jews resettled in several places including Alexandria, Egypt in 332 B.C. The Jews were strongly affected by Babylon.

Here is the drastic underlying connection between the Kabbalah, Philo, and the Christian Gnostics of Egypt. This would bring the resurgence of Babylon as *Mystery Babylon*. The eclectic theology of Egypt would pass on to all the other Roman provinces, and then, ultimately from the "Mother of all churches" it would spread throughout the world.

Teachings Derived From Philo

^A God from God, Light from Light placed in the Nicene Creed.

^B The idea or divine reason of God seen in the writings of most of the Ante-Nicene Fathers, including Justin and Tertullian.

^C Several Creators in Gen. 1:26 quoted by all Trinitarians.

^D God is three, yet one basic Trinitarian doctrine.

^E Uninitiated see three, initiated see one they call it a mystery. Philo mentions *the middle person of the three*.

^F Logos begotten by the Father Eternal Son theory.

^G Logos, an intermediary, messenger, mediator wrongly applied to Christ's divinity instead of his humanity.

^H Logos, the angel of the Lord heavily taught by Justin, Theophilus and several others.

Philo's Trinity

^I Logos is also God application to John 1:1.

^J Wisdom flows from divine Logos Catholic Fathers taught that Christ is both Word (logos) and Wisdom.

^K Wisdom, nurse and mother Gnostic teaching, Mariology

^L Wisdom is both masculine and feminine false doctrine covered up by the Catholic Fathers and their original formula for the Trinity.

^M Wisdom is the beginning, image, sight of God wisdom wrongly taught as more than an attribute of God.

^N Wisdom is God feminine wisdom is not God. To some Trinitarians, wisdom was Christ. To others, wisdom was the Holy Spirit.

^O Trinity came by revelation to Philo it was not divine revelation, but something he received in his soul. From his own soul he heard that within God there were two other equal powers.

^P God has a womb Tertullian and others quoted strange scriptures about God's womb. None of the scriptures given in the writings of Philo or the Ante-Nicene Fathers ever produced a legitimate bible verse with the word "womb" in it.

^Q The three days before the creation of the sun, as types of the Trinity Theophilus writes about this in his declaration of a Trinity or Triune God. This is why the word Trinity appears in Catholic writings.

^R So-called ascetic Christians of Alexandria Eusebius wrote about Philo's work and referred to these same people as belonging to monasteries. Eusebius claims that they were the first Christians of Alexandria, even though, they were not called by that name.

^S The second God who is the Word of the other Ante-Nicene Fathers saw the Word as a second God. Their writings reflect them making the Son, a second person.

^T Dress of the High Priest is an emblem of the Zodiac Connection to the occult.

^U The snake in the garden, represents pleasure Occult teaching.

^V The image of the divine and invisible being, the eternal word. The words *being* and *person* were used interchangeably.

^W God can transform a woman into a virgin the perpetual virginity teaching.

^X The Triad in unity doctrine seen in the Athanasian Creed.

^Y The governing principle of one of the supreme powers Theophilus quotes this principle in his "Theophilus To Autolycus." One of Philo's supreme powers with God was "Chastening," or "Authority," or "Eternity." All of them meant the same thing to Philo, the governing principle.

^Z The Lord God of three natures the three hypostasis teaching.

Philo's Books

On the Creation (B), (C)
Allegorical Interpretation I, II, III (M), (U), (W)
On the Cherubim (O), (Y)
On the birth of Abel and Cain
That the Worse is Wont to attack the Better
On the Posterity of Cain and his Exile
On the Giants
On the Unchangeableness of God
On Husbandry
Concerning Noah's Work as a Planter (V)
On Drunkenness (K)
On the Prayers and Curses Uttered by Noah
On the Confusion of Tongues (F)
On the Migration of Abraham
Who is the Heir of Divine Things (D), (G), (N), (P), (Q), (Y)
On Mating with the Preliminary Studies
On Flight and Finding (J), (L)
On the Change of Names (Z)
On Dreams (H), (I)
On Abraham (E)
On Joseph
On the Life of Moses I, II
The Decalogue
The Special Laws I, II, III, IV
On the Virtues
On Rewards and Punishments (A)
Every Good Man is Free
On the Contemplative Life (R)
On the Eternity of the World
Flaccus
Hypothetica
On Providence I, II (S)
On the Embassy to Gaius

Sovereignty I, II (T)

Questions and Answers on Genesis I, II, III, IV (U), (X)

The Athanasian Creed Forgery

For many years, the religious world was tricked into believing that the Athanasian Creed was authentic. Time would catch up to this so-called creed and expose it for what it is, a forgery. It was never written by Athanasius or any of his close friends. To this day, no one knows who wrote it. Yet, that has not stopped Trinitarians from using it as a primary source to define the Trinity. This forgery has been used above and beyond the bible.

It is now time to expose this false confession and to put those who use it in their place. The teaching of three coeternal and coequal persons existing in the Godhead would be seen exclusively in the Athanasian Creed. This creed is considered to be the most descriptive of all the baptismal creeds. History reveals that for many years it was believed to have been written by the pope of Alexandria himself. The truth is that people believed for a very long time in what some today consider a forgery. Most of the statements found therein are nothing but philosophical jargon.

Most of the information in this false letter is what Catholics use to keep all Trinitarians in line. Confessing only those things affirmed will bring praise from the "Mother Church." Straying from the falsified yet highly accepted creed will bring the accusation of heresy. Most religious historians will quickly tell you that both its authorship and date are uncertain.⁸ It has been compared to other Catholic forgeries of the same nature such as the "false decretals" and the famous

Philo's Trinity

“Donation of Constantine.” Both acquired much for the Catholic religion on false pretenses.

Furthermore, this obscure document was submitted in its complete form without any synod authority or a convened council to discuss and debate. Another source tells us that before it was known as the Athanasian Creed, it was simply referred to as the Catholic Faith.⁹

It is also important to note that the Eastern Orthodox Church rejected this letter altogether. It is believed that in its original form it was written in Latin not Greek. The bottom line is, that the most used of all Trinitarian Creeds that gives a more elaborate definition of the Trinity doctrine, is not an authentic creed. It is the writing of one individual whose identity has been mysteriously hid for many years.

Take away this falsely named creed and you would have Trinitarians exercising all kind of liberties. Some in the past have disagreed with Rome only to be smacked on the head or tamed into submission. Why do we have creeds? These were put in place by the *State Religion* to insure that all people of faith would be submitted to their beliefs and practices. Manmade authorized statements cannot replace the Word of Almighty God.

There are some well known Trinitarians that do not believe in all the statements made in the Catholic creeds. For example, the "Incarnational Sonship of Christ" is one such doctrine. This is a teaching that strikes directly at the Eternal Son dogma that *Rome* and *Geneva* defended with all their power. They were even willing to put people to death. Michael Servetus was given a second chance if he only confessed to the *Eternal Sonship* of Christ. He chose the Apostle Peter's confession instead, and died for it.¹⁰

More modern proponents have been wrongly accused of "heresy" because they disagreed with the Nicene statement of the Eternal Son. Former advocates of this teaching include Men such as: Walter Martin, Adam Clarke, Albert Barnes, John MacArthur (recanted), Jimmy Swaggart, F.E. Raven, Oliver Buswell, Ralph Wardlaw and the Dake Reference Bible, to name a few. These men were chastised by Rome's writers for teaching that the Son did not exist until his birth in Bethlehem. Before Christ's birth he was not the Son, he was and is the eternal God.

How could a previously unknown coequal, coeternal theory of the 5th century, constitute the sole truth of God and have many profess that this is the gospel of Jesus Christ? Some would argue that it was not really a forgery because it was a detailed description of the Trinity doctrine by the Western Church, which supplied the "need at that time." They insist that "It provided for a more explicit explanation of Trinitarian faith."

Liking something that looks good, but in reality is not the right thing, can be hazardous to your health! Insistence is given to the worth of the confession as opposed to its wrongful authorship and the specific date of its conception. They would have us believe that *the end justifies the means*, for it is not the origin of the creed that matters, but the valuable content.

