

Gnosticism and the Biblical Canon

From:

"Levi Self" <le*****@***.com>

To:

[BCC list]

Date:

Jul 10, 2025 9:10:58 PM

#30 | My Shocking Discovery of John Calvin's
"gnostic" Canon of Scripture

youtu.be

“In this episode, I cover one of the most shocking discoveries I made as a protestant exploring the Catholic Church: John Calvin, and many other protestant sects, were **"gnostics" when it came to the canon of Scripture** (which books should be in the Bible). In fact, *their account of how we can know the canon of Scripture was eerily similar to the "burning in the bosom" Latter-Day Saints (Mormons) use to vouch for the Book of Mormon. We consider the disturbing implications of this.*”

The implications of this reach into every corner of Protestantism, as virtually all denominations in Protestantism believe similarly: some even saying that you can “taste” true authentic scriptures. Without an infallible teaching authority, each are tossed to and fro by their own understanding of what Scripture *is* and what Scripture *means*.

May God bless you as you seek Him!

In Christ Jesus,

Levi Self

“Now this is eternal life: That they may know thee, the only true God, and Jesus Christ, whom thou hast sent.

Holy Father, keep them in thy name whom thou hast given me: that they may be one, as we also are.

That they all may be one, as thou, Father, in me, and I in thee; that they also may be one in us:

I in them, and thou in me: that they may be made perfect in one: and the world may know that thou hast sent me and hast loved them, as thou hast also loved me.”

Re: Gnosticism and the Biblical Canon

From:

"Mark Bullen" <mb*****@*****.net>

To:

"Levi" <le*****@***.com>

Date:

Jul 11, 2025 6:27:44 AM

Your heresy has been thoroughly answered and exposed.

Re: Gnosticism and the Biblical Canon

From:

"Levi Self" <le*****@***.com>

To:

"Mark Bullen" <mb*****@*****.net>

Date:

Jul 11, 2025 10:45:34 AM

You introduced an interesting topic: heresy.

But that begs an important question.

Heresy is not just error... it's formally defined and declared by a **visible, authoritative** body established by Christ, to safeguard the Faith and preserve the unity of the Church throughout all times. It is this authority that allows Christians everywhere to know definitively: what is true vs. false, orthodox vs. heterodox.

In the video, I pointed out a troubling reality about the Protestant Biblical Canon: that it was known by many Reformers, including Calvin, not through an objective, historical authority, but through **private, inward revelation**. This epistemology mirrors the gnostic principle condemned by the early Church, and is disturbingly similar to how LDS justify the Book of Mormon.

But if heresy is to be determined by each autonomous local congregation, based on **their own** private interpretation of Scripture, how is any declaration of heresy **universally binding**? How does one congregation's judgment become the standard for all Christians everywhere?

Without a visible, infallible teaching office established by Christ, each individual or group becomes their own magisterium. Every man does that which is right in his own eyes, sincerely believing his interpretation is the correct one.

So I ask: when you label something "heresy," is this a judgment issued by an authority instituted by Jesus Christ to bind consciences? Or is it simply the conclusion of your particular interpretation within your local, autonomous congregation?

In Christ Jesus,

Levi Self

"That thou art Peter; and upon this rock I will build my church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it.

And I will give to thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven. And whatsoever thou shalt bind upon earth, it shall be bound also in heaven: and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth, it shall be loosed also in heaven."

Re: Gnosticism and the Biblical Canon

From:

"Mark Bullen" <mb*****@*****.net>

To:

"Levi" <le*****@***.com>

Date:

Jul 11, 2025 12:24:43 PM

The books that the protestants did not include in their Bible were books that the Jews did not include in the Hebrew Bible. It does not affect the New Testament Text, Does not need the phony Magisterium, Does not help the papists and Mary worshippers one bit.

You, LIKE Mormons and Gnostics do not rely on the Scripture anyhow, but have long left it with your popish presumption and rest on the magisterium, not the Scripture. The Mormons do not rest on the books of Mormon, but on their present President/Prophet, etc.

The reason we have the books in our Bible that we do is because the oracles of God, delivered to the Jews, was found in the Hebrew Bible, and the New Covenant books were those from the Jewish Apostles and their direct Jewish associates which they oversaw. This is the Word of God, and your establishment presumption is Satan's Counterfeit.... the antichrist system

Go kiss your Mary statue and ask yourself if Paul would do that.

We have the visible infallible Word of God from the Apostles, and This is what we are supposed to build upon.

Re: Gnosticism and the Biblical Canon

From:

"Levi Self" <le*****@****.com>

To:

"Mark Bullen" <mb*****@*****.net>

Date:

Jul 11, 2025 5:22:15 PM

Dear Mark,

Your explanation gives some insight into your understanding of this very important topic, and I can see now why you do not agree with some of the Reformers, especially Calvin, with his personal illumination which "confirmed" to him the canon, and also the Westminster Confession, which basically affirmed the same thing - "*our full persuasion and assurance of the infallible truth and divine authority [of the Holy Scriptures], is from the inward work of the Holy Spirit bearing witness*" - (Westminster Confession, Chapter 1, Paragraph 5)

And not relying on a "*inward witness*", "*spiritual experience*" or "*burning in the bosom*" to know what the revealed Scriptures are, is **commendable**. You are placing your trust of the biblical canon in an entity outside of your own personal feelings, which is good and right, as God does not speak individually to us to reveal what the inspired books are nor was the table of contents ever revealed by public revelation (which ended with St. John).

You are right in saying that the Protestant Old Testament collection of books is identical to that of the Hebrew Bible, *i.e.*, *the Masoretic Text*. But as was brought to my attention about 2 years ago, **this canon** (of only the Old Testament books) **was not finalized until well after Christ's resurrection by the Christ rejecting Jews at the Council of Jamnia, ~90 A.D.** As you have previously pointed out, the Septuagint was used by the people of Jesus' day, quoted by the Apostles and was the Old Testament Scriptures in circulation by the predominately Greek speaking Church, as these Old Testament Scriptures were copied into Greek before Christ. The Septuagint, as you know, *includes the deuterocanonical books*, which have been included since the first Christian biblical canon. To choose the Masoretic Text over the Septuagint is choosing modern antichrist Judaism over the Apostles. *But I digress.*

So more on topic: you wrote that "*the New Covenant books were those from the Jewish Apostles and their direct Jewish associates which they oversaw,*" and that "*we have the visible infallible Word of God from the Apostles.*"

But this raises a deeper question:

Who determined which writings were truly apostolic and which were

not? Who decided that 2nd Peter, Revelation, and Hebrews were inspired, while books like 1st Clement or the Shepherd of Hermas, written by direct associates of the apostles were not?

We both agree that Scripture is infallible. But the issue is **not the nature of Scripture**, but rather **how the canon was known, recognized, and universally received**, especially given that many canonical books of the New Testament were disputed for centuries (See Eusebius' *Ecclesiastical History* (Book III, Chapter 25), Origen (quoted in Eusebius, *Ecclesiastical History* 6.25.8), Jerome (*Preface to the Catholic Epistles*), *Muratorian Fragment*, (lines 71–72), Cyril of Jerusalem (*Catechetical Lecture IV*, 36)).

The Apostles themselves did not leave behind a completed & compiled New Testament, nor did St. John leave us an authorized and infallible *Table of Contents for the New Testament*. That process unfolded over time and required **discernment** by the early Church, guided by the Holy Spirit, long before any Bible was printed.

So let me ask plainly:

How can you know with certainty that your Bible contains the correct list of inspired books for your New Testament?

In Christ Jesus,

Levi Self

Therefore, brethren, stand fast; and hold the traditions which you have learned, whether by word, or by our epistle.

Re: Gnosticism and the Biblical Canon

From:

"Mark Bullen" <mb*****@*****.net>

To:

"Levi" <le*****@***.com>

Date:

Jul 11, 2025 8:07:15 PM

Who disputes that the New Testament Canon was established *based on **who wrote, not on who wrote the list***. The epistles and Gospels were copied and passed around long before there was ever a Roman Catholic. The big lie is that *all church history was the same as Roman Catholics are today* -- they say it over and over in the council of Trent docs. But that is a lie and not hard to expose. The first century believers knew who wrote what and **Who Wrote** was the basis.

The lists written and decided on by churchmen (before Romanism existed) does not change the facts that true believers cherished, read, and recognized the writings of the apostles as inspired of God from the time they first circulated. The only one's who much later questioned it were the ones who had not received that particular book and needed to be convinced it was from an apostle. The writings of Clement of Rome were NEVER considered Scripture or from any apostle -- and he was not a Jew, to whom were committed the oracles of God. He was not a papist either, and his writing was not under the oversight of an Apostle. The writings of the Apostle's associates that were inspired were due to being written under the oversight of the living Apostles, not after their death.

The Jews recognized the *deuterocanonical books* as not of equal authority with the Tanakh which they had in Hebrew in the first century -- "finalized" is a flimsy word of deceit.

Who determined which writings were truly apostolic and which were not?

-- The local congregations and their pastors who were witnesses in the first century -- NOT the highjacked Roman clergy who did not exist at that early age.

-- Lists began to be made of accepted books due to the attack on the Bible which Marcion led.

-- The Local Apostolic Assemblies were the ones who preserved the Scriptures entrusted to them.

But as said before, You, like the Mormons, do not rely on the Scriptures, but on your presumed inspiration -- So the Word of God has been usurped and why would you bother arguing about the Canon of Scripture? You don't even hold it as the Final Authority for faith and practice anyway.

The *deuterocanonical books* do not support your false doctrines anyhow -- Why are you concerned about them?

NO Apostle ever said, "it is written" and then quoted the apocryphal books

Re: Gnosticism and the Biblical Canon

From:

"Levi Self" <le*****@***.com>

To:

"Mark Bullen" <mb*****@*****.net>

Date:

Jul 11, 2025 11:04:44 PM

Dear Mark,

Thank you again for your thoughtful response.

We can both agree on one thing for certain: **Marcion was a dangerous heretic.**

His rejection of the Old Testament and his severely truncated canon of New Testament writings was a direct attack on the fullness of the Gospel and the apostolic witness.

But that's precisely why I find your view of the canon somewhat *puzzling*.

If the canon of Scripture was obvious to all true believers from the beginning, if, as you said, "*local congregations and their pastors... preserved the Scriptures entrusted to them*", then how did Marcion's canon gain so much traction? How did entire Christian communities fall into confusion over which books were truly apostolic? And why did the Church need to respond with increasing clarity and formal recognition of the canon if it was never in doubt to begin with?

As you noted, "*lists began to be made... due to the attack on the Bible which Marcion led.*"

That's precisely the point: it took time, effort, and discernment to define the canon because it wasn't self-evident. The crisis Marcion provoked forced the Church to act; but the definitive list of the 27 New Testament books wasn't finalized until the end of the 4th century (e.g., Councils of Rome [382], Hippo [393], and Carthage [397]).

If the canon were truly obvious to all faithful Christians from the start, the Marcionite threat would never have required such a response. But the fact that the Church needed to authoritatively settle the matter centuries later, and that **she did so with enduring consensus**, is proof that an infallible authority was necessary to recognize and define the canon.

You also referenced Romans 3:2, "*to them were committed the oracles of God*", to imply that only Jewish authors or communities could have preserved inspired Scripture. But that verse refers specifically to the *Old Testament Scriptures* given to Israel. The New Testament, by contrast, was entrusted to the Church: the Body of Christ made up of both Jew and Gentile, no longer bound to ethnic Israel but united in Christ. If apostolic authorship is your standard, then I must ask: by what authority were books like Mark, Luke, Acts, or Hebrews accepted, despite their uncertain or non-apostolic authorship? Again, the answer is not obvious or automatic. **It required discernment, and it required authority.**

You said that the Church did not give us the canon, but that believers simply "*recognized*" what was apostolic. But the Marcion episode proves that "*recognition*" varied dramatically and was far from universal. If "*recognition*" was enough, why were authoritative lists needed at all? Why were bishops and theologians (like Eusebius, Origen, and Jerome) still unsure of certain books as late as the 4th century?

The conclusion seems inescapable: the only reason the New Testament canon is known to us today, complete and closed, is because *the Church*, guided by the Holy Spirit, declared it so. The Church didn't create the canon, but she did have to identify and affirm it, as it was not "*self-evident*".

I do believe you are misinformed or misunderstanding the role of Scripture in the Church.

Holy Scripture is a central item in our liturgy where the Epistle & the Gospel is read daily and the Psalms are prayed at specified times throughout the day by those in religious orders. The entire Canon of the Mass is filled with Scripture through and through. In Holy Mass, after the reading of the Gospel, the Priest kisses the Gospel as an act of veneration, because it contains the words and deeds of Christ. Sacred Scripture is one strand of the threefold cord which encompasses authority; it is the infallible written public revelation that can only be known by the sacred apostolic tradition which was passed down through the successors of the Apostles. Scripture is held in the high esteem, but it cannot function as the sole or final authority apart from the Apostolic Tradition through which it is known, received, and correctly interpreted. And Sacred Scripture is not "*self interpreting*" per se, as it is an inanimate object that **requires an interpreter**. Even St. Peter says that some of St. Paul's epistles are "*hard to be understood, which the unlearned and unstable wrest, as they do also the other scriptures*". Sacred Scripture requires an interpreter, an interpretation or an explanation, and there are countless interpretations available today which lead men astray into all sorts of devious heresies and errors. The Church is the only entity given authority by Jesus Christ

to bind and loose, the keys of the kingdom, and can infallibly interpret and teach the Sacred Scripture in light of Sacred Tradition by the teaching of the Holy Spirit whom Christ promised to send to lead her into all truth. Sacred Scripture itself affirms that the Church is the pillar and ground of truth.

In Christ Jesus,

Levi Self

But if I tarry long, that thou mayest know how thou oughtest to behave thyself in the house of God, which is the church of the living God, the pillar and ground of the truth.

Re: Gnosticism and the Biblical Canon

From:

"Mark Bullen" <mb*****@*****.net>

To:

"Levi" <le*****@***.com>

Date:

Jul 12, 2025 7:10:42 AM

How did entire Christian communities fall into confusion over which books were truly apostolic?

Right, and how did entire Christian communities fall prey to the false Romanist priesthood, idolatry, popery, etc.? Men with conflict of interest, hungry for power, riches, security, admiration, etc. Thus the rise of the antichristian papacy. Marcion didn't just altar the LIST, he edited books -- but just like with Mormonism -- How did so many people follow a nut like Joseph Smith and B. Young? How did so many people follow Muhammed? Satan is working to destroy God's salvation program, high-jacking and monetizing, and this turned out to be not so hard with so many willing covetous, power hungry men.

God is the one who preserved His Word, it wasn't the Romanists who worked very hard to keep it from the people God intended it to go to. The early Congregations who were used of God to preserve it, were not Roman Catholics. The rise of Romanism is the rise of Christendom grossly ignorant of God's Word and full of man-made superstitions and unbiblical rituals.

Officially recognizing the books of the Canon was established prior to Romanism, and that was of no consequence to them, because they didn't follow it anyway, it was just part of the false front while they did as they pleased and claimed infallibility as the only ones who really could understand the very Scripture written to common Christians.

ALL the writers of Scripture were Jewish -- This is what "to them were committed the oracles of God" means. The Gentiles were grafted in, and they did not receive the oracles of God. Preserving the Scripture is not the same. "The Church" which you love to speak -- is ekklesia "The Local Congregation" of God's saints -- "The Local Assembly of true believers" -- NOT the Priests, Cardinals, Popes, etc. of the Romanist system. You assume that the Roman Catholic system IS THE CHURCH -- that is blindness.

Are you listening?

If apostolic authorship is your standard, then I must ask: by what authority were books like Mark, Luke, Acts, or Hebrews accepted, despite their uncertain or non-apostolic authorship?

I answered that, and told you how that was different than Clement and Hermas -- Are you not listening? These men were traveling and working with LIVING Apostles who gave credence to their writing. Which books were accepted was not left to a Romanist to figure out, but was known and cared for by true believers in the local congregations of the first century. Peter obviously read all or most of Paul's epistles before AD 70, yet none of them were sent to Peter by Paul. Justin Martyr testifies very early that the Christians gathered and read the memoirs of the Apostles. During the persecutions many died trying to preserve the Scriptures. I repeat, The early churches were not the same as the Romanist system you follow.

You said that the Church did not give us the canon, but that believers simply "recognized" what was apostolic.

NO, I said the Local Congregations, NOT the Romanist "Church" Knew what was apostolic and preserved such. God entrusted the Scriptures to the local assemblies to whom they were sent; and they preserved, copied, and

circulated them by God's providence for us. The Romanists Did Not make that decision, but simply received that from the Christians prior to their day, and while they tout the list given to them, they trample on the Scriptures and Do not obey them. The Scriptures were sent to congregations of common Christians who clearly understood what they said without a Romanist to Interpret them - amazing isn't it?

Why were bishops and theologians (like Eusebius, Origen, and Jerome) still unsure of certain books as late as the 4th century?

The same reason men like Origen castrated himself, and Jerome was the father of Monasticism, and Eusebius is of questionable character in his history -- They were men affected by the errors of their day - Like in the churches of Revelation 2 & 3 - speaking their own opinions, and not the representatives of the elect of God who did not bow the knee to the image of baal.

God has always preserved a remnant -- Ro 11:3 Lord, they have killed thy prophets, and digged down thine altars; and I am left alone, and they seek my life.

4 But what saith the answer of God unto him? I have reserved to myself seven thousand men, who have not bowed the knee to the image of Baal.

5 Even so then at this present time also there is a remnant according to the election of grace.

The Apostles were the only authoritative men who can be trusted to be led of the Spirit into All Truth --

That is why they are the key to the Scriptures, NOT the hierarchy of the papal antichrist system. You have surrendered your brain and faith in God's Word to the antichrist, and happily swallow everything he says -- because you want it to be true.

Of the seven churches of Revelation, the most prominent, authoritative one we would have expected to be the Ephesians -- but even they had veered off course and needed to be corrected -- corrected by what? By the original standard set forth by the Apostles -- the FIRST Works and Love. Rome was not even spoken of, and it only gained prominence by being the western seat of the empire. Power loving men used that to gain the ascendancy and Satan used that to hi-jack many congregations for his own agenda. Romanists are revisionists when it comes to history, and they always try to keep a good front. God knows why you have embraced it, and you will give account to Him when it is time.

Again:

But as said before, You, like the Mormons, do not rely on the Scriptures, but on your presumed inspiration -- So the Word of God has been usurped and why would you bother arguing about the Canon of Scripture? You don't even hold it as the Final Authority for faith and practice anyway.

The *deuterocanonical books* do not support your false doctrines anyhow -- Why are you concerned about them?

NO Apostle ever said, "it is written" and then quoted the apocryphal books

Romanists do not receive the Scriptures as FINAL authority of faith and practice -- when you leave this, you wonder in the world of deception.

Re: Gnosticism and the Biblical Canon

From:

"Levi Self" <le*****@***.com>

To:

"Mark Bullen" <mb*****@*****.net>

Date:

Jul 12, 2025 9:00:58 AM

Dear Mark,

Thank you for continuing this exchange. I've read your response and what's at stake here is too important to be taken lightly by either of us.

You've argued that the early local congregations "*knew*" which books were apostolic, that those books were "*recognized*" by the faithful from the beginning, and that later councils merely acknowledged what had already been preserved.

But that raises an honest historical question I can't seem to get around: if the canon was universally known and recognized early on, especially by numerous local churches scattered across the Roman world, why don't we see any clear, **consistent lists of canonical books from the 1st or 2nd centuries**? We should expect dozens of such lists, especially if each local assembly was independently preserving and copying the authentic books. And yet, what we do find (*Muratorian Fragment*, *Origen*, *Eusebius*, *Cyril*, etc.) shows disagreement, uncertainty, and regional variation even into the 4th century. The oldest surviving list (*Muratorian Fragment* dating around 170AD) does not mention Hebrews, James, 1st Peter, 2nd Peter, or 3rd John

Further, if these early churches already "*knew*" the canon, how do we explain Marcion? **Why would he have felt the need to construct his own list in the 2nd century?** More importantly, why did his list provoke such alarm and debate among the churches, if a universally accepted canon was *already circulating*? If local believers were confidently preserving the full New Testament corpus, Marcion's list should have been instantly dismissed as a bizarre deviation from not only his own local congregation, but also surrounding congregations that already had *apostolic lists*. Instead, it triggered a long process of discernment in the Church that spanned centuries.

Finally, if there was already universal consensus, why did the Church find it necessary to settle the matter definitively through regional councils in the late 4th century (*Hippo* and *Carthage*), and why did disputes persist right up to that point? The record shows that books like *Hebrews*, *Revelation*, *2nd Peter*, *James*, and *Jude* were not always accepted, even among those deeply committed to apostolic teaching.

If the canon was clear from the beginning, we would not expect this level of **historical uncertainty** or the need for formal definition.

To say that I "*want it to be true*" and have "*surrendered my brain*" to an antichrist is simply not true, and I believe such a judgment crosses a line that Scripture warns against.

You know the commandment: "*Thou shall not bear false witness against thy neighbor.*"

I did not come to believe in the Catholic Faith because I wanted it to be true, but because I was confronted, often painfully, by what I could no longer ignore.

This was not an emotional or impulsive decision. It was one I wrestled with deeply in prayer, study, and humility, asking God to lead me into all truth, wherever that path led me.

I kept truth at the forefront of my mind and God led me to the one true Church because of my great desire to know what was right.

A lot of your teachings on truth, authority & the Salvation Program helped open my eyes to what was obviously there the whole time, but I had been rejecting from my youth due to biases.

Christ established a Church, a Salvation Program, an infallible teaching authority to steer the faithful through every scenario for the last 2,000 years.

I have said it before and can say it again, I would not have come to understand and accept the Catholic Faith had it not been for God working through *your teachings* for those 10 years to help correct my understanding on authority, truth (objective, not subjective), history (early church, church fathers, AD 70, Moses' seat, Acts 15 - Jerusalem Council), and the Salvation Program (a Church, a Bride, the Ark, no salvation outside of the Church). Having come from more of an anti-authority/anti-establishment family and then associating with the Charity mennonites, I needed a lot of training to even get my mind wrapped around many of the critical points which the Catholic Church teaches. God knew it was going to be extremely difficult, if not impossible, to get me into the true Church without having the rigorous training, which you provided. You helped to cultivate in me the love for truth above anything else and that is why I felt the need to risk everything (friends, relationships, perks) to get to the bottom of it and find truth. God is faithful; He heard my cries and distress of soul during the storm and led us to the rock

of truth. And I appreciate all that you taught and instilled in me to get me to that point. The things that you taught me to lead me to truth have been a great blessing in my life; I do not look over those 10 years with regret, but rather with appreciation of God schooling me in the only way that I would have ever possibly accepted it. I love you all for all that you have done for us in our lives, I appreciate you as neighbors and I desire and pray that God will help use me to return the blessing and bring you all into His one, holy, catholic and apostolic Church, that we may all be one, as Jesus and His Father.

In Christ Jesus,

Levi Self

I am the living bread which came down from heaven. If any man eat of this bread, he shall live for ever; and the bread that I will give, is my flesh, for the life of the world.

Except you eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink his blood, you shall not have life in you. He that eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, hath everlasting life:

For my flesh is meat indeed: and my blood is drink indeed. He that eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, abideth in me, and I in him.

Re: Gnosticism and the Biblical Canon

From:

"Mark Bullen" <mb*****@*****.net>

To:

"Levi" <le*****@***.com>

Date:

Jul 12, 2025 11:52:25 AM

It seems you like putting words in people's mouths and ignoring what has been said to you, just so you can keep talking your ideology. You want the discussion to orbit the topic of the canon, but are ignoring the fact that the canon of Scripture is NOT obeyed by Romanists, so what is the point? The Scriptures prove Romanism corrupt and false. So what is the point? The Scriptures do not support the Magisterium of Romanism. The Scriptures do not support the idolatry and extreme arrogance. The Romanists claim to have given the Scriptures authority -- nonsense - The Apostles gave the Scriptures authority because Christ gave the Apostles authority. If the popes were the inheritors of such authority, then their writings would have been included in the canon of Scripture from the start -- the truth is obvious.

You state: *Sacred Scripture is one strand of the threefold cord which encompasses authority; it is the infallible written public revelation that can only be known by the sacred apostolic tradition which was passed down through the successors of the Apostles. Scripture is held in the high esteem, but it cannot function as the sole or final authority apart from the Apostolic Tradition through which it is known, received, and correctly interpreted.*

If the purpose of *apostolic tradition* is knowing, receiving, and correctly interpreting the Word and rightly understanding the canon of scripture, then you admit that the Scripture is the **Final Authority** and that **Right Interpretation** determines **TRUTH**. If then you depart from the Scripture, you are in error. If you do not follow the *proper interpretation*, you are in error. If you add to the Scripture so as to make the Word of God of none affect by your tradition, then you are in error. If so, then the Scripture is the sole **AUTHORITY** and our correctness and authority comes from properly ascertaining what is Scripture, properly interpreting and applying it.

However, this is only a false front of Romanism, who follows NOT the Scripture which they claim to interpret properly, but they follow piles of their own superstition which does not come from the Scriptures OR the "early church" writers.

THIS IS THE REAL ISSUE.

Some of these "early lists" were discovered hundreds of years later. The Muratorian fragment was discovered in the **18th century**, So how many other lists do we not know about? Obviously God preserving His Word has been the issue, not preserving the lists. And who wrote the list is not important, but who wrote the Epistle or Gospel.

I think one of your misconceptions which has been evident in past exchanges has to do with the formation of the early Christian assemblies. It is evident that the churches began in the EAST, not the WEST, and most of the

epistles were written to the people in the EAST, and may originally been in Aramaic (James and Hebrews for sure) not Greek. The Scriptures that were everywhere available was the Tanakh in the synagogues throughout the Roman Empire and beyond. The letters of the apostles would have been sent to the specific congregations they wrote to, and copied and preserved from there. As more of these copies circulated, the concern was WHO wrote this, NOT who wrote the LIST. The eastern churches would have compiled their canon as they collected more and more letters from the Apostles **before** the Western Churches. The books the Western churches would collect would be the one's circulated closest to them and in the language they understood. God providentially guided the establishment of the canon we possess today through His faithful saints. The only thing we can be certain of is that We have a Bible; and all Christendom receives the books based on WHO wrote them.

WE HAVE A BIBLE -- On This we can all agree. Where and how the Old Testament has been preserved is very hard to prove other than God's providence; and the same is similarly true about the New Testament; but the big issue is properly interpreting it AND THEN OBEYING IT.

You Wrote:

Christ established a Church, a Salvation Program, an infallible teaching authority to steer the faithful through every scenario for the last 2,000 years.

1. NO, Christ did not establish an infallible teaching authority (other than His Apostles and the Scriptures previously existing and those produced by the Apostles) -- It is a lie of Romanism that can be proven false by their many inconsistencies, reverses, outright disobedience to Scripture, and shameful history -- you have been deceived and God knows all the reasons.
2. The Word of God has always been the guide of the faithful -- NOT one western congregation elevating itself and dominating the field in a shameful way.
3. If the churches were an infallible teaching authority, then which of the Seven Churches of Revelation had that? They were all Christ's churches at the time. The early Christians prior to Romanism's hi-jack did not believe such a thing; but always refers to the Scripture for guidance -- NOT the papists.

I have said it before and can say it again, I would not have come to understand and accept the Catholic Faith had it not been for God working through *your teachings* for those 10 years to help correct my understanding on authority, truth (objective, not subjective), history (early church, church fathers, AD 70, Moses' seat, Acts 15 - Jerusalem Council), and the Salvation Program (a Church, a Bride, the Ark, no salvation outside of the Church).

1. Moses' Seat only applied to Judaism as a national religion with a specific family priesthood and temple, and THEY WERE WRONG, had been corrupted, and were cast out of the vineyard, which was then given to the disciples of Jesus -- Romanism is a usurpation and hi-jack of Satan. Each local bishop has a responsibility to teach God's Word clearly, but all his authority is delegated and accountable to the congregation who should not follow a Diotrefes, or a Jezebel, but only what is Scriptural. There is NO infallible "seat" in Judaism or Christianity -- That is usurpation, just like Mormonism's President.
2. The Jerusalem Council was based on Scripture and the direct miraculous working of God through chosen Apostles. Rome is not Jerusalem and the Pope is not the brother of Jesus or an Apostle. The administrative decisions for the unity of the congregations of the Lord were

NOT establishing new doctrine but application of previous Scripture to a new situation. God grafted in Gentiles WHILE the apostles were there to make proper discernments. We are to ONLY contend for THE FAITH ONCE FOR ALL DELIVERED TO THE SAINTS: That body of Doctrine and Practice established in the first century by the Apostles.

3. You have grossly misapplied my teaching to a corrupt and unbiblical organization that has monetized the very priesthood of Jesus in the heavens and numerous other blasphemous usurpations and idolatry.

I am resting my eternal destiny on God's Word as the only infallible standard and authority for the salvation of my soul. The Jews FELL because of having a "Zeal of God, but not according to Right Knowledge" If God spared not the natural branches on this account, take heed lest he also spare not thee.... and your precious family following trustingly behind you.

Praying you will open your eyes in honesty.

Re: Gnosticism and the Biblical Canon

From:

"Levi Self" <le*****@***.com>

To:

"Mark Bullen" <mb*****@*****.net>

Date:

Jul 12, 2025 2:00:14 PM

Dear Mark,

The discussion should orbit around the canon, as the canon defines WHAT scripture even is.

Catholics can point to a particular council in history and can know without any doubt which books constitute as divine revelation / sacred scripture.

Most Protestants rely on some "inward witness" of John Calvin or those who composed the Westminster Confession to know which books should be considered sacred scripture, but this is relying on some man's personal feelings, taste test or special gnosis. You seem to skim past the Reformation all the way to the times of the Apostles and come to the same 66 book canon that Calvin and others claimed to have received by this "inward witness": a 66 book canon that never existed in history until the Reformation. But if the theory you assert, of apostolic lists, actually existed, there should be some form of evidence that supports this claim. But the only lists that have survived antiquity disprove a unified 27 book New Testament canon and the first time in history we find the exact complete 27 book list is actually from the 4th century in *Athanasius' 39th Festal Letter*, just 26 years before the Council of Hippo!

> *"God providentially guided the establishment of the canon we possess today through His faithful saints"*

To which I heartily agree!

> *"but the big issue is properly interpreting it AND THEN OBEYING IT."*

Yes, and this moves into the next major issue: *interpretation*.

So this raises a critical problem: an infallible text *without* an infallible interpreter still leads to *fallible* conclusions.

The fruit of this is plain in Protestantism: thousands of denominations, each insisting on **their own interpretation**, each claiming the Spirit, and many contradicting one another on serious matters of doctrine, morality, and even salvation itself. If Scripture alone is the final authority, why has it produced such division?

Even in the earliest centuries, Scripture was never treated as something that could be privately interpreted apart from the living teaching authority of the Church.

Acts 8:31 is telling: when the Ethiopian eunuch was reading Isaiah, Philip asked, "Do you understand what you are reading?" He replied, "How can I, unless someone guides me?"

Scripture is inspired. It is infallible. But its infallibility doesn't eliminate the need for an authoritative interpreter: **it magnifies the need for one.**

Otherwise, every man becomes a magisterium unto himself, and truth becomes whatever seems most "biblical" to him.

We need more than just a perfect book. We need Christ's living voice through the Church He founded, "the pillar and foundation of truth" (1 Tim 3:15) to teach, interpret, and guard what was entrusted once for all to the saints.

> *"but are ignoring the fact that the canon of Scripture is NOT obeyed by Romanists"*

> *"The Scriptures prove Romanism corrupt and false"*

> *"The Scriptures do not support the Magisterium of Romanism"*

You are exemplifying this problem very clearly.

Because you are trusting in your own understanding, your own judgement, your own reading of sacred scripture, you can not possibly see how the Catholic Church upholds the truth of the Scriptures.

But you obviously have not studied much Catholic Teachings, as when I did, it became apparent to me that the things I had previously been taught (by you) were already believed for centuries by many faithful, holy Catholics. Your teachings and theology aligns pretty close on a lot of issues to that of the Catholic Church and it was the Protestants who maligned and misrepresented what She actually taught. Upon examining the Catechism and actual Catholic Teachings, I realized we had not been far off all this time, but had been working to establish a "parallel" church, hierarchy, structure, beliefs similar to that of the Catholic Church.

> "If the purpose of apostolic tradition is knowing, receiving, and correctly interpreting the Word and rightly understanding the canon of scripture, then you admit that the Scripture is the **Final Authority** and that **Right Interpretation** determines **TRUTH**."

This reflects a misunderstanding. The Catholic Church does not teach that Scripture is the "final authority" in isolation. Rather, the Church teaches that the Word of God comes to us in two modes: Sacred Scripture and Sacred Tradition. These are inseparable, and both are interpreted and safeguarded by the Church's Magisterium (teaching authority).

The Magisterium does not stand above the Word of God, but serves it. It ensures the faithful transmission and correct interpretation of Divine Revelation, both written and oral, throughout history. So, Scripture is not "final authority" alone but part of a threefold structure of authority: Scripture, Tradition, and Magisterium, each serving and supporting the others.

> "If then you depart from the Scripture, you are in error. If you do not follow the proper interpretation, you are in error."
The issue then is: who has the authority to determine the "proper interpretation"?

So yes, departing from Scripture is error, but misinterpreting Scripture without the Church's guidance is also error.

> "but they follow piles of their own superstition which does not come from the Scriptures OR the "early church" writers."

I actually was very much concerned about this myself when I first began my studies into the Church.

There were soo many issues such as the sign of the Cross, holy water, incense, prayers for the dead, the rosary, images, crucifixes, genuflecting, intercessory prayer, sacramentals, etc, etc that all seemed spooky or pagan superstitions. As I approached each issue, investigated, researched, consulted church history, consulted the catechism, found the biblical (and most of the time, ancient Jewish) basis for these things, I realized that I was fed a pile of lies all my life, which upon investigation, all stemmed back to the anti-Catholic Protestant reformation. Christians had been practicing these things for over 1,500 years before the reformation and they each contain a biblical basis!

> "If the churches were an infallible teaching authority, then which of the Seven Churches of Revelation had that?"

I think you are confusing teaching with practice and how the Church actually exercises her teaching authority. Studying some Catholic teachings would be helpful, not to make statements like this.

> "We are to ONLY contend for THE FAITH ONCE FOR ALL DELIVERED TO THE SAINTS: That body of Doctrine and Practice established in the first century by the Apostles."

To which I agree and say Amen.

> "I am resting my eternal destiny on God's Word as the only infallible standard and authority for the salvation of my soul."

You are resting on a fallible standard, as your canon lacks books which God providentially preserved in the Septuagint, in spite of the Christ rejecting Jews.

And you are resting your eternal destiny (and that of those subscribe to your beliefs) on your own fallible interpretation of the infallible sacred Scriptures.

The only infallible source of truth and authority in our world is the Catholic Church, which Christ commissioned to go into all the world (universal) and teach what He had taught them.

The only city that sets on a hill from the times of Christ, which illuminates to the entire world, Jesus Christ and His sacrificial love, is the one, holy, catholic and apostolic Church.

In Christ Jesus,

Levi Self

Another parable he proposed unto them, saying:

The kingdom of heaven is like to a grain of mustard seed, which a man took and sowed in his field.

Which is the least indeed of all seeds; but when it is grown up, it is greater than all herbs, and becometh a tree, so that the birds of the air come, and dwell in the branches thereof.

Re: Gnosticism and the Biblical Canon

From:

"Mark Bullen" <mb*****@*****.net>

To:

"Levi" <le*****@***.com>

Date:

Jul 12, 2025 4:24:36 PM

Most Protestants rely on some "inward witness" of John Calvin

That is a misrepresentation by the Romanists. The internal and external evidence of all written material is considered with the leading of the Holy Spirit. The Quality or internal evidence speaks to those who are intimately familiar with the Scriptures and it's doctrine -- kind of like - my sheep know my voice - which testifies against much of "early church" writings with obvious errors. This is the very reason the Jews also put lesser weight on the apocryphal books. When a book contains things contrary to known doctrine, it makes it suspect.

The New Testament is a little different -- it is not *Who made the list*, but **who wrote the book** -- You are mixing two things that do not mix and only to defend some apocryphal books that do not support your system anyhow. Amazing how democrats, communists, and romanists accuse the other side of their own doing -- YOU are the one's claiming to follow your own infallibility -- You are the one's who will not build solely on the Word of God, but on your own conclusions while claiming infallible teaching ability and understanding.....

But the only lists that have survived antiquity disprove a unified 27 book New Testament canon and the first time in history we find the exact complete 27 book list is actually from the 4th century in *Athanasius' 39th Festal Letter*, just 26 years before the Council of Hippo!

Yes, and the council of Hippo was still 200 years before any bishop assumed to be "ecumenical bishop" and it wasn't even at Rome; but the Roman bishop rebuke John and said that what he declared was antichrist. Maybe if they had internet, phones, computers, typewriters and USPS they could have all agreed to a list of accepted books sooner. What evidence did they use? What evidence did Athanasius use? What evidence did earlier lists use? Was the criteria based on the infallible magisterium? or was the evidence **WHO wrote the book** and **was He conversant with living apostles when he wrote it**. That is criteria that everybody agrees upon -- not your imagined infallible magisterium and assumed tradition -- same lie the Jews used - "The oral law passed down from Moses at Sinai...."

So this raises a critical problem: an infallible text *without* an infallible interpreter still leads to *fallible* conclusions.

So who was the infallible interpreter of the infallible Old Testament? The Sanhedrin? The Sadducees? The Pharisees? The Herodians?

If Scripture alone is the final authority, why has it produced such division?

Ever hear of Satan? Acts 20:29 For I know this, that after my departing shall grievous wolves enter in among you, not sparing the flock.

30 Also of your own selves shall men arise, speaking perverse things, to draw away disciples after them.

31 Therefore watch, and remember, that by the space of three years I ceased not to warn every one night and day with tears.

32 And now, brethren, I commend you to God, and to the word of his grace, which is able to build you up, and to give you an inheritance among all them which are sanctified.

What caused the division While the Apostles were still alive? Judaizers, Gnostics, Diotrefes, Leaving the first love, Luke-warm...

AND what caused all the division in the Romanists camp for hundreds of years - Franciscans, Jesuits, Benedictines, Augustinians, etc. -- Anti-popes and queers, pedophiles, etc. etc. The UNITY of the Romanists is a false front -- YOU know the corruption and division which you have admitted previously -- Don't play like you don't know. Just because the Pope eventually crushes the opposition doesn't mean that their infallible Magisterium created "unity" -- what a falsehood.

This is why we must contend for THE FAITH once for all delivered to the Saints - The saints were not "canonized" by Romanists, they were the disciples of Jesus

Even in the earliest centuries, Scripture was never treated as something that could be privately interpreted apart from the living teaching authority of the Church.

Acts 8:31 is telling: when the Ethiopian eunuch was reading Isaiah, Philip asked, "Do you understand what you are reading?" He replied, "How can I, unless someone guides me?"

Scripture is inspired. It is infallible. But its infallibility doesn't eliminate the need for an authoritative interpreter: **it magnifies the need for one.**

That is a LIE -- the epistles were written to ordinary people before popery was ever thought of or the lie of the Magisterium. The Ethiopian Eunuch was reading a prophecy NOT understood until it was fulfilled... and only wanted to know "who is the prophet speaking of" -- This is a very poor example of your point, because you must explain 1. Who was the infallible interpreter of the Old Testament for all those years? and 2. How is this example even appropriate when we are speaking of New Testament Scripture written FOR THE COMMON MAN TO UNDERSTAND. You have got to see how sad your logic is on this point -- Be Honest.

Because you are trusting in your own understanding, your own judgement, your own reading of sacred scripture, you can not possibly see how the Catholic Church upholds the truth of the Scriptures.

Are you not the one who just previously spoke of all your searching and seeking and researching? Are you debating me or is your priest? Are you using your brain to believe the teaching of the Romanists or just blindly following?

Name it! Name the point of Scripture that I do not understand -- name the doctrine that the Romanists hold that I am wrong on. Hyperdulia over Mary? Maybe the immaculate conception or the assumption or sinless life of Mary or the re-sacrificing of Jesus every mass, or Prayers to the dead, or embellished false stories about Jesus, Mary, or the infallibility of the Pope, or the infallible Magisterium, or the preeminence of Rome and seat of Peter, or maybe his bones, or the lies about Peter being Bishop of Rome while the Bible has him in Judaea, or maybe the slaughter of thousands of innocent people who rejected Mary worship and statues, or the claim of the Pope to be head of all the church world-wide sitting between two cherubims. O what Blasphemy -- maybe we should speak of the celibacy of the priests and all the ungodliness stemming from such disobedience to Scripture.

We need Christ's living voice through the Church He founded, "the pillar and foundation of truth" (1 Tim 3:15) to teach, interpret, and guard what was entrusted once for all to the saints.

Was it entrusted once for all to the saints? Paul was speaking of local assemblies and what they should strive for - Study to show yourself approved rightly dividing the WORD. He was not declaring the infallibility of a certain bishop or group of bishops. The only voice we have is the voice of God's Word and the illuminating Holy Spirit - whom God hath given to those who obey Him. If I am living by the Scriptures, and the Romanists are not, then who will be condemned at the judgment? So, tell me where the Romanists are obeying the Scripture and I am not? Your definition of CHURCH is not the definition in the Scriptures, but you speak of a certain papist party who has hi-jacked the name Catholic and the name Church exclusively for themselves and consider all others, including all the eastern churches, as schismatics -- HOW ARROGANT.

Name the places where the Reformers misrepresented the Romanists -- I would like at least five .

The Catholic Church does not teach that Scripture is the "final authority" in isolation. Rather, the Church teaches that the Word of God comes to us in two modes: Sacred Scripture and Sacred Tradition. These are inseparable, and both are interpreted and safeguarded by the Church's Magisterium (teaching authority).

So, name the doctrines that the Romanists get from the "sacred tradition" that cannot be gained by the Written Word of God -- At least five please.

So yes, departing from Scripture is error, but misinterpreting Scripture without the Church's guidance is also error.

So, tell me which Scriptures I am misinterpreting -- what did I miss without the Romanists guidance?

There were soo many issues such as the sign of the Cross, holy water, incense, prayers for the dead, the rosary, images, crucifixes, genuflecting, intercessory prayer, sacramentals, etc, etc that all seemed spooky or pagan superstitions. As I

approached each issue, investigated, researched, consulted church history, consulted the catechism, found the biblical (and most of the time, ancient Jewish) basis for these things, I realized that I was fed a pile of lies all my life, which upon investigation, all stemmed back to the anti-Catholic Protestant reformation. Christians had been practicing these things for over 1,500 years before the reformation and they each contain a biblical basis!

So name the Biblical basis for each of those items, please. And that they were practiced by all the first century Christians as something delivered by the apostles - like in Acts 20 where Paul says, he delivered the WHOLE counsel of God -- Was this part of that?

I think you are confusing teaching with practice and how the Church actually exercises her teaching authority. Studying some Catholic teachings would be helpful, not to make statements like this.

NO, you need to explain how these churches could be so far off if Jesus promised to infallibly lead the churches in all truth without the Apostles -- without a living apostle who determines which church was right -- They all could claim it equally with apostolic succession, the claim of infallible guidance, tradition, magisterium -- if they all claimed it, then the one with the government backing and most money would come out on top and kill of the rest -- does that mean they are right? Think with your head. It is amazing how well you swallow their pills.

You are resting on a fallible standard, as your canon lacks books which God providentially preserved in the Septuagint, in spite of the Christ rejecting Jews.

And you are resting your eternal destiny (and that of those subscribe to your beliefs) on your own fallible interpretation of the infallible sacred Scriptures.

The only infallible source of truth and authority in our world is the Catholic Church, which Christ commissioned to go into all the world (universal) and teach what He had taught them.

The only city that sets on a hill from the times of Christ, which illuminates to the entire world, Jesus Christ and His sacrificