

Lucan: It's time to begin. Bro. David, will you please offer the opening prayer?

Zahakiel: Dear Father in Heaven, We come before you during these sacred hours for rest and refreshment, to worship your holy Name, and to receive the blessings you have prepared for all who call upon that Name in faith. May your Spirit rest upon us for this time of our fellowship and beyond, for we ask this in Yahshua's name. Amen.

Barb: Amen

Pastor Chick: Amen.

Adriel7777: Amen

Peter_Jr_18: Amen.

Lucan: Amen

Marie-kadeth: Amen

Elyna 1: Amen.

Naraiel: Amen

Lucan: Tonight's study and discussion is "Blasphemy and the Mark of the Beast."

We have spoken much of the "name of the beast" over the years, as Revelation 13 tells us the following: "And that no man might buy or sell, save he that had the mark, or the name of the beast, or the number of his name." (Revelation 13:17)

We have indication from the SDA Bible Commentary that the Greek here does not support the first "or;" that is to say, the Scripture reads "the mark, that is, the name of the beast."

We see confirmation of this a chapter later: "And the smoke of their torment ascendeth up for ever and ever: and they have no rest day nor night, who worship the beast and his image, and whosoever receiveth the mark of his name." (Revelation 14:11)

While Pastor has blessed us with some insights into the relation between the mark of the beast and the name of blasphemy, the whole of the matter has yet to become fully clear. My desire tonight is, rather than to teach conclusively on this matter, to invite discussion from those in attendance after a summary of the notes I've gathered thusfar.

There are a number of verses that give insight into the relation between "blasphemy" and the name, or mark, of the beast:

"So he carried me away in the spirit into the wilderness: and I saw a woman sit upon a scarlet coloured beast, full of names of blasphemy, having seven heads and ten horns." (Revelation 17:3)

We see here the name of the beast coming up again; in this case, "names," implying multiple. These are "names of blasphemy," or, as other versions have it, "blasphemous names." What is a name of blasphemy?

"And I stood upon the sand of the sea, and saw a beast rise up out of the sea, having seven heads and ten horns, and upon his horns ten crowns, and upon his heads the name of blasphemy." (Revelation 13:1)

Here in the very first introduction of the first beast, we have the "name of blasphemy" described. This verse marks the passage from the Pagan to the Papal stages of Rome; from the dragon power to the leopard-like beast. In this very first introduction the Papal beast is brought to view as having "upon his heads the name of blasphemy;" this would seem to be a clear precedent for what the "mark of his name" would entail later in the context – the name of blasphemy.

"And they worshipped the dragon which gave power unto the beast: and they worshipped the beast, saying, Who [is] like unto the beast? who is able to make war with him? And there was given unto him a mouth speaking great things and blasphemies; and power was given unto him to continue forty [and] two months. And he opened his mouth in blasphemy against God, to blaspheme his name, and his tabernacle, and them that dwell in heaven." (Revelation 13:4-6)

We see here in the same description the matter of blasphemy raised not only again, but repeatedly and with force. While this prophecy is nearly identical to that of the little horn power in Daniel, that book makes no mention of the specific charge of "blasphemy." Revelation wishes us to understand explicitly that this power is a blasphemous power, "speaking great things and blasphemies." And who are these blasphemies against?

First: "Against God." Secondly: "To blaspheme His name." Thirdly: "His tabernacle." And finally: "Them that dwell in heaven." How this is true of the Papal power is a relatively straight-forward question, and one I think Uriah Smith addresses well:

"Thus this beast power blasphemes the temple in heaven by turning attention of his subjects to his own throne and palace instead of to the tabernacle of God; by diverting their attention from the sacrifice of the Son of God to the sacrifice of the mass... He blasphemes them that dwell in heaven by assuming to exercise the power of forgiving sins, and so turns away the minds of men from the mediatorial work of Christ and His heavenly assistants in the sanctuary above." [Daniel and the Revelation, Uriah Smith, p. 571]

We know what a name is; it is either what someone is called, or what they are known by; their reputation. Name in this sense can represent character, glory, renown, along with the actual phonetics that designate an individual. Even among the most dyed in the wool of historic Adventists, the conclusion that the seal of God is the Sabbath requires that "name" means something more than the literal name.

Blasphemy here is shown to be a matter of impersonation, of taking on the attributes of God by declaration or by effect, or by substituting something of one's own invention in place of what God has ordained. To turn one's attention from Yahweh to self is blasphemy; to turn the attention and service from heaven to one's self is blasphemy. To

assume power that belongs to Yahweh is blasphemy; in short, to make one's self an idol, or image, is blasphemy. We read, for example: "Who opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God, or that is worshipped; so that he as God sitteth in the temple of God, shewing himself that he is God." (2 Thess. 2:4)

Once more from "Daniel and the Revelation", we read of "blasphemy:" "In the Gospels we find two indications of what constitutes blasphemy. In John 10: 33 we read that the Jews falsely charged Jesus with blasphemy because, said they, "Thou, being a man, makest Thyself God." This in the case of the Saviour was untrue, because He was the Son of God. He was "Immanuel, God With Us." But for man to assume the prerogatives of God and to take the titles of deity--this is blasphemy... Again, in Luke 5:21 we see the Pharisees endeavoring to catch Jesus in His words. "Who is this which speaketh blasphemies?" said they. "Who can forgive sins, but God alone?" Jesus could pardon transgressions, for He was the divine Saviour. But for man, mortal man, to claim such authority is blasphemy indeed." [Uriah Smith, Daniel and the Revelation p. 569](LMK)

Zahakiel: Finished

Adriel7777: F

Pastor Chick: F

Barb: F

Naraiel: f

Elyna 1: F

Peter Jr 18: F

Lucan: A "prerogative" is an "exclusive right;" to assume the right to do what Yahweh alone says He will do, or the authority He says He will exercise, is also blasphemy. While this quote speaks of the gospels, there are other instances of "blasphemy" in the Scriptures, yet not always translated that way into English. The Old Testament scriptures that speak of blasphemy are often translated in various ways and from multiple words, yet offer some valuable insights:

"And thou shalt know that I [am] the LORD, [and that] I have heard all thy blasphemies which thou hast spoken against the mountains of Israel, saying, They are laid desolate, they are given us to consume." (Ezekiel 35:12)

"Blasphemies" here is from the word "Ne'atsah," and is also translated at times as "provocations:"

"Yea, when they had made them a molten calf, and said, This [is] thy God that brought thee up out of Egypt, and had wrought great provocations; ... Nevertheless they were disobedient, and rebelled against thee, and cast thy law behind their backs, and slew thy prophets which testified against them to turn them to thee, and they wrought great provocations." (Nehemiah 9:18, 26)

In both cases, "provocations" is from the word "Ne'atsah." Ezekiel shows us that blasphemy can be against Yahweh's chosen place or people, and consists of those who

say they are theirs to have power over. Nehemiah tells us that "blasphemy," or "provocation," consists of two things.

First is to attribute to a lesser creation that which is of Yahweh. Second is to reject the counsel of the True Witness, rejecting and persecuting those who testify against rebellion. This varied translation is not unique to the Hebrew; in the New Testament, the Greek for "blasphemy" is also translated frequently as "railing," or "evil speaking."

One well-known example: "Yet Michael the archangel, when contending with the devil he disputed about the body of Moses, durst not bring against him a railing accusation, but said, The Lord rebuke thee." (Jude 1:9)

"Railing" here is translated from the word "blasphemia;" the root word there is quite obvious. We see similarly in 2 Peter 2:11: "Whereas angels, which are greater in power and might, bring not railing accusation against them before the Lord." Here again, "railing" is "blasphemos;" the same word in a different form.

"Blasphemy" itself is something called a compound word; that is, it is a word composed of two other words. "Blapto" is the first; it means to hurt, to injure, to cause harm. "Phama" is the other; it means "fame, reputation." "Blasphemy," then, is that form of idolatry or slanderous speech or behavior which causes hurt to the name and reputation of Yahweh; or His tabernacle, or His name, or those that dwell in heaven, etc.