There is something dreadful in this line of thinking. When the Holy Scriptures are not used as a foundation, people will resort to whatever suits their fancy. That is why Jesus spoke these words: "Heaven and earth shall pass away, but my words shall not pass away" (Matthew 24:35). We will be judged by the Word of God; " ...the word that I have spoken, the same shall judge him in the last day" (John 12:48).

Philo's Trinity

While some tend to agree with this false reasoning, the truth remains that this creed was brought into the church under a most misleading assumption. It was given the name of Athanasius to deceive the people. What is still more of a serious matter is how did this individual arrive at his conclusion of three coequal and coeternal persons? Did this secret voice acquire his information from Philo of Alexandria? The fact that some fathers did, leads to one conclusion.

Whether people agree with its contents is not what is at stake. It has been given authority and a definite position in the church that it does not rightfully deserve. The importance of such an extreme component of orthodoxy unquestionably merits the complete participation of its highest representatives, not some unknown individual who may not have consented to its misrepresentation.

This strange doctrine of coequal and coeternal persons is being pushed unjustly today as gospel truth. Line six of the Athanasian Creed states that the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit are "the glory equal, the majesty coeternal." Line eight states that the "Father is uncreated, the Son uncreated, and the Holy Spirit is uncreated." Line nine also says that "the Father is incomprehensible, the Son incomprehensible, and the Holy Spirit incomprehensible." Line ten states, "the Father eternal, the Son eternal, and the Holy Spirit is eternal."¹¹

According to Novatian who was discussed previously, if the Son and Spirit were given the same exact attributes as those of the Heavenly Father, this would no longer constitute the existence of one God. The Athanasian forgery according to this bishop's views, was proclaiming three Gods not one. If the Athanasian creed is false and a contradiction to many of the Ante-Nicene Fathers, why is it in use today?

Modern theologians and well respected apologists are saying repeatedly that the coequal, coeternal features of the divine persons are foundational aspects of the Trinity. Yet there is no proof of this! It is not biblical. It was never taught by the majority of the Ante-Nicene Fathers, and now we know this letter is not even an official document. Christians that accept such nonsense are not really practicing *Sola Scriptura*. Whether knowingly or unknowingly, they have been misled.

How this mysterious unknown soul came up with such coequal and coeternal ideas is the biggest concern of all. This cannot continue as a mystery. It will be found out! It cannot be ignored that Philo of Alexandria taught the same identical philosophy. He was the first to mention *equal persons in God*.

Although, the Catholic Church agrees with the false Athanasian writer, the confusion between the Ante-Nicene Fathers and this anonymous contributor is notable. Why would anyone professing to believe in Christ turn to these weak and beggarly confessions of questionable origin? This practice has been in the Catholic Church for centuries.

Consider this information:

The author of the Didache is unknown.

The author of the Apostle's Creed is unknown.

The author of the Book of Wisdom is unknown.

The author of the Epistle of Barnabas is unknown.

The author of the Athanasian Creed is unknown.

Trinitarians have been given false information. There is no foundational proof for their philosophical doctrine. Furthermore, there are far too many contradictions that have

Philo's Trinity

not been cleared. Modern Trinitarian defenders must be questioned as to their expertise in their use of questionable material. Is it correct or ethical to use a document of unknown authorship and present this as proof? This practice must be discontinued. Saints cannot be involved with such deception! Christians are required to wear the whole armor of God!

Furthermore, it is ethically wrong to deceive people into believing that this writing is an authoritative creed. To submit individuals under such influence is misleading. This confession cannot be used to define the Trinity. Trinitarians have absolutely no scriptural validation, and they have no creedal justification either.

What does this mean for the Protestant Christian who believes in the Trinity? If there is any fear of God and the Holy Scriptures, the doctrine must be tossed out. This is not Sola Scriptura! True and sincere Christians must do what is correct. They must denounce the unbiblical and research the scriptures with renewed passion.

May the truth of God be known. May the true biblical teaching of monotheism be established. It is now time for true Reformers to arise. It is the duty of mature Christians to stand up for truth and truth alone. The bible commands: "But seek ye first the kingdom of God, and his righteousness; and all these things shall be added unto you" (Matthew 6:33). The armor of God was previously mentioned. The bible explains it this way:

"Stand therefore, having your loins girt about with truth, and having on the breastplate of righteousness; And your feet shod with the preparation of the gospel of peace; Above all, taking the shield of faith, wherewith ye shall be able to quench all the fiery darts of the wicked. And take

the helmet of salvation, and the sword of the Spirit, which is the word of God: Praying always with all prayer and supplication in the Spirit, and watching thereunto with all perseverance and supplication for all saints" (Ephesians 6:14-18).

Having your loins girt about with truth is the only alternative for the spiritual Christian. Anything else is not acceptable! Even though the Ante-Nicene Fathers believed that philosophy was a gift from God, the truth is that it was pagan ideas that were mixed with scripture. The Word of God is inspired, while men's thoughts are not. The Psalmist said it this way, "Thy word have I hid in mine heart, that I might not sin against thee" (Psalm 119:11).

Chapter 5

The Modern Defense of the Trinity

The modern day Trinitarian defends his/her position by hiding the original formula of *God, Word, and Wisdom*. They defend from a biblical perspective and not from history which would destroy their popular stance in Christian circles. Some history is produced in order to satisfy the demand, but it is only minimal. The origin of the contemporary Trinity has been watered down to appear innocent and godly. The truth of how this pagan doctrine caused untold misery to millions is never a discussion among Christians.

The connection of the Trinity with philosophy is never mentioned, especially with those Christian denominations that profess *Sola Scriptura* or scripture alone. The majority of Christians as a whole, have no idea that the Logos teaching of John 1:1 was replaced with the Logos teaching of Greek philosophy, or to be more exact, Philo's allegorical doctrine of Word and Wisdom.

Exodus has a great biblical illustration. The children of Israel cried out to God for mercy after being forced into slavery by the Egyptians. They were tired of the many years of abuse, injustice, and the falseness of a system that advocated many false gods. The children of Israel were the true representatives of the only God that created the heaven and the earth. Why then, were they slaves to another group of people that did not know the true God of Israel? An in-depth study of the book of Exodus is recommended in order to see the seriousness of serving God. The lessons learned in this book are priceless.

The Modern Defense of the Trinity

After four hundred years of suffering, God would hear Israel's enduring cries. Why did it take so long? At what time did the Hebrews get so desperate that they cried out to God? Through Moses, God would provide a powerful deliverance. "Let my people go" would be the strong words (nine times) that would eventually become reality. The slavery of the Hebrew children brought upon by the Egyptians would serve as a "type" of the slavery that was experienced many years later by Christians under the power of Rome.

For hundreds of years, the Roman Catholic Church ruled the land with an iron fist (or iron teeth). The bible reveals in the book of Daniel, that the fourth beast had nails of brass (Greek influence). Its claim of being God's kingdom here on earth eventually lost its appeal, for people experienced and saw much contradictions to "all men are created equal." Eventually, the crimes became so grave that religion became a form of slavery. God raised up mighty men known as the "Reformers" to challenge the religious system and to create a movement that would ultimately "sever ties" from the self appointed, "Mother of all churches."

Although, such men of God as Wycliffe, Tyndale, and Luther were instrumental in leading hundreds of thousands away from Rome, they could not completely remove Rome from their hearts. Referring back to Exodus, a type of this is seen with Israel. After such a powerful liberation from the Egyptians, Israel would unbelievably cry out for the fleshpots of Egypt. When Moses went into God's presence to receive the ten commandments, the Hebrews would return to their pagan worship of animal Egyptian gods. Moses' anger would burn because of the former Egyptian slaves and their continuous backsliding.

Philo's Trinity

The children of Israel were set free from slavery, yet a "slave mentality" was still being manifested in the hearts of those being tested in the desert. The exact thing happened with the Reformation of the 1500's. Instead of ridding themselves from every single doctrine of the Roman Institution, those State/Religion *slaves* kept the teachings and traditions that the Catholic Church deemed acceptable for their very own. For whatever reasons given, these fabricated statements (creeds) continue to this day among both Catholics and Protestants.

Are the creeds of yesteryear truly biblical doctrines? They cannot be, for the bible exposes Rome as Mystery Babylon. Can a false system that misleads the world be trusted in any of its teachings? To believe such a thing is a grave error. We cannot trust one single confession that comes from a different origin other than God and the bible. To be truly biblical Christians, we must stand on the Word of God alone. It is written, "Man shall not live by bread alone, but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God" (Matt. 4:4).

A background investigation into the main leaders of the Protestant and Reform movements point to the majority of sources concluding that Rome was Mystery Babylon. Those who oppose this view are in a very small minority. It is those who belong to the ecumenical mindset who are ignoring or denying these historical facts.

Some work diligently to bring a *One World Church*. When this happens, prophecy revealed in the book of Daniel and Revelation will be fulfilled. God is giving us time to identify the beast, and to break away before it is too late. We must come out of her (my people) as the bible clearly commands in the book of Revelation. There are catastrophes described as coming on the entire world. See chapter 13.

Saying the Doctrine is Biblical

In their very first line of defense, those that uphold the Trinity doctrine are not relating the truth of where this concept really came from. Most Christians advocate that the "three persons of one substance" is a revelation given by God to the Church. They project in their teachings that the bible is their only source. Many even claim that it is a New Testament revelation that came with the teachings of Christ.

While all of this sounds really truthful and spiritual, the reality of the matter is that all these ideas are false. The Trinity came to modern Christianity not as a revelation from God or the bible, but as a formulation of dogma by the Catholic Church. The Ante-Nicene Fathers played a decisive part in its early development through the teachings of Philo Judaeus, Greek philosophy, and a misappropriation of water baptism. Ignatius gave baptism a false *persons* interpretation.

Not only is the word "Trinity" not found in the bible, but neither is the phrase "three persons of one substance." The supposedly heavenly term "Trinity," was actually found in the unpopular writings of Theophilus, the bishop of Antioch! The word Trinity was first coined as he was referring to the three days mentioned by Philo! He mentioned the three days before the luminaries as a type of the Trinity.

The Catholic creeds insist that all must confess the Son as "twice begotten of the Father." When Pastors are asked to give their definition of the Trinity, it is always the same. It is always a declaration of the Catholic creeds. They cannot move away from the creeds because these are the only real source and origin of the Trinity.

Philo's Trinity

When it comes to the present defense of the Trinity doctrine, things have not changed. What kind of interpretation do modern theologians use? They mix their scriptures with preconceived ideas, instead of scripture interpreting scripture. This is the reason why countless numbers of Christians have been deceived into believing such lies. It is without doubt ancient Alexandrian philosophy.

They take selected scriptures from the bible and give them an allegorical interpretation, the same way that Philo of Alexandria would be prone to do. The passages that they use over and over are such verses that are not direct proof of any of their claims. The verses used can be misconstrued or interpreted in several ways, especially when Greek words are manipulated to alter the true meaning of the text.

In other words, without their use of other scriptures to verify the proper meaning, the passage by itself seems to mean something in their favor. This is going against the golden rule of the Reformation, or the *Synthesis principle*. This cannot be sound biblical doctrine. This is not scripture interpreting scripture! One of the greatest mistakes in studying the bible is committing the error of COSA or *the Classical One Scripture Application*. You cannot teach doctrine with one verse of scripture. This pertinent information is missing from most scholarly books that teach on "how to study the bible."

The passage from Genesis 1:26 leads the way with all believers of the Trinity giving this verse the same polytheistic interpretation. The one Lord God of creation is portrayed as creating all things with the help of divine persons. Again, this was exactly the same kind of philosophy used by Philo of Alexandria. The Almighty God did not need assistants. He created all things by Himself! It is the bible that claims only

one Creator of all. The Catholic Priests acquired Philo's pagan interpretation, "hook, line, and sinker." There is no textual justification for using such an interpretation. There are many scriptures throughout the bible that contradict this!

The context of the entire chapter of Genesis 1 does not give such a conclusion. Furthermore, this passage could never contradict the major teaching of a singular Godhead that is quoted continuously throughout the bible. The teaching that God is one, is a major doctrine of the bible. Believing that God spoke to other divine persons or beings goes against the entire Old and New Testaments.

Does John 1:1 teach a Trinity? All that the Apostle John was saying in this entire chapter is that the Word of God (expression, speech, life), became flesh. Compare John 1:1 to 1 John 1:1 and you have the answer. It clearly states that the Word is the "eternal life" of God. Substitute eternal life for the "logos" or Word and the text becomes simple to understand. In the beginning was "eternal life" and the eternal life was with God, and eternal life was God. Making the Word out to be a second person is not what this verse is teaching. A false interpretation was derived from this simple text because of a philosophical view that was interjected into their doctrine.

John states that they beheld his glory as "of the only begotten of the Father." He does not mention that the Eternal Son of God was made flesh. All bible dictionaries new and old agree that logos is "something said." The other word used is "rhema" or utterance. Apeggello means "to announce." It was the Greek Logos of Philo of Alexandria that was given a divine "being" existence with God. It was this philosophical logos that became the second god. There are no scripture references that provide this type of interpretation.

Philo's Trinity

Furthermore, John 1:1 is not a passage for the Trinity. The third person, the Holy Ghost is not even mentioned. You cannot use a verse to defend the Trinity, when there is no Trinity in the passage. Why is there no reference to the "Spirit" when it states "in the beginning?" Should this verse have mentioned instead, "in the beginning was the Word and Wisdom," as professed in the literary writings of the Ante-Nicene Fathers?

One of the main sources used in this book restates this truth: "Another area of importance in the study of Philo is his use of Logos (Word) and Wisdom concepts and beliefs."¹ Indeed, it was Philo's most important doctrine. This is the formula acquired by the Ante-Nicene Fathers that was further developed during the Council of Nicaea.

Theophilus' first mention of the Trinity completely exposed the triune formula that was used exclusively by the fathers. His formula was "God, Word, and Wisdom."² Many well meaning church members might not know the original formula of the Unity, but what about historians, apologists, and scholars? Have they withheld this evidence through ignorance or intentionally? What is the truth behind this lack of historical knowledge? Catholics have their traditions to uphold, but what about Christian denominations?

This is why the simple reading of John 1:1 has been given a total unusual interpretation than the one intended by the Apostle John. The beloved disciple was never a follower of Greek philosophy. Only ignorance of the Word of God would conclude that John had any involvement with Philo of Alexandria. Trinitarians have been given another meaning other than the simple one reflected in scripture. For the record, the logos of the Apostle John is not the logos of Philo.

The Modern Defense of the Trinity

Without prior knowledge of the Catholic priests and their Greek Logos, no one would suspect such trickery. This is why debate after debate does not yield any satisfactory results. Modern apologists whether innocent or not, promote this kind of interpretation. They do this without letting their followers discover the ancient "Wisdom" secret of the Ante-Nicene Fathers and their addiction to philosophy. The information is available to uncover such error, but it has been labeled as "heresy" to prevent sincere seekers from finding the truth.

The apostles of Jesus were never Greek philosophers. There is a most interesting comment that we found in *Adam Clarke's Commentary on the holy bible*. Clarke explains in reference to John 1:1, "...therefore Jesus, who was before all things and who made all things, must necessarily be the eternal God." He comments further, "The apostle does not borrow this mode of speech from the writings of Plato, as some have imagined; he took it from the scriptures of the Old Testament, and from the subsequent style of the ancient Jews.' 'And the Word was God.' 'Or "God was the Logos"; 'therefore no subordinate being, no second to the Most High, but the supreme, eternal Jehovah."³ Clarke was correct!

Runia wrote, "It is in Philo's own native city that he first makes an important impact on the Christian tradition."⁴ Even though it started with the first Catholic bishops such as Ignatius, it was the leaders of the first theological school of Alexandria that took active part in disseminating Philo's ideas. Runia elaborates further on the powerful school of the third century. He wrote, "The members of the Catechetical school in Alexandria--chiefly Pantaenus, Clement, Origen--must have decided that Philo's writings could be of benefit to them in their task as teachers in the Christian community..."⁵

Philo's Trinity

There is evidence that most religious historians make one basic mistake. They claim that the Ante-Nicene Fathers were mainly Christian, never Catholic. Yet, these men were more committed to philosophy and tradition than scripture alone. They were priests and monks, something foreign to today's Christian communities. Historians, in stark contrast to Eusebius and his book on Ecclesiastical History, continuously assume that all of this was done to the "Christian tradition" instead of the Catholic one. For some strange reason most educated men cannot tell the difference.

Violation of the Great Commission

Matthew 28:19 is just one of many verses that present the Great Commission of our Lord Jesus. There is only one way to interpret "in the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost." Both Catholic and Christian denominations alike, do not interpret this verse with other scriptures. In the modern book "Charismatic Chaos," the author presents "five principles for sound biblical interpretation." On his list as number four is "The Synthesis Principle." He explains this key application as meaning "scripture interprets scripture," an expression taken from the Reformation. He adds to this by saying, "No other part of the Bible can contradict any other part."⁶ Matthew 28:19 is one of those unique verses that must be compared to others since it is a major doctrine.

When it comes to the Great Commission passage in question, it was discovered that not just some, but all who believe in the "Trinity in Unity" consistently violate this verse and completely ignore the Synthesis Principle. This is an

The Modern Defense of the Trinity

embarrassment to mainline denominations everywhere. There are no other scriptures that resemble this particular verse. That is why it must be compared to all the other verses on baptism and the Great Commission. Not applying this wonderful rule of the Reformation keeps the false view of the Catholic Church in the forefront. Comparing this uncommon passage to others completely destroys the false argument of a baptism for the Trinity.

We know this is shocking information for some. This has gone on for far too long of a time. This is now the moment to make these things right. How is it possible that the Synthesis Principle has never been applied to this particular verse? We know it started with the Catholic Church and their *dogmatic theology*. Why are most Protestants and Reformers caught up with the same deception? From our biblical understanding, Christianity that uses the dogmatic approach to doctrine is strongly in error. True Christianity has no pope who can change the bible!

John 17 reveals nothing against the oneness of God. Jesus' priestly prayer confirms the mission that Christ came to fulfill. This is where Paul's mystery of godliness teaching comes in (1Timothy 3:16). Even Trinitarians believe that Christ was God in the flesh. Was one God praying to another? Is this the explanation Catholics give to this passage? Christ was 100% man even though he was 100% God. The bible declares that God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto himself (II Corinthians 5:19).

Christ being God in human form limited himself all the way to the cross. You see, God cannot die. In order to die for us, Christ had to confine his Godhood to that of a servant. In the flesh, the Father was greater than him.

Philo's Trinity

John 14:16 speaks about another Comforter. Is this really teaching that another divine person would be coming on the scene? After Christ had clearly upheld Jewish monotheism throughout his entire ministry was he now teaching something totally different and contrary to Jewish view? The answer to this is "of course not." Following the conversation of Jesus to the end would reveal the complete truth of what the Lord was really saying.

The second part of the verse reads, "but ye know him; for he dwelleth with you, and shall be in you" (John 14:17). Verse eighteen explains, "I will not leave you comfortless: I will come to you" (John 14:18). What Christ meant by another Comforter, was simply another manifestation, that of his own Spirit. This is actually a contradiction to church philosophers who taught *emanations* instead of *manifestations*.

The teaching of the Spirit of Christ is biblical. Paul wrote, "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" (Romans 8:9). There are many verses that can be cited. One more should help to establish this biblical doctrine. The Holy Spirit is the Spirit of the Son: "And because ye are sons, God hath sent forth the Spirit of his Son into your hearts, crying, Abba, Father" (Galatians 4:6). Undeniably, the Holy Spirit is the Spirit of the Son. God help those who reject these simple teachings of Holy Scripture.

The Holy Spirit is not the third person of the Trinity. It is God's Spirit. Jesus said, "God is a Spirit: and they that worship him must worship him in spirit and in truth" (John 4:24). God promised to pour out "his" Spirit upon all: "... I will pour out my spirit upon all flesh" (Joel 2:28). Peter confirmed

The Modern Defense of the Trinity

God's Holy Spirit in the book of Acts 2:17. The Holy Ghost or Holy Spirit that was given on the day of Pentecost was God's Spirit. Paul explained it this way, "Now the Lord is that Spirit: and where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty" (2 Corinthians 3:17).

Presenting the Fathers as Men of God

How holy were the men that brought us the Trinity formulation? Were they men that studied the scriptures only? Were they holy in their walk and contenders of the faith delivered once to the saints? If they were Catholic, does this not imply that they held other traditions apart from the bible? They indeed held to such teachings as the *perpetual virginity* of Mary, the *Eucharist*, the *Eternal Sonship*, *three Persons*, and many other unbiblical contradictions to scripture. The important fact to consider about these men is the historical truth that these bishops were the best of philosophers.

These bishops were also *Gnostic* or held to Gnostic inclinations. Furthermore, the doctrine of the Trinity was held not only by these "expounders of knowledge," but also by the other more extreme Gnostics, and the secret followers of the Kabbalah.

The Real Ante-Nicene Fathers

1. The so called fathers were part of a group within the church who introduced a different tradition than that of the early church of the apostles.

Philo's Trinity

2. They did not represent the majority view of all the church communities.
3. Through their personal manuscripts, it is concluded that they did not represent the majority view within their very own church.
4. They quite often quoted strange scriptures that are not found in the bible. For example, "God has a womb."
5. Many of them cited the Apocrypha lost books in their discussions of certain doctrines. Books such as the writing of *Judith*, *Tobit*, *Sirach*, and others.
6. They made use of certain examples that they thought to be true, but in reality, were erroneous statements. A good example was the "Phoenix Bird."
7. These men provided historical information such as the men who personally knew the apostles and succeeded them. Their chronological order contradicts that of several others. They are greatly disputed today. For example, the information on "Linus" as the first pope is considered a forgery.
8. They were highly in favor of the priesthood, and strayed away from the biblical notions of ministry. Included was the authority of the single bishop. The basic ministries of apostles, prophets, pastors, etc. as found in Ephesians 4:11, were rejected.
9. These men held similar views in certain doctrines, repeating the same examples throughout. There is an invisible thin line that connects them, such as "Christ the Word and Wisdom" or Genesis 1:26, "Let us make man in our image."

The Modern Defense of the Trinity

10. The Ante-Nicene Fathers were all followers of the bible and lovers of Greek philosophy at the exact same time.
11. The Greek Logos was accepted by all these men.
12. In particular, the doctrine of Divine Wisdom can be seen as an accepted application (especially the Logos / Wisdom combination).
13. The writings of Philo of Alexandria can be traced to the writings of the Apostolic fathers. Examples of his concepts were used by the fathers themselves. In other words, they were using Philo's ideas as their very own. In many instances, they were plagiarizing.
14. The Greek Logos was a second person or God, most of the time inferior to the Father.
15. Most of these men believed in a wrong and idolatrous concept of Mary, including perpetual virginity.
16. Most of these men were Anti-Semitic.

Catholic Creeds instead of Bible

The second deception that comes in our day pertaining to the Blessed Trinity, is presenting this doctrine as purely biblical when its existence is found exclusively in the Catholic creeds. With the Nicene Creed being the only exception, the Didache, the adored Apostles' Creed, and the Athanasian Creed are all forgeries. It is through these confessions that the Trinity is presented to the world as an apostolic teaching. Yet, the apostles had nothing to do with such a belief!

Furthermore, it can be concluded that the Athanasian Creed, under the same censorship rules applied against the evangelizing of Catholics, must be removed. Catholic leaders

Philo's Trinity

for the most part, are always in objection to Christian literature that evangelizes and educates their members with the true gospel. They call it "hate material."

