

Are You Following the Doctrines of Antichrists?

Peter Ditzel

"Hereby know ye the Spirit of God: Every spirit that confesseth that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh is of God: And every spirit that confesseth not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh is not of God: and this is that spirit of antichrist, whereof ye have heard that it should come; and even now already is it in the world" (1 John 4:2-3).

"For many deceivers are entered into the world, who confess not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh. This is a deceiver and an antichrist" (2 John 1:7).

Many people speculate about antichrist. Some speak of the Antichrist, referring to a particular person, such as the Pope or all of the Popes. Often, the Antichrist is seen as an end-time figure equated with the man of sin in 2 Thessalonians 2:3. While there may be some validity in calling the Pope and the man of sin Antichrists, John's concept of antichrist is much broader. He is not speaking of a particular person, but says that many deceivers have entered the world and that each of these deceivers is an antichrist. Notice 1 John 2, verses 18 and 22: "Little children, it is the last time: and as ye have heard that antichrist shall come, even now are there many antichrists; whereby we know that it is the last time.... Who is a liar but he that denieth that Jesus is the Christ? He is antichrist, that denieth the Father and the Son."

So, there are many antichrists. The Greek word John used that is translated as "many" is elsewhere translated in the New Testament as "many" 210 times, as "much" seventy-three times, as "great" sixty-two times, and is also translated as "plenteous," "abundant," "common," "oftentimes," and so forth. This is important to know because some writers and speakers, going back to the Reformation, have so emphasized the idea of one person as "the Antichrist" that we can easily lose sight of the Bible's clear statements in John's writings that there are many antichrists.

Who Are John's Antichrists?

John does not leave us without a way to determine who these antichrists are. In the verses quoted at the beginning of this article, we see that these antichrists are people who deny that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh. So, who denies that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh?

Copyright © 2010 wordofhisgrace.org

Permission is granted to reproduce this article only if reproduced in full with no alterations and keeping the copyright statement and this permission statement intact.

In 1 John 2:22, we see that these antichrists also deny that Jesus is the Christ. This should not be seen as something different from denying that Jesus Christ has come in the flesh. John is saying that these antichrists deny that Jesus was God incarnate as the Christ ("Christ" is the Greek word for the Hebrew "Messiah"). Many types of people immediately come to mind who would fit into this category: atheists, Jews, people of any religion other than Christianity. But, while these people certainly fit John's definition of antichrist, they are not specifically the kind of people John has in mind.

We can know this because in 1 John 2:19, right in the midst of John's warnings about antichrists, he writes, "They went out from us, but they were not of us; for if they had been of us, they would no doubt have continued with us: but they went out, that they might be made manifest that they were not all of us." The antichrists of John's day were people who had been in the church, people who had apparently confessed faith in Christ, but who were in reality antichrists. John warned about these antichrists because, no doubt, they continued to call themselves Christians, but there was something about their doctrine that, when understood, identified them as antichrists. The churches had to be warned about these dangerous people who might deceive, at least for a time, true Christians and be disruptive to their spiritual growth.

Understanding the Nature of Jesus Christ

John's warnings should make us realize that we must not be careless in our understanding of the nature of Jesus Christ. In Matthew 16:13-17, we read Peter's confession of who Jesus was: "When Jesus came into the coasts of Caesarea Philippi, he asked his disciples, saying, Whom do men say that I the Son of man am? And they said, Some say that thou art John the Baptist: some, Elias; and others, Jeremias, or one of the prophets. He saith unto them, But whom say ye that I am? And Simon Peter answered and said, Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God. And Jesus answered and said unto him, Blessed art thou, Simon Barjona: for flesh and blood hath not revealed it unto thee, but my Father which is in heaven."

Peter's statement was loaded. It is packed with information. It would require at least a volume to detail everything Peter said in those few words. But, briefly, he said that Jesus—which, remember, means Savior—was the Christ, the Messiah. The Old Testament is full of prophecies, shadows, and types of the Messiah. Peter was saying that Jesus, who was the Savior, was also the fulfillment of all that the

Scriptures say about the Messiah. He then links these concepts of the Savior and Messiah with "the Son of the living God." This was an amazing statement because it was not generally believed by the Jews that the Messiah was to be the Son of God. But this is what Peter said. It was such an amazing statement that Jesus recognized that it had to have been a direct revelation given to Peter by God.