We thus read of Paul: "Who was before a blasphemer, and a persecutor, and injurious: but I obtained mercy, because I did [it] ignorantly in unbelief." (1 Tim. 1:13)

We may note that blasphemy is not only against Yahweh, but also "them that dwell in heaven." We may see another instance of blasphemy, similarly against Yahweh's subjects, and this time also in Revelation:

"I know thy works, and tribulation, and poverty, (but thou art rich) and [I know] the blasphemy of them which say they are Jews, and are not, but [are] the synagogue of Satan." (Revelation 2:9)

We see here that it is blasphemy for one to "say they are Jews, and are not, but are the synagogue of Satan."

One possible example of the "name of blasphemy" is to hold the title and reputation of being "Jews" – whether this be under the Papal or Adventist era – while in reality being the synagogue of Satan. In other words, to claim to be Yahweh's people while not truly being such is blasphemy, just as much as to divert faith from Yahshua's mediation to a false mediation is blasphemy. It has the same effect of diluting, misrepresenting, and thus causing injury to, and replacement of, the truth of Yahweh.

I would like to close my notes on this, and transition to open discussion, with a quote from Mrs. White on this exact verse in Revelation. While I have preferred to keep this study

Scriptural in its basis, I encountered the following previously unpublished letter while researching, and I think you will quickly see why I am including it for our consideration. It is a bit long, so please let me know when you have finished:

““But are of the synagogue of Satan.” [Verse 9.] Here is a warning coming to our people, of assertions from those who claim to be Jews and are not. They claim to stand as believing present truth when they have brought in sentiments that have falsified the truth and have so mingled these pretentious, superior beliefs with the truth that, through their erroneous suppositions, the soul will in future test and trial give up the foundation of the faith for fables. God says to every man, “Watch ye and pray, lest ye enter into temptation.” [Mark 14:38.] There is a class that will be prominent who will give up the faith, and the seducing spirits of satanic agencies will overcome them through specious temptations. It is plainly stated of this class that they claim “they are Jews, and are not, but are of the synagogue of Satan.”

“Fear none of those things”—the blasphemous claims—“which thou shalt suffer.” Verse 10. When, through pretensions, a work will be done like that of Judas, fear not if you do suffer. Engage in no human worldly policy to save yourselves from betrayal; yield not at all to Satan’s devising. He tempted Christ: “All these things will I give Thee, if Thou wilt fall down and worship me’ [Matthew 4:9], I am in possession of the genuine religious sentiments.” Answer, No. “Behold, the devil shall cast some of you into prison, that ye may be tried; and ye shall have tribulation ten days: be thou faithful unto death, and I will give thee a crown of life. He that hath an ear, let him hear what the Spirit saith unto the churches.” Now the Holy Spirit speaketh. Listen: “He that overcometh shall not be hurt of the second death.” [Revelation 2] Verses 10, 11. Here are statements to be presented and taken into the mind. Persecutions will come from the pretentious who are joined to Satan’s army. They say they are Jews but are not.” [Ellen G. White, MS149, 1904](LMK)

Zahakiel: Finished.

Adriel7777: F

Naraiel: f

Pastor Chick: F

Elyna 1: F

Barb: F

Lucan: To my knowledge, this is the only example of the “Synagogue of Satan” who “say they are Jews and are not” being applied clearly and specifically to those who “claim to stand as believing present truth,” but in reality “give up the faith” in the current era. This is not speaking of the world, or the various daughters of Babylon; they have neither of these things to claim or to surrender, and cannot betray us as Judas. This is “a warning coming to our people;” a call to fear not “the blasphemous claims” of those who, as Satan, say “I am in possession of the genuine religious sentiments.”

And what reveals them as deceivers? “Persecutions will come from the pretentious who are joined to Satan’s army. They say they are Jews but are not.”

It is Adventists that this quote speaks of as engaging in "blasphemy" through human worldly policy and a pretention of the genuine faith. It is Adventists who are spoken of as claiming to be "Jews but are not." It is Adventists being told precisely how to reply when told to submit to those who require worship, while claiming to have "genuine religious sentiments:" "Answer, No."

Pastor Chick: Halleluyah!

This concludes my notes on the subject; I expect there are more insights to be had, and there are certainly several passages of Scripture that have not made it into my brief summary tonight. I would now like to open the floor for discussion and input from the brethren; are there any with comments, questions, insights, etc. to share?

Zahakiel: C

Lucan: Go ahead

Zahakiel: As I read through the notes that Bro. Luke has presented tonight, a number of thoughts come to mind that may help us to solidify our understanding of the connection between the Mark of The Beast and the concept of blasphemy. The Book of Revelation is a revelation of contrasts... The thing it reveals is not primarily the end of the world, as it is often depicted, but the character of the Father and Son. By contrast, it reveals the mind and character of Satan, and if the Book is read with this purpose in mind, some of its mysteries become clearer. While nominal and misguided Christians struggle with the identification of the Mark of the Beast, CSDAs know that it is a matter of rejecting the worship of Yahweh, and taking on the mind of the Beast; that is, it is the thoughts rooted in the flesh. The Dragon is Satan himself, and the beast is Satan as he acts through human beings... a "warm blooded" creature that nevertheless has the heart of rebellion.

One definition of blasphemy that I have not heard... but that I think is perhaps most useful to this discussion as it applies to Yahweh, is that it is the opposite of worship. Neither of these words, blasphemy or worship, have simple, perfect definitions in English. They require spiritual insight to really understand.

Worship is partly a mental exercise, ascribing all power and majesty to Yahweh. It is also a principle that can be expressed through words and actions. True religion, as the Word says, is expressed in how we treat the weaker and defenseless... how we care for one another.

By perfect contrast, blasphemy CAN be defined as replacing Yahweh, as it usually and sufficiently is, but more fundamentally than that... it is taking away (in one's mind) the all-mighty and perfect character of Yahweh, so that one comes to believe that He CAN be replaced by a lesser being: Satan, self, pope, or General Conference.

As with worship, blasphemy is primarily a mental activity, of not seeing Yahweh as the Most High and the All Mighty, but it may also be expressed in words and actions. Violating the commandment to not use Yahweh's name in vain is blasphemy, because it treats His

name as less than holy. Even people who say things like "Oh, my God" as an expression of surprise and dismay... even though we know that 'God' is not our Father's name, and barely His title... the act is still an expression of blasphemy, because in the mind of the person speaking those words, they are treating what they think is His name as a common thing, replaceable with any other expression of disgust, and not worthy to be spoken with reverence. It is a phrase with no purpose except, (as Bro. Luke described as the source of the word) to harm the reputation of the concept of "God."

Claiming to be divine when one is not is likewise blasphemy, because if we could be like Him, then He would be like us... which is infinitely less than the reality of His divine nature.

Satan, in attempting to take Yah's place... holds himself up as a suitable substitute, and his activities on earth set up a Mark of the Beast as a spiritual sign on those who accept His reasoning. Such people are inevitably lost, because only infinite love and power can save a soul from the sinful state... Satan cannot do it, but in removing worship from Yahweh he blasphemes, and causes others to do the same. Those who do not worship Yahweh are marked, because like Cain their minds are turned away from the divine nature and purposes of the Creator, away from His limitless glory to a lesser thing... Satan himself, self, or some earthly and non-divine power to which they give reverence.

This is precisely why those in the last days, as described by Ellen White, so mysteriously give up the faith, because they no longer worship. They no longer hold in their minds (as Paul references in Romans) the glory that is Yah's character. They have submitted to specious, or misleading, temptations. They cannot have victory, and they do not overcome the Beast and its image. They cannot have the Faith of Yahshua, and so they take the Mark rather than receiving the seal of Yah's perfect approval. I think that is all that has come to mind for now. End.

Elyna 1: Nattie: Q

Lucan: Go ahead

Elyna 1: Those who are blaspheming, do they always know that they are? The obvious answer is yes, since they will be punished. So she is still wondering about those that may be ignorantly doing it, like saying "OMG" etc. End.

Pastor Chick: A

Lucan: Go ahead

Pastor Chick: The Church is God's safety for those who seek to worship Yahweh. Babes in Christ are likely to err on occasion, but, a sanctified member of the family of Yah will save the life of that erring one through proper correction and the erring child, being born from above, will go forward in victory and the faith of Yahshua. There will be no forgetting...

Adriel7777: Amen

Pastor Chick: because the most holy worship of the Most High is what satisfies the soul.
End

Adriel7777: Amen

Elyna 1: Guerline: C

Lucan: Go ahead

Elyna 1: I think the question needed to be rephrased as those that blaspheme in ignorance, will they receive the same punishment as those that know they are. I believe that they will be treated like any other sins. Yet even their ignorance Yah winks at for knowledge has increased. I think this is a good topic to study and ponder upon, even beyond this meeting. I will certainly look at it closer in the next few weeks. Thanks for all these points Bro Luke. End.

Barb: C/Q

Lucan: Go ahead

Barb: I think this has been a good study so far. I understand that the name of SDA registered is a blasphemous name. How do we tie all of this together so we can explain to other Adventists that that name is the mark of the beast, when they say that the mark of the beast is of the first beast? End.

Elyna 1: (Thank you for your answer Pastor.)

Zahakiel: A

Lucan: Go ahead

Zahakiel: Well, I suppose I have a question as well. Do we encounter SDAs commonly who say the Mark is of the first beast? The Great Controversy spells this out pretty clearly although I suppose less are reading books like that these days than they used to... but to reply to how we tie the registered name SDA to the concept of blasphemy, the comment I gave earlier addresses that. If we understand blasphemy to be a principle in opposition to worship, then anything that arises as a result of losing worship is blasphemous.

When the SDAs registered their name, they did so with a very specific reason, to ask the world to protect them. They did this because they did not believe, or accept, that Yah would defend His Church. In their minds, He was no longer All-mighty, and would not act to defend His Bride. Any act that comes forth from this belief is an act of blasphemy. End.

Pastor Chick: A

Lucan: As far as I know, all SDAs believe the mark of the beast is of the first beast. The idea is that the second beast causes men to form an image to the first beast, and enforces its mark. Sunday was the expectation here, because it can be clearly shown as a mark, or

sign of authority, of the Papacy. And, I think this is where we are trying to address the crux of the issue - the principles and prophecies that apply to Sunday worship need to also apply to the trademark. How the trademark can be a "mark" of the first beast is difficult, unless we understand the first beast to be "full of names of blasphemy," with a mark that is a "name of blasphemy..." So, Sunday worship would also need to be a "name of blasphemy..." I have some thoughts on this line, but I want to let Pastor give his input here. Go ahead Pastor.

Pastor Chick: I have much to say, but am handicapped by typing on this phone keyboard.

Firstly... we see that blasphemy is multi-faceted and the first beast is FULL of blasphemies. (Plural)

Secondly... Rev 13:16 introduces "the mark"; as "A mark"... implying this mark is potentially one of several or many. What I considered as a simplified way to introduce the GENERAL description of "the mark of the beast" would be to use the literal wording of the Bible... "The (a) mark, that is, the name of the beast". Then, referring back to THE BEAST in Rev. 13:1, which speaks of its "name of blasphemy" ... "name of the beast" = "name of blasphemy" ... "mark of the beast" = "name of the beast" = "name of blasphemy" ...

Elyna 1: Peter: C/Q

Pastor Chick / Barb: SO, the simple conclusion would be... The "mark of the beast" is "the name of blasphemy" keeping in mind that this "name of blasphemy" can take form in multiple possible ways since the BEAST is "full of blasphemies" which might be manifested in multiple ways.

Sunday sacredness enforced on a people, while forbidding true worship would obviously be A "name of blasphemy" and when the principles given in the Christ, the Beast, and the Corporation are brought in we can see the IMAGE parallel easily enough and we can develop the TRADEMARK NAME as a literal fulfillment of the MARK... the "mark of the beast" which is equivalent to "the name of blasphemy". END.

Lucan: Go ahead, Peter

Elyna 1: (Peter) The Name or the mark of the Beast: "Seventh Day Adventist TM" is a type or parallel with King Saul, who blasphemed and took the name of Yah in vain when he took the place of Samuel the high priest and offered sacrifice. And more than that, in his further and total desperation, went to the witch of Endor. The SDA in desperation, went to the US Gov. to try regain or maintain power over the people of Yah. End for now.

Lucan: I am inclined to see the mark as being relatively flexible; that is, when a government (beast) exercises religious authority, it is blasphemy. And, any requirement they impose that runs cross with the true faith is a mark of blasphemy. I think this would explain how 666 can be a mark of the beast, despite it being, from the best I can tell, a

warning against Nero and emperor worship well before the Papacy was conceived. But, it is a mark of blasphemy.

Something Pastor has brought up is how the Papal beast is full of blasphemies, or names of blasphemy. Sunday is one that comes front and center, but realistically, ANY of the various persecutions and forced blasphemies from that power could qualify, as I see it. So, along with Sunday worship being forced being a name of blasphemy, we might add the trinity being forced on a people as a name of blasphemy, easter being forced on a people as a name of blasphemy, saint worship being forced on a people as a name of blasphemy... I think it becomes clear very quickly why that beast is "full" of them. This character, or name of blasphemy, ends up being in contrast to the character, or name of Yahweh...

Adriel7777: (Nods)

Lucan: It forces a decision between accepting a mark of blasphemy - submitting to one who requires blasphemy, either by rendering worship to the beast power, or participating directly in blasphemy one's self. Or, rendering service to Yahweh, in whatever the case is...

I think this would explain why the early Adventists were entirely correct to see Sunday worship as the mark of the beast, had it come to pass as such. And, why we are entirely correct to see the trademark as the mark of the beast, as it has come to pass as such. And, ANY such union of church and state, requiring men to choose between service to Yahweh and blasphemy - worshipping an image, or idol.

I suppose the mark would be "of the first beast" in this sense because that beast is known for blasphemy; it is full of them; it is the defining characteristic of the Papacy that it is blasphemous. You could even say it is it's name. 😊 That is all I have for the moment; any others?

Pastor Chick / Barb: C

Lucan: Go ahead

Pastor Chick / Barb: Actually a question. Do you see any difference in what Bro. Luke is saying and what I have said? It seems we are on the same page, but with varying words and depth. END

Adriel7777: Yes.

Lucan: Yeah, I was a bit surprised when you started saying basically what I had in mind. 😊

Adriel7777: (Bro. David as well)

Lucan: I think we are on the same page as far as I can tell.

Pastor Chick / Barb: C

Lucan: Go ahead

Pastor Chick / Barb: If we can convince Adventists to START with the GENERAL conclusion of what the "mark of the beast" IS and then, break down HOW the enforcement of Sunday Sabbath is "a name of blasphemy" and HOW the TM NAME is a "name of blasphemy" and getting them to understand the fact that ANY "name of blasphemy" could fulfill the prophecy, according to the generation we might see some movement to present truth. END.

Lucan: I think it might be challenging to get most Adventists away from the idea that the mark is a Sabbath issue... I wonder if what Bro. David brought in, regarding blasphemy being the opposite of worship, can shed some light on that. I mean, if one is blaspheming, they are definitely not keeping the Sabbath in spirit.

Zahakiel: C

Lucan: Go ahead

Zahakiel: I often find it simpler, when looking at potentially complex issues, to examine the motives of those involved. This is why I began by defining blasphemy as I did. The common thread in all the activities you and Pastor have described... from trademarking the name, to forcing Sunday sacredness, to promoting the veneration of the saints... they all have losing confidence in Yah's perfection at their root. This is what makes blasphemy the sin it is... because it removes reverence for Yah from the mind, and results in this multitude of activities, the many "names" of blasphemy, or forms it can take. End.

Pastor Chick / Barb: C

Lucan: Go ahead

Pastor Chick / Barb: To avoid trying to "convince" a believer of our view we have the instructions to herald the angels' messages "in their order". A person who cannot receive the first angel will not follow the second with a sanctified spirit etc. But, what we are discussing CAN solidify the concept of the 4th Angel, and not only for new-comers, but for those of us who have been hanging on for years without seeing a harvest and having questions arise. This study nips in the bud any questions that Satan might suggest to our people. I recall times when most of us have wondered HOW to apply the TM to the first beast... I think YAH has given us a sound answer to any of those types of questions. END.

Barb: C

Adriel7777: Amen

Barb: Another thought that might help some: Since the image of the beast is a reflection of the beast, the name of the image is also the name of the beast. End.

Lucan: Are there any other questions or comments on this subject?

Pastor Chick / Barb: C

Lucan: Go ahead

Elyna 1: Q/C

Pastor Chick / Barb: I pray that YAH will inspire an article OR some sort of writing that ties all of this together. It would be potentially useful for future evangelism, I think. END.

Barb: Amen

Lucan: Go ahead, Guerline

Elyna 1: SDAs believe that the image of the beast is a thing: "Sunday sacredness" etc., but the Image of the beast cannot be a thing but a person because it causes people to worship the beast. Not sure if and how this ties into the concept we are discussing. Anything to that? End

Pastor Chick / Barb: A

Lucan: I'm a bit puzzled. The image of the beast is a union of church and state. It enforces a mark, which was expected to be Sunday sacredness. Go ahead, Pastor/Barb

Pastor Chick / Barb: I would suggest reviewing the video: The Christ, the Beast, and the Corporation. END.

Elyna 1: C

Lucan: Go ahead

Elyna 1: Right Pastor. I seem to understand what we and the bible say the image is but I was looking at what they say it is... Oh they believe the same thing as us. It is a union but what they believe differently is what that union does, and how it does it. So we are saying that the name and the Mark ties into the names of blasphemy spoken of in Revelation, right? End.

Pastor Chick / Barb: A

Lucan: Go ahead

Pastor Chick / Barb: Very simply, what I am saying at this point... The mark of the beast is a name of blasphemy, when taking the words of Scripture as they are written... that is, combining Rev. 13:16, 17, and verse 1. The image is stated to be "of the beast". The BEAST is the Papacy, a combination of Roman government with the apostate Catholic Church... a "church-state union". The SDA Corporation is a direct parallel with the Papacy, a union of church and state which becomes an IMAGE of the BEAST, created by the Lamb-like beast. END. (See Bible Readings for the Home, for what the image is.)

Elyna 1: Right on. 😊 C

Lucan: Go ahead

Elyna 1: That is what I understand, but we are trying to show that the mark is blasphemy. Of course it is. But I believe the difficulty is to get SDAs and offshoots to accept the first Angel. End.

Lucan: Are there any other comments? If not, I'll ask Pastor to offer the closing prayer.

Pastor Chick / Barb: Dear Father in Heaven. We thank You for this inspiring and enlightening study. We pray that ALL will see the simplicity of the Gospel and surrender to the call of the Mighty Angel. For those who flirt with Your Bride, but without consummation we pray that a terrible conviction will come upon them and that they see the wisdom of YAH in gathering His remnant Church for the final conflict and preparation for translation. But for those who linger in the valley of decision the day will come, and final as it must be when the Voice from Heaven will be, Too Late, Too Late. Bless us with Sabbath rest, as we continue in sanctified worship. In YAHSHUA's holy name, AMEN.

Barb: Amen

Zahakiel: Amen.

Lucan: Amen

daphna: Amen

Elyna 1: Amen.

Adriel7777: Amen

Pastor Chick / Barb: Let us always be ready to give "a reason of the hope that is within us." It has been recently stated... Adventists believe the Bible because Ellen White quoted it. It would be blasphemy to worship EGW. It would be blasphemy to worship a "pet doctrine." We must go deeper in the Mind of Christ in order to accurately discern the many fingers of blasphemy. Blessings to all.