Protestants can argue against Catholics that the forged creed is also "hate material." The last part of the document reads, "This is the catholic faith, which except a man believe faithfully he cannot be saved."⁷ Catholics are claiming that failure to believe in this so-called creed would cause people to miss heaven. It must be removed.

The bible teaches that proclaiming the Word in the last days is crucial. The Apostle Paul wrote to his co-laborer, "Preach the word; be instant in season, out of season; reprove, rebuke, exhort with all longsuffering and doctrine" (2 Timothy 4:2). The man of God gave us the reason for such instruction. He forewarned, "For the time will come when they will not endure sound doctrine; but after their own lusts shall they heap to themselves teachers, having itching ears; And they shall turn away their ears from the truth, and shall be turned unto fables" (2 Timothy 4:3-4).

If there ever was a time to preach sound doctrine, it is now. Churches must come back to the inerrant Word of God. Preachers, pastors, and teachers must willingly return to the basics. These would be major doctrines that are found written in the bible. The Holy Scriptures clearly outline the very first teachings of Christ. The book of Hebrews explains it this way:

"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" (Hebrews 6:1-2).

The Modern Defense of the Trinity

There is only one gospel. Galatians 1:8 warns us not to believe any other gospel than the one preached by the apostles of Christ. Disobedience to this powerful warning would have severe consequences. The *Eternal Gospel* cannot be altered in any way.

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.

And I saw another angel fly in the midst of heaven, having the everlasting gospel to preach unto them that dwell on the earth, and to every nation, and kindred, and tongue, and people (Revelation 14:6).

Chapter 6

The Missing Piece of the Puzzle

When the bible speaks about "Mystery Babylon," no one seems to know what this title means. Indeed, it is one of the greatest mysteries recorded in Revelation, chapters 17 and 18. Scholars are divided as to its rightful meaning. Reformers and Protestants, as mentioned previously, all believed that this was a reference to the Roman Catholic Church. One of the strongest manuscripts on this matter has stood since 1916, and has been reprinted ever since.

The book "Two Babylons" by Alexander Hislop has been loved and hated by all who have been privileged to read its contents. Hated mainly by those who are most comfortable with the traditional Catholic religion. Indeed, they will explain away all condemning evidence with modern rational ideas.

Hislop's meticulous research led him to the ancient city of Babylon. His discovery that Babylon's religion included a "Trinity in Unity" the same as Rome, provoked quite a stir. He wrote, "In the unity of that one only God of the Babylonians, there were three persons represented or symbolized by the equilateral triangle." His findings further revealed that "the three persons had come to be, the Eternal Father, the Spirit of God incarnate in a human mother, and a Divine Son, the fruit of that incarnation."¹

Hislop explained that it all started with Nimrod, Semiramis, and their Son. The story is quite gruesome because it is believed that Nimrod married his mother. Nimrod was known as the father, and at the same time he became Ninus,

the son. Semiramis was worshipped as "Rhea" the great goddess Mother. After Nimrod was killed, the worship of the Mother and Son became widespread throughout the world.

In the bible, this pagan worship would later be identified as Baal worship. The gods were known as Baal, Astarte, and Tammuz. The children of Israel suffered much for their disobedience in following after these and other strange gods. This trinity that had as one of its members, the goddess Mother, has always been exposed in the bible. See the book of Jeremiah, chapters 7 and 44. She was called the "Queen of Heaven."

It is most incredible, that when Mystery Babylon was researched, a "Trinity" of three persons appeared within the end-time prophecies of the bible. Mystery Babylon has a Trinity! The Unholy Trinity as it is referred to, is found in chapter 16, verse 13 of the book of Revelation. The spirits that go forth from the dragon, beast, and false prophet are spirits of devils working miracles throughout the world. Some scholars believe that this Trinity is a mere imitation of the Trinity of both Catholics and Christians. Their information is wrongfully reversed, for it was ancient Babylon who first gave us the false Trinity. Even the revealing of Mystery Babylon came before the advent of the Roman Catholic Church. Who is imitating who?

Philo's Contributions

Take Philo Judaeus away from the historical evolution of the Trinity and you have a missing link. It is Philo that brings together all the theories that the Fathers expounded as

Philo's Trinity

Greek philosophy and more directly, the Greek Logos. Philo taught that along with God there were two distinct and equal powers. He referred to them as persons and beings. He explained his vision of God at one time as being one, and at another time as three. The allegorical formula of God, Word and Wisdom was quietly placed into Catholic Theology.

Westcott and Hort of the 1800's, were the two most noted and respected authorities on the New Greek Edition of the bible. Most modern translations of the bible, including the NIV, are a reflection of that work. Those who religiously use these new edited Greek bibles are probably not aware that Westcott and Hort were heavily influenced by the writings of Plato and Philo. One encyclopedia quoted Westcott as saying, "There is nothing improbable in the surmise that the teaching of Philo gave a fresh impulse to the study of the Logos as Divine Reason which was already shadowed forth in the Biblical doctrine of Wisdom (Westcott)."²

After all the research conducted, it is directly known that Philo's allegorical teaching on the Logos did change the course of Christianity. It was the school of Alexandria, with later help from the council of Nicaea that was responsible for this strange doctrine to make its way into the majority of churches. The truth is evident, "The Alexandrian school was shaped by the threefold influence of Plato, Philo and the Johannine Gospel."³

Even the famed Nicene Creed has within its content, "God from God, Light from Light." This statement, believed to be derived from Plato, is also recorded in the writings of Philo. Certainly, with this much evidence coming through the cracks on the roman wall, Philo's contributions can be seen throughout the formulation of the Trinity.

The mystery doctrine of the three coequal, coeternal, persons in the Godhead must be revealed for what it is. Where did this doctrine that is strongly taught in the Athanasian forgery come from? Where did this false creed derive the coeternal formula? Can it be denied that Philo of Alexandria taught this doctrine? We have shown the links and how these theories were taken up by many of the Ante-Nicene Fathers.

The Apostles Were Never Greek Philosophers

A well-rounded study of the New Testament would dispel any false assertions that the apostles were associated in any way with Greek philosophy. In fact, the opposite of this is true. The apostles of Jesus Christ, including the Apostle Paul, were categorically opposed to any and all types of philosophy. Jesus, referring to the gospel stated, "Heaven and earth shall pass away, but my words shall not pass away" (Matthew 24:35). The gospel is the exclusive words of Christ, not of Heraclitus, Plato, or the Stoics.

Christ's doctrine was looked upon as being new: "And they were all amazed, insomuch that they questioned among themselves, saying, What thing is this? what new doctrine is this?' 'For with authority commandeth he even the unclean spirits, and they do obey him" (Mark 1:27).

Paul, while at Athens encountered the Stoics among the Epicurean philosophers: "Then certain philosophers of the Epicureans, and of the Stoics, encountered him.' 'And some said, What will this babbler say?' 'Other some, He seemeth to be a setter forth of strange gods: because he preached unto them Jesus, and the resurrection" (Acts 17:18). The apostle

Philo's Trinity

found them to be among other things, too superstitious. They were polytheistic and had many altars for their gods.

Philosophy falls under the inspiration of men, not of God. 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" (Colossians 2:8). At the beginning of this book it was revealed exactly how Philo came up with his Trinity doctrine. He drew his triune philosophy from the inspiration of his own "soul."

The line drawn between Greek philosophy and the *eternal gospel* was decidedly miles apart. The apostle wrote to believers everywhere, "All scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness: That the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works" (2Timothy 3:16-17). True believers in Christ will not settle for anything except God's imperishable Word. Philo believed that he wrote under a certain special type of inspiration. This is how the Trinity first appeared in the Apocrypha lost books and was eventually received by the Roman Catholic Church.

The doctrine of Christ is connected only with those who want to do the will of God: "Jesus answered them, and said, My doctrine is not mine, but his that sent me.' 'If any man will do his will, he shall know of the doctrine, whether it be of God, or whether I speak of myself" (John 7:16-17).

It was the doctrine of Christ that became the apostles' only foundation: "And are built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner stone" (Ephesians 2:20). The book of Acts reveals, "And they continued stedfastly in the apostles' doctrine and fellowship, and in breaking of bread, and in prayers" (Acts

The Missing Piece of the Puzzle

2:42). If the apostles had taught anything apart from what Christ had imparted, would this not have been a serious betrayal of the gospel? Of course! The apostles were diligent in preaching exactly what Christ commanded. It was the Roman Catholics and their exclusive bishops who further added and replaced Christ's true doctrine with that of Greek philosophy and paganism.

Evolution of the Greek Logos

- Heraclitus
- Plato
- Stoics
- Philo
- Ignatius
- Justin
- Theophilus
- Irenaeus
- Hippolytus
- Tertullian
- Clement
- Origen
- Novatian
- Athanasius

* This list leads up to the council of Nicaea, 325 A.D.

Conclusion

How did the church go from believing in one God to asserting that it was one God, yet three persons? The apostles

Philo's Trinity

were clearly Jewish and upholders of Deuteronomy 6:4. Christ confirmed this in Mark 12:29 when he was asked, "Which is the first commandment of all?" The Lord responded by repeating "the Lord thy God is one." So if Christ and his disciples did not change the "Shema," then who did? The missing piece of the puzzle was Philo of Alexandria. His connection with the Catholic Church brought a new doctrine into the church communities. This new concept of God was really an ancient teaching that started in Babylon. It is the missing piece of the puzzle that connects the Catholic Church to "Mystery Babylon."

The fact has been firmly established that the Ante-Nicene Fathers took their belief of the Eternal Son, and the Trinity concept of persons from Philo of Alexandria. There are similar notions with the trinities of the Gnostics, and the cultic Kabbalah. All these doctrines are one and the same. They all include Divine Wisdom as a second or third member of the Godhead. They all make use of the Greek Logos as a separate god that existed with God from the very beginning.

If this has been established as coming from sources other than the bible, true believers must make a decision. The only choice for those who love God is to reject the Trinity doctrine. This is the only wise and spiritual thing to do. This should have happened during the Reformation.

Failure to reject such deceptive teachings will enable Mystery Babylon to continue with its strong delusions. True Christians have always made the bible their only claim. The bible is the only source of authority. Catholics have tradition, the pope, and Marian apparitions. The Mormons have the writings of Joseph Smith and other unbiblical practices. Many religions have special books to teach them their own ways.

The Missing Piece of the Puzzle

Biblical Christians are the only ones that continuously honor God by preaching a pure and holy gospel. Historically, Protestants were prevented from completely breaking away from Rome before, during, and after the Reformation.

It is of prime importance to understand that during this time there were many who rejected the doctrine of the Trinity. Michael Servetus was a man of high intelligence. He wrote thought provoking books that contradicted the doctrine of the Trinity. Although, he was burned at the stake by the Geneva Council under John Calvin in Oct. 27, 1553, his murder prompted a growing resistance. One of several associations classified as being Anti-Trinitarian became known as the "Unitarians." The movement spread throughout the different countries and is still active today.

It is important to understand that this particular group has suffered many changes throughout its existence. Many would agree that the movement has become very liberal in its theology. Some have even added the word "Universalist" to the once singular title of "Unitarian." Many would agree that this is definitely not the message of the bible. There is another group who does not believe in a Trinity. Instead of teaching that Jesus is God, they use only half of the bible to prove that Jesus was just a man.

Well known groups such as the "Oneness Pentecostals" can be shown to have existed since "the Church of the book of Acts." Though, this has been a heavily persecuted Church, it has survived under several different denominations. It is an error to think that all proclaimed Oneness believers belong to the "United Pentecostal Church." The book "Apostolic History Timeline" by the late Rev. Marvin M. Arnold, D.D., Th.D., is an important "read" in this matter.⁴

Philo's Trinity

In the 1900's there was a strong resurgence of the "Oneness Doctrine" and baptism in Jesus name among very prominent Pentecostal Churches. While gathered at a revival camp meeting that resulted from ministries such as that of Maria Woodworth Etter, ministers among these groups would rise to proclaim the gospel that was confirmed in the book of Acts.⁵ It started with true baptism in the singular name. These ministers expounded the name of the Lord Jesus Christ.

Some Pastors, completely ignorant of the Synthesis principle were reluctant to abandon their Catholic orthodoxy. They formed in opposition to Oneness, their very own Pentecostal organization. This group became the well known "Assemblies of God." They automatically fell in line with major denominations that live under the same Catholic banner. Included are such major groups as the Methodists, Baptists, Lutheran, Episcopalian, Presbyterian, Church of Christ, Reformed, etc. There are other groups not recognized as having the same orthodox views, yet they still practice a baptism of three. Jehovah Witnesses, Seventh Day Adventists, and even Mormons are in this category.

The time has come to totally regain our true apostolic heritage. It is not a Roman inheritance, but a Jewish legacy. It is the Christian's birthright to believe in only one God. The New Testament scriptures cannot be broken. They claim no other truth but that our Lord God is one. Jesus is our mediator, as pointed out by Paul, the "man" Christ Jesus. This is the gospel's mystery of godliness, God manifest in the flesh. Christ never affirmed that he and the Father were two separate persons or beings. He said that they were one. Men picked up rocks to stone him, because he said, "Abraham rejoiced to see my day" and "before Abraham was, I AM."

Worldwide Acceptance of Alexandrian Theology

The theology of Egypt never declined; "but by the 8th century the Alexandrian theology was accepted by the whole Christian world, east and west."⁶ Alexandrian theology is Philo's theology. It is the standard teaching of Rome. The Catholic Church has singlehandedly persecuted those who would not adhere to her cup of abominations (Revelation 17:5).

On the supposedly Protestant side, Calvin and several others also persecuted and murdered many in the name of their triune deity. Calvin drank from the same cup as the woman of Revelation 17. Is it any wonder that faith in the one God of the bible would continuously diminish, while an allegiance to the Trinitarian creeds would get even stronger?

Why did the Roman Catholic and Protestant defenders of this Christian philosophy use torture and murder as the way to solve any contradictions to their doctrine? This was the "Mafia" mentality that muscles into whatever business they choose. This is using force and producing fear in those who will not submit to the most criminal of God-Fathers. In Revelation, this is the woman who rides the beast.

While modern apologists on the side of the creeds are not bringing Oneness believers to the courts or to be burned at the stake, a spirit of persecution is still evident. By deeming those who reject the Trinity doctrine as being part of a cult, they easily scare off sincere yet immature seekers of God. Trinitarians, to a large extent, refuse to research the scriptures on baptism, or to uncover the many historical facts set forth in

Philo's Trinity

a book such as Philo's Trinity. Some will argue against such evidence even though they have no biblical proficiency or accurate historical knowledge.

A simple and sincere desire to reexamine their faith is missing. The most persecuted Paul wrote to the Corinthian believers: "Examine yourselves, whether ye be in the faith; prove your own selves." 'Know ye not your own selves, how that Jesus Christ is in you, except ye be reprobates' (2 Corinthians 13:5)? It is a lie to assume that the early church was so persecuted it never really studied the nature of God.

There is hope that true Christians of all denominations will heed to the teaching of those verses that command believers to be meek and lowly of heart. Disciples must be as the "Bereans" who tested everything out by scripture. It is spiritual blindness not to search out a matter. It is true that in the last days "men shall not endure sound doctrine." The bible clearly states that "they shall heap to themselves teachers, having itching ears." This is not a good thing!

The truth remains that true worshippers of God must worship in spirit and in truth: "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. God is a Spirit: and they that worship him must worship him in spirit and in truth" (John 4:23-24). Where is the Trinity in this statement? Why did Jesus state such a confession?

Only through research, much prayer, and a willingness to submit to scripture, can one arrive at the answer. May God open eyes to the most beautiful revelation of one God: "Now unto the King eternal, immortal, invisible, the only wise God, be honour and glory for ever and ever. Amen" (1 Timothy 1:17). He truly is the only wise God!

Today's Modern Deception

The Roman Catholic Church wants you to believe that the central doctrine of Christianity is the Blessed Trinity. The truth of the matter is that the central doctrine of both faith and scripture has always been Christ. The bible undeniably states, "For other foundation can no man lay than that is laid, which is Jesus Christ" (1Corinthians 3:11). When modern Christians defend the Trinity, they advocate that the teaching of "three persons of one substance" is biblical. When questioned, they neither understand the term "persons" nor the biblical meaning of "substance."

To teach the multitudes that the Trinity doctrine was derived solely from Holy Scripture is not only a mistake, but a major deception. If one chooses this path in their defense, it equals the idea that there was no significant history relating to this teaching. It implies that there were no important voices in the past that contended against this major error on the Godhead. It is saying that there is no important data apart from the bible. Yet, it is the bible that points to the men coming after the apostles. It is unmistakably clear that certain men would come in with their own ideas. It was also from within the church itself, that men would arise to lead many astray.

Certain current Reformers are professing that there are three true foundations of the Trinity revealed in the bible. One such apologist wrote, "Every error and heresy on this doctrine will find its origin in a denial of one or more of these truths."⁷ The three foundations given were "that there is only one God, that there are three divine persons, and that the persons are coequal and coeternal. Any proficient bible scholar would be

Philo's Trinity

willing to take the first one to the bank. Good people would probably go without eating with the other two, simply because the bank cannot cash them. In other words, one is true, the others are completely false. The apologist wants to convince his readers that three divine persons is a second foundation. The word *persons* in relation to God is not even biblical. Researching where this word came from would completely destroy foundation two and three. Using the Athanasian Creed as this apologist has done, reveals his trust in a forgery.

For centuries Philo was hailed as a Christian, a bishop, and a strong contributor to Catholic theology. It would take a good number of years, but eventually the truth would be revealed that Philo was never a Catholic bishop, let alone a true bible Christian. He followed not Christ, but Plato, the Stoics, and the Kabbalah. He was upheld for many years as a theological authority only to be removed quietly from the list of respected Catholic theologians. Records of his previous early involvement in bringing Triune applications to the table were quickly removed.

This is the sad history of the evolution of Catholic theology. Is it any wonder that ever so large numbers of believers remain in their mistaken belief of a mystery that is enveloped in a sort of darkness? To spiritualize the Trinity by saying that it is a pure doctrine coming directly from scripture, is to ignore the multiple writings of the first century Philo, the Ante-Nicene Fathers, the Council of Nicaea, and Constantine's Hagia Sophia. If the doctrine is coming from the Holy Scriptures, why was it totally absent from the faith of first century believers?

Philo's Trinity is a contradiction to modern apologists who insist that "historic biblical Christianity" taught an eternal

distinction between the Son, the Father, and the Spirit.⁸ It was the Catholic Church that invented these eternal distinctions, along with their coequal, coeternal theories. It was second century bishop priests that brought deception with their new philosophy. Some apologists such as the author of "Jesus Only Churches," wrote quite mistakenly that "Orthodox Christianity confesses as in the Chalcedonian Creed that the Son was begotten before the worlds (7), and (8) was born of the Virgin Mary, the Mother of God according to his manhood."⁹

What does the author mean by orthodox Christianity? Does he mean that Catholics are Christian? Is he trying to say that Christians believe the same as Catholics? Isaiah 7:14 states, "conceived of a virgin." Galatians 4:4 reveals, "made of a woman." Christians did not believe historically in the Chalcedonian Creed, especially the beginning statement of "following the holy fathers." Christians do not follow religious men whose passion was philosophy and pagan traditions.

True biblical Christians do not believe in "perpetual virginity" nor do they believe that Mary was the Mother of God. The latter confession came from the Council of Ephesus 431 A.D. where Cyril and friends voted for the "Theotokos." Beisner also defends "the Word is the eternal Son of God, eternally distinct from the Father" by using John 1:1. His focus on the Greek word "pros" implies in the author's mind, a plurality of persons. The sly technique of overemphasizing a certain key word, alters the interpretation of the entire passage.

To overlook the multiple writings of the "Apostolic Fathers" is to show poor scholarship. Their authentic writings now acquired in volumes, must be researched in order to understand what happened after the death of the apostles. It is strongly recommended to research the "translated" literary

Philo's Trinity

works of the Ante-Nicene Fathers. Studying books about the fathers, arguably, is the reason that the Trinity has retained its popular position. Books such as "The Fathers" by retired Pope Benedict, completely omits Theophilus as a great leader of the church.¹⁰ The same omission occurs in most books that discuss the contributions of the Ante-Nicene Fathers.

Theophilus should be recognized at least on the point that he was the first to mention the Trinity. To cite only selected portions of what the Ante-Nicene Fathers taught in their writings, is to deceive Christians in their faith. The first ecumenical council stands the test of time in revealing the circumstances that ultimately led to the Trinity's mandatory acceptance.

The formula that surfaced with the first mention of the word "Trinity" or "Triad" supplied the direct link to Philo. The connection was established through Christian philosophers. The mystic theory, "God, Word, and Wisdom," would be applied to the teachings of Christ and to the Holy Spirit by all the Catholic bishops that incorporated his Greek Logos.

After the historic council of Nicaea, Constantine and his followers would come to reflect the ideology that gave us a Triune Godhead. "Divine Wisdom" or "Holy Wisdom" was the name given to the cathedral built in Constantinople. It stood for one thousand years as a direct testimony to the philosophical, and doctrinal results of Nicaea. Modern day Trinitarian Christianity does not quite understand just how this strange worship of "Hagia Sophia" came into the church, both Protestant and Catholic.

Seriously, when was the last time that some Christian who loves the Lord Jesus, raised up his or her hands and said, "Praise be to Holy Sophia?" When has a church choir, in the

The Missing Piece of the Puzzle

middle of rural America, expressed gratitude in song to "Holy Wisdom?" Now, would they be singing to Christ or to the Holy Spirit?

Worshipping Sophia would put you in very strange company. Madame Blavatsky in her Theosophical Glossary wrote about Sophia or Wisdom as "the female Logos of the Gnostics, the female Holy Ghost with others."¹¹ Those that worship Holy Wisdom or Holy Sophia as God, are in the same identical category as: Gnostics, Feminists, Pagans (Witches), Kabbalists, New Agers, Theosophists, and devote Catholics who worship the celestial virgin Mary. True Christians cannot be in a group such as this. God is holy!

Now this would make an interesting kind of church. The reality of this affiliation is that it would be extremely ecumenical, but never true Christianity. Some Catholics and Protestants are rather happy with this arrangement. This could never be the true worship of one God as defended by the monotheistic Jews that uphold the Old Testament. It could never be the faith of the monotheistic Jews that gave us the New Testament. May the grace of the Lord Jesus be with you.

Philo's Trinity Catholic Trinity

Revelation	Revelation
Mystery	Mystery
Philosophy	Philosophy
Transcendence	Transcendence
Creators	Creators

Philo's Trinity

Three Days	Three Days
Powers	Powers
Reason	Reason
Greek Logos	Greek Logos
Divine Wisdom	Divine Wisdom
Second God	Second God
Triune Nature	Triune Nature
Persons / Beings	Beings / Persons
All Distinct	All Distinct
All Equal	All Equal
God from God	God of God
Light from Light	Light of Light

*These are terms and concepts found in both Trinities.

Notes

Chapter 1: Philo of Alexandria

1. The Works of Philo: New Updated Edition, Translated by C.D. Yonge (Hendrickson Publishers Marketing, LLC., 1993) 11.
2. Ibid., 29.
3. Ibid., 43.
4. Wisdom. (1915). . International Standard Bible Encyclopedia. Dr. James Orr, General Editor (Chicago: Howard-Severance Company, 1915)
5. The Works of Philo, xii.
6. Logos. (1999). . Encyclopedia, Encarta 2000. (Microsoft Corporation, 1999)
7. The Works of Philo, 747.
8. Ibid., 421
9. Ibid., 83
10. Ibid., 290.
11. Ibid., 85
12. Alfred Edersheim, *The Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah*. Part IV, WM.B. (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1980) 44-48.
13. H.P. Blavatsky, *The Theosophical Glossary* (Los Angeles, California: Theosophical Publishing House, 1918) 235, 305.
14. Israel Regardie. *The Tree of Life, An Illustrated Study in Magic*. 3rd Edition by Chic and Sandra Cicero (Woodbury, Minnesota: Llewellyn Publications, 2001) 47, 52, 53.

Chapter 2: Philo, the Church Father

1. Catechism of the Catholic Church, Pope John Paul II (New York: Doubleday Publishers, 1995) 60.

2. David T. Runia, *Philo in Early Christian Literature: A Survey* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1993) 295.
3. Ibid., 138
4. Ibid., 3
5. Ibid., 31
6. Ibid.
7. Ibid., 89
8. Justin. (1981). . McClintock and Strong Encyclopedia, Biblical, Theological, and Ecclesiastical Literature. John McClintock, James Strong, (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1981)
9. Ante-Nicene Fathers (Peabody, Massachusetts: Hendrickson, Publishers, Inc., 1995) 1.279.
10. The Treatise On The Apostolic Tradition of St. Hippolytus Of Rome, Edited by The Rev. Gregory Dix. Revised by Henry Chadwick (Ridgefield, CT: Morehouse Publishing, 1937, 1968, 1992) xx.
11. Ibid.
12. Runia, 105, 158, 194
13. The Works of Philo: New Updated Edition, Translated by C.D. Yonge (Hendrickson Publishers Marketing, LLC., 1993) 290.
14. Ante-Nicene Fathers, 3.607.
15. Runia, 127
16. A Dictionary of Early Christian Beliefs. David W. Bercot, Editor (Peabody, Massachusetts: Hendrickson Publishers, 1998) 74.
17. Eusebius' Ecclesiastical History (Peabody, Massachusetts: Hendrickson Publishers, Inc., 1998) 51.
18. The Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church, F.L. Cross. London (New York: Oxford University Press., 1974) 696.
19. CREEDS OF THE CHURCH PC Study Bible formatted electronic database
Copyright © 2003, 2006 by Biblesoft, Inc.
20. New Advent Catholic Encyclopedia, *The Logos*, online.
www.newadvent.org. (5 May 2013)
21. Runia, 342
22. Ibid., 347

23. Ibid., 83

Chapter 3: The Secret Disciples of Philo

1. Ante-Nicene Fathers (Peabody, Massachusetts: Hendrickson, Publishers, Inc., 1995) 1.116.
2. Hans Kung. *The Catholic Church: A Short History*. A Modern Library Chronicles Book (New York: The Modern Library, 2003) 13.
3. Ibid., 18
4. A Dictionary of Early Christian Beliefs. David W. Bercot, Editor (Peabody, Massachusetts: Hendrickson Publishers, 1998) 61.
5. Bart D. Ehrman. *Lost Scriptures-Books that did Not Make It into the New Testament*, (New York, New York: Oxford, University Press, Inc., 2003) 214.
6. Ante-Nicene Fathers, 3.623
7. Ibid., 5.653
8. New Advent Catholic Encyclopedia, *The Apostolic Fathers*, online. www.newadvent.org. (5 May 2013)
9. Ehrman, 223
10. Ibid., 224
11. Ante-Nicene Fathers, 1.223, 1.227, 1.228
12. The Works of Philo: New Updated Edition, Translated by C.D. Yonge (Hendrickson Publishers Marketing, LLC., 1993) 342.
13. Ante-Nicene Fathers, 2.101
14. A Dictionary of Early Christian Beliefs, 343
15. Ibid., 688
16. The Treatise On The Apostolic Tradition of St. Hippolytus Of Rome, Edited by The Rev. Gregory Dix. Revised by Henry Chadwick (Ridgefield, CT: Morehouse Publishing, 1937, 1968, 1992) xx.
17. Ibid.

18. Ibid.
19. Ibid., 33-37
20. Ante-Nicene Fathers, 3.602
21. Ibid., 3.600
22. A Dictionary of Early Christian Beliefs, 687
23. Ibid., 101
24. Ante-Nicene Fathers, 3.601
25. A Dictionary of Early Christian Beliefs, 688
26. Ibid., 226
27. Ante-Nicene Fathers, 5.643
28. Ibid.
29. Eusebius' Ecclesiastical History (Peabody, Massachusetts: Hendrickson Publishers, Inc., 1998) 40.
30. Ibid., 54
31. Ibid.
32. Ibid., 52
33. Ibid.

Chapter 4: Father of Orthodoxy

1. Eusebius' Ecclesiastical History (Peabody, Massachusetts: Hendrickson Publishers, Inc., 1998) 390.
2. Ibid., 388
3. A Dictionary of Early Christian Beliefs. David W. Bercot, Editor (Peabody, Massachusetts: Hendrickson Publishers, 1998) 107.
4. Logos. (1915). . International Standard Bible Encyclopedia. Dr. James Orr, General Editor (Chicago: Howard-Severance Company, 1915)
5. The Works of Philo: New Updated Edition, Translated by C.D. Yonge (Hendrickson Publishers Marketing, LLC., 1993) 668.

6. Catechism of the Catholic Church, Pope John Paul II (New York: Doubleday Publishers, 1995) 74.
7. The Blessed Trinity. (2013). . New Advent Catholic Encyclopedia, online. www.newadvent.org (5 May 2013).
8. Athanasian Creed. (1915). . International Standard Bible Encyclopedia. Dr. James Orr, General Editor (Chicago: Howard-Severance Company, 1915)
9. Athanasian Creed. (1981). . McClintock and Strong Encyclopedia, Biblical, Theological, and Ecclesiastical Literature. John McClintock, James Strong, (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1981)
10. Daniel D. Corner, *The Believer's Conditional Security* (Washington, PA: Evangelical Outreach, 2000) 42.
11. CREEDS OF THE CHURCH PC Study Bible formatted electronic database Copyright © 2003, 2006 by Biblesoft, Inc.

Chapter 5: Modern Defense

1. The Works of Philo: New Updated Edition, Translated by C.D. Yonge (Hendrickson Publishers Marketing, LLC., 1993) xii.
2. Ante-Nicene Fathers (Peabody, Massachusetts: Hendrickson, Publishers, Inc., 1995) 2.101.
3. Adam Clarke's Commentary on the Bible, Abridged by Ralph Earle (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Book House, 1979) 897.
4. David T. Runia, *Philo in Early Christian Literature: A Survey* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1993) 336.
5. Ibid.
6. John F. MacArthur, Jr. *Charismatic Chaos* (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Zondervan Publishing House) 113.

7. CREEDS OF THE CHURCH PC Study Bible formatted electronic database Copyright © 2003, 2006 by Biblesoft, Inc.

Chapter 6: The Missing Piece of the Puzzle

1. Alexander Hislop, *Two Babylons* (London: A. & C. Black, LTD., 1932) 16-22.
2. Logos. (1915). . International Standard Bible Encyclopedia. Dr. James Orr, General Editor (Chicago: Howard-Severance Company, 1915)
3. Ibid.
4. Marvin M. Arnold, D.D., Th.D., *Apostolic History Outline* (Michigan: Arno Publications, 1985)
5. Maria Woodworth Etter, *Signs And Wonders* (New Kensington, PA: Whitaker House, 1997)
6. International, *Alexandria*.
7. James R. White, *The Forgotten Trinity* (Minnesota: Bethany House Publishers, 1998) 28.
8. E. Calvin Beisner, *"Jesus Only" Churches* (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Zondervan Publishing House, 1998) 13.
9. Ibid., 19-21
10. Pope Benedict XVI, *The Fathers* (Our Sunday Visitor Publishing Division, 2008)
11. H.P. Blavatsky, *The Theosophical Glossary* (Los Angeles, California: Theosophical Publishing House, 1918) 283.