Peter himself did not fully understand all of the implications of what he said. This becomes obvious when we see in Matthew 16:21-23 that Peter did not understand that the Christ had to die for the sins of His people. Like the blind man of Bethsaida (Peter's home town), Peter's eyes were, at this time, only partly opened (see Mark 8:22-33). Nevertheless, they were opened enough for it to be obvious that it was a revelation from God.

Proof that the Jews did not understand that the Messiah would be the Son of God is found in Matthew 22:41-45: "While the Pharisees were gathered together, Jesus asked them, Saying, What think ye of Christ? whose son is he? They say unto him, The Son of David. He saith unto them, How then doth David in spirit call him Lord, saying, The LORD said unto my Lord, Sit thou on my right hand, till I make thine enemies thy footstool? If David then call him Lord, how is he his son?" In this passage, Jesus is saying that the Christ, prophesied to be a descendent of David, was also prophesied to be God, proven by David referring to Him as Lord. Rejecting this point, most Jews rejected Jesus, crucified Him for blasphemy (Mark 14:61-64), and thereby rejected salvation (John 5:39-40; Acts 13:46)!

If we are slipshod in our understanding of Jesus, we can fall for the erroneous teachings of those who today fit John's definition of antichrists. We must know why He was called Jesus, who the Christ or Messiah was, what He was to accomplish, and so on. We may say that we believe in the incarnation of Jesus, but if we reject anything that He accomplished in His flesh, then we are really denying His full incarnation.

A Few Modern Antichrists

So many Christians today know so little of these things that, for example, they wonder why Jehovah's Witnesses should not be considered Christians. Jehovah's Witnesses say that Jesus Christ, before He was a human, was the archangel Michael, a created being. This means that they do not believe Him to be truly God. But, as we have seen, Jesus taught otherwise. Anyone denying that Jesus was

truly God is an antichrist. The Jehovah's Witnesses, then, are antichrists. But they are not alone.

Almost every heretical cult has a deficient view of Jesus Christ. For example, there are a number of groups that continue to follow the teachings of Herbert W. Armstrong (such as the Living Church of God; the Church of God, an International Community; the United Church of God, an International Association; the Philadelphia Church of God; the Church of the Great God; and over two hundred others). Yet, Armstrong clearly fit John's definition of an antichrist.

His teachings did not give Jesus the credit for accomplishing what the Bible clearly says He did. As just one illustration, in his book *Mystery of the Ages* (page 228 of the paperback edition), Armstrong wrote,

Today's customary gospel about Christ [which, on the next page, Armstrong goes on to call a "false gospel"] believes that simply "believing on Christ," which is professing Christ as personal Savior, means that one is already saved. Yet Mark 7:7-9 shows that many even go so far as to worship Christ, and all in vain because they do not obey God's commandments—especially the Sabbath—but follow the traditions of men by which Satan has deceived the whole world.

Further, he taught,

The blood of Christ has atoned for the past.... The blood of Christ has paid the price of past guilt.... A Christian must grow and develop in grace, spiritual knowledge and godly character.... In a sense, then, the Church shall become co-saviors with Christ.... But many have not realized that we are not saved by the blood of Christ.... After we have attained to the resurrection of the dead, as the wife of the Son of God, and members of the God family, we shall be not only heirs and coheirs with Christ, but in a sense, co-saviors.

Mystery of the Ages, 197-98

According to Armstrong, Christ's atonement is not sufficient to save us; His death paid the penalty for past sins only. Armstrong's teaching is that a Christian is to then go on and qualify for salvation by growing in godly character, which includes keeping the commandments of the Old Covenant. This denial of the full salvation Jesus Christ came in the

flesh to accomplish is a form of denying that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh. As John said, "This is a deceiver and an antichrist." Those who continue to teach Armstrong's doctrines must bear the same label.

The teachings of the Roman Catholic Church (Romanism) are also the teachings of antichrist. Many doctrines could be named, but I will mention just a couple. Romanism teaches that Christians must add to the work of Jesus on the Cross through penance and other good works. It also teaches that Jesus did not die as a sacrifice once for all time because Romans Catholic priests offer Jesus at altars in Catholic churches around the world hundreds of thousands of times a day when they perform the mass. Based on this information alone, the purveyors of Catholicism are antichrists because they refuse to accept everything that Christ accomplished in His flesh. By so doing, they "confess not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh."

Docetics and Judaizers

In John's time, as in ours, there were many ways one might claim to be a Christian, but, in reality, deny that Jesus was the incarnate Christ. This is not the place to list all such heresies. But one was Docetism. Docetics openly denied Christ's incarnation and crucifixion, saying these were only an illusion. Hopefully, most who claim Christianity would recognize such a heresy for what it is. But there was another common heresy in John's time that has a counterpart today that is not so easily recognized.

Judaizers believed that, for someone to become a Christian, he had to first become a Jew. Males, therefore, had to be circumcised. After this, even though they were Christians, they were obligated to keep the Law of Moses. This heresy crops up throughout the New Testament, but Paul addresses it most completely in Galatians. And it is most succinctly dealt with in Acts 15, where the church clearly rules that circumcision and keeping the Law of Moses are not necessary.

But how is this specifically a heresy that "confesseth not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh"? Because it denies at least part of what Jesus, the Christ, the Son of the living God came to do and, in fact, did accomplish. It denies some things that were part and parcel of being Jesus, the Savior, and much of what the Old Testament said in prophecies, types, and shadows of the Messiah. For one, it denies the full efficacy of the sacrifice of Jesus Christ. It essentially says that

Jesus' atonement was not enough. Additions to Jesus' atonement—such as circumcision and law keeping—are also needed.

It also "confesseth not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh" by denying that Jesus Christ was the end goal and fulfillment of the law. Notice first the law of circumcision. God gave this law to Abraham (Genesis 17:9-12). Abraham's descendants were to be circumcised, not because they were the children of believers (many had parents who were not believers), but because they were in the physical line of descent from Abraham that was to lead to the promised Seed, the Messiah (Galatians 3:16). Once the Messiah was born, there was no longer a need for circumcision: "For in Jesus Christ neither circumcision availeth any thing, nor uncircumcision; but faith which worketh by love" (Galatians 5:6). The One to whom circumcision pointed had been born. Therefore, the Judaizers' insistence on circumcision showed them to be blind to the fact that the One to whom circumcision pointed had come, and, therefore, was a denial of the incarnation of the Messiah. This made them, by John's definition, antichrists.

Next, notice the entire Old Covenant law. In Matthew 5:17, Jesus said, "Think not that I am come to destroy the law, or the prophets: I am not come to destroy, but to fulfil." This Scripture is often misunderstood. People equate fulfilling with destroying. Jesus truly came not to destroy the law, but to fulfill. To destroy the law would mean to abolish the law before it had fulfilled its purpose. Jesus did not do this. He fulfilled the law because He was the culmination of the law. He was everything the law pointed to, and He kept the law perfectly for us.

The law served the purpose of guarding the Jews until Jesus Christ came. (If this is news to you, I suggest you read "Should we preach the law to bring people to Christ?" <http://www.wordofhisgrace.org/preachlawqa.htm>.) But when Jesus came, He fulfilled its purpose: "Wherefore then serveth the law? It was added because of transgressions, till the seed should come to whom the promise was made; and it was ordained by angels in the hand of a mediator" (Galatians 3:19). Notice that the law was added only until the Seed, Jesus Christ, should come. He has come and fulfilled the purpose of the law. Again, when the Judaizers claimed that Christians must continue keeping Old Covenant law, they were, in effect, denying that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh because they refused to believe that He accomplished one of the primary purposes for which He came, the fulfillment of the law. Such a denial made them antichrists.

Modern Judaizers

But perhaps this emphasis on circumcision and keeping Old Covenant law sounds familiar. Maybe you are beginning to see that this was not a problem that went away in the first century. Do you know of any churches that, in effect, continue circumcision by claiming that infant baptism is a continuation of circumcision? Do you know of any churches that say the Old and New Covenants are really the same covenant and, therefore, the Old Covenant law continues today?

It is very likely that you do. They are called Reformed and Presbyterian and Puritan. Most (Reformed Baptists excepted) teach that baptism is the equivalent of and New Testament continuation of circumcision. They (including the Reformed Baptists) also teach that Old Covenant law continues today because the Old Covenant and the New Covenant are merely different administrations of the same covenant. They actually believe that the Old Covenant, which is clearly a covenant of works and death, is a covenant of grace. This blending of the Old Covenant and the New Covenant is called Covenant Theology or Reformed Theology.

Many will be shocked at what I am saying about Reformed Theology. Doesn't Reformed Theology teach the Doctrines of Grace (the Five Points of Calvinism or the TULIP), and don't I also believe the Doctrines of Grace? Yes, this is true. But some of the other doctrines of Reformed Theology are not biblical and are a hindrance to those who are seeking freedom in Jesus Christ.

The Reformed Attempt to Continue Circumcision

Thomas Patient, who lived in England in the seventeenth century, was an Anglican, who became a Puritan and moved to New England. After a time, he came to see the fabrications that support Covenant Theology and infant baptism, a warrant was then issued for his arrest, and he fled back to England where he became a leading Baptist.

In 1654, he wrote, "In Acts 15:1, it is said by the false teachers, 'Except ye be circumcised after the manner of Moses, ye cannot be saved.' Those teachers were of the same opinion with these in our days who hold that the covenant of circumcision was a covenant of life." Patient continues to explain that Paul, in Galatians 3, "does set the covenant of grace and that of works in opposition. One he calls the Spirit and the other flesh." Patient then refers the reader to Galatians

5:1-3, "Stand fast therefore in the liberty wherewith Christ hath made us free, and be not entangled again with the yoke of bondage. Behold, I Paul say unto you, that if ye be circumcised, Christ shall profit you nothing. For I testify again to every man that is circumcised, that he is a debtor to do the whole law." Do you think of your baptism as the New Testament form of circumcision? Then you are entangled with a yoke of bondage, and you are a debtor to do the whole law.

As one writer insightfully observes, "Whenever religion rejects God's authority, it creates 'another Jesus' which always leads to 'another gospel.' Why? Because whenever the sufficiency of Christ is denied, another gospel must be concocted to instruct people what they must do to be saved" (Mike Gendron, "Three Fatal Errors Common Among False Teachers," *Proclaiming the Gospel*, July-September 2008, 2). To deny that Jesus came to fulfill and end the law and that He actually did that which He said He came to do—fulfill and end the law—is to deny the sufficiency of Christ, distort His Gospel, and misrepresent who Jesus Christ is. It is saying that Jesus is not who He claimed to be. What more dangerous spiritual position could one be in? As Jesus said, "I said therefore unto you, that ye shall die in your sins: for if ye believe not that I am he, ye shall die in your sins" (John 8:24).

The Heidelberg Catechism used by Reformed churches states:

Question 74. Are infants also to be baptized?

Answer: Yes: for since they, as well as the adult, are included in the covenant and church of God; and since redemption from sin by the blood of Christ, and the Holy Ghost, the author of faith, is promised to them no less than to the adult; they must therefore by baptism, as a sign of the covenant, be also admitted into the christian church; and be distinguished from the children of unbelievers as was done in the old covenant or testament by circumcision, instead of which baptism is instituted in the new covenant.

Another Reformed confession, the Belgic Confession of Faith, says,

Therefore we detest the error of the Anabaptists, who are not content with the one only baptism they have once received, and moreover condemn the baptism of the infants of believers, who we believe ought to be baptized and sealed with the sign of the covenant, as the children in

Israel formerly were circumcised upon the same promises which are made unto our children. And indeed Christ shed His blood no less for the washing of the children of the faithful than for adult persons; and therefore they ought to receive the sign and sacrament of that which Christ hath done for them.... Moreover, what circumcision was to the Jews, that baptism is to our children. And for this reason Paul calls baptism the "circumcision of Christ."

The Scripture partly quoted above is Colossians 2:11: "In whom also ye are circumcised with the circumcision made without hands, in putting off the body of the sins of the flesh by the circumcision of Christ." Is baptism done without hands? No. We use our hands to baptize someone. How, then, can this verse be referring to baptism as the circumcision made without hands? This cannot be a reference to baptism. Paul is writing of spiritual circumcision, which he elsewhere calls circumcision of the heart: "But he is a Jew, which is one inwardly; and circumcision is that of the heart, in the spirit, and not in the letter; whose praise is not of men, but of God" (Romans 2:29). In Colossians 2:12, Paul lists something else about the saints. Not only are their sins removed by the circumcision of the heart, but they are also dead to their sins (v. 13) because they are united with Christ in His death and burial, this being represented by their baptism. It is a complete distortion of these verses to say that Paul calls baptism the "circumcision of Christ." Paul is writing of two different things: 1. spiritual circumcision, and, 2. the death and burial of the saints with Christ, which is represented by their baptism.

Thomas Patient was not known for pulling punches. Writing of the covenant of circumcision, he said, "But when Christ came and became fully exhibited in the flesh, then the ground upon which this covenant was given ceased. Therefore, the covenant also ceased. For any man to go about to defend a covenant in the flesh is a doctrine virtually denying that Christ is come and fully manifested in the flesh." And this is exactly what the doctrine of infant baptism does. It denies that the covenant of circumcision, which God made with a fleshly line only until Christ should come, has ended. It teaches that the children of believers are in a covenant relationship with God because of their fleshly descent from their parents. It says that they should be sprinkled as a New Testament continuation of circumcision. This is a denial that Christ came in the flesh and ended the fleshly covenant of circumcision that passed from parent to child. It is a doctrine of antichrist.

Reformed Theology Versus the End of the Old Covenant

Likewise, to say that Christians must keep the Old Covenant law is to deny that Christ came in the flesh to fulfill and end that law. Why? Although those who hold to it will not agree (some, because they do not understand the logical implications of the system they claim to believe), Covenant Theology holds people in legalistic bondage to a law that Christ has completely fulfilled and is no longer in effect. In John 8:31-32, Jesus said, "If ye continue in my word, then are ye my disciples indeed; And ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you..." Make you what? In covenant with God because of your physical descent? subject to the Old Covenant law? obligated to the Ten Commandments? debtors to the "moral law"? A thousand times, NO! "The truth shall make you free"!

Notice what the Jews Jesus was speaking to replied. "They answered him, We be Abraham's seed, and were never in bondage to any man: how sayest thou, Ye shall be made free?" Is this not what is at the heart of Covenant Theology? Covenant Theologians can also say, "We are in covenant with God because of our descent from our believing parents. What do you mean we must be made free? Surely, you don't mean free from the law." "Jesus answered them, Verily, verily, I say unto you, Whosoever committeth sin is the servant of sin. And the servant abideth not in the house for ever: but the Son abideth ever. If the Son therefore shall make you free, ye shall be free indeed" (John 8:33-36).

And who commits sin? Everyone who tries to keep the law! Paul makes this very clear: "Moreover the law entered, that the offence might abound. But where sin abounded, grace did much more abound" (Romans 5:20); "What shall we say then? Is the law sin? God forbid. Nay, I had not known sin, but by the law: for I had not known lust, except the law had said, Thou shalt not covet. But sin, taking occasion by the commandment, wrought in me all manner of concupiscence. For without the law sin was dead. For I was alive without the law once: but when the commandment came, sin revived, and I died" (Romans 7:7-9); "The sting of death is sin; and the strength of sin is the law" (1 Corinthians 15:56).

But hear the remedy: "For sin shall not have dominion over you: for ye are not under the law, but under grace" (Romans 6:14); and, "There is therefore now no condemnation to them which are in Christ Jesus, who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit. For the law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus hath made me free from the law of sin and death.

For what the law could not do, in that it was weak through the flesh, God sending his own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh, and for sin, condemned sin in the flesh: That the righteousness of the law might be fulfilled in us, who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit" (Romans 8:1-4). How is this accomplished? By Jesus keeping the law perfectly in our stead, and by His taking our sins upon Himself and suffering God's wrath and dying for them, thus completely fulfilling the law for us so that it ended.

Another way that Paul expresses this is by saying that we have become dead to the law. This is just as a wife becomes dead to the law of her husband when he dies so that she is then free to marry another: "Know ye not, brethren, (for I speak to them that know the law,) how that the law hath dominion over a man as long as he liveth? For the woman which hath an husband is bound by the law to her husband so long as he liveth; but if the husband be dead, she is loosed from the law of her husband. So then if, while her husband liveth, she be married to another man, she shall be called an adulteress: but if her husband be dead, she is free from that law; so that she is no adulteress, though she be married to another man. Wherefore, my brethren, ye also are become dead to the law by the body of Christ; that ye should be married to another, even to him who is raised from the dead, that we should bring forth fruit unto God. For when we were in the flesh, the motions of sins, which were by the law, did work in our members to bring forth fruit unto death. But now we are delivered from the law, that being dead wherein we were held; that we should serve in newness of spirit, and not in the oldness of the letter" (Romans 7:1-6).

Read again what Paul says in the verses above. He says that we have "become dead to the law by the body of Christ." Therefore, to say that we have not become dead to the law, to say that we are still under Old Covenant law because the Old and New Covenants are just two administrations of the same covenant, is to reject the work that Christ completed in His body, to deny that Jesus did everything in His body that the Bible says He did, and, thus, to deny Jesus Christ is come in the flesh in all that that implies. It is, by John's definition, a spirit of antichrist.

Why Am I Writing This?

Occasionally, I am asked about other people's salvation. These are questions such as, Are any Arminians saved? Are there any saved people in the Roman Catholic Church? Is Herbert Armstrong in hell? I

rarely respond to these questions because I have found that they usually come from people who have already made up their minds and are merely trying to pick a fight. Nevertheless, my answer to such questions would be this: It is God who elects (1 Peter 1:2), Jesus Christ who saves (Luke 2:11), the Holy Spirit who regenerates (John 3:5), and Jesus Christ who is the righteous Judge (2 Timothy 4:8). Peter Ditzel has nothing to do with this. God's saints are to be discerning, but not condemning. This does not mean that we must continue to have "open dialogue" and "irenic relations" with every heretic in the world; Jesus and his followers often hotly debated with those who were trying to promote teachings that were contrary to the Gospel. But we must not take God's place as Judge of someone's eternal destiny.

That said, I want to make clear that I did not write this article to condemn anyone. I wrote it for two reasons:

1. I wrote this article to warn those who believe any system of theology that denies in any way that Jesus is come in the flesh. John does not pussyfoot. To call someone an antichrist is strong language. An antichrist's work is contrary to the work of Christ on earth. It does not gather God's sheep to their Shepherd. It scatters them by sending them off in the wrong direction to works, law-keeping, outdated covenants, or anything that does not center on Jesus Christ alone (Matthew 12:30). I hope that some people will take this as a wakeup call and examine whether what they believe is really solidly based on the Bible.

2. I wrote this article to warn Baptists (and others) who have come to believe the Doctrines of Grace. I want to caution them away from Reformed or Covenant Theology. The Doctrines of Grace are biblical, but much of Reformed Theology is not. It is, in fact, largely unbiblical and was fabricated by magisterial Reformers to help them retain the power the Roman Catholic Church had held in partnership with the civil authorities (pictured in Revelation 17 by the harlot riding the beast). I am concerned that Baptists are getting their education in the Doctrines of Grace by the writings of Reformed, Presbyterian, and Puritan theologians and, along the way, they are picking up Reformed/Covenant Theology.

As Sovereign Grace Baptist preacher Jerry Locher, in an article titled "A Recovery of Baptist Ecclesiology," explains:

The reason that the reformers reached back into the Old Covenant for part of their ecclesiology is because they were in opposition to Baptist New Covenant ecclesiology. They were able to lay hold of the sword in the Old Covenant to persecute Baptists who stood in opposition to them.

There is another element in this equation as to why we need a recovery of a Baptist ecclesiology. With the recovery of the doctrines of God's sovereign grace, many Baptists who have embraced Calvinism have done so by reading the reformers and the Puritans. In doing so, they have swallowed the reformed and Puritan ecclesiology. The constant use of the word "reformed" by Baptists has no doubt led to many of our Baptist fathers turning over in their graves! To call a Baptist church reformed leads only to blur Baptist distinctness in ecclesiology. A Baptist cannot be reformed and be a Baptist!

Baptists should recover the doctrines of God's sovereign grace in the gospel, but at the same time reject any and all reformed ecclesiology that does not follow the pattern of the New Testament (and much of it does not).... The Roman Catholic Church was never reformed by the reformers; they went out from it to start all over, but in doing so they took a lot of Rome with them. Parts of Rome remain with all Protestant churches to this day....

It is time to stop playing around with doctrines that entangle us in law-keeping, works, covenants that are ended or anything that turns our focus away from the centrality of Jesus Christ and denies anything that He came to accomplish. It is time to turn from the spirit of antichrist to the Spirit of the Lord, for, "...even unto this day, when Moses is read, the vail is upon their heart. Nevertheless when it shall turn to the Lord, the vail shall be taken away. Now the Lord is that Spirit: and where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty" (2 Corinthians 3:15-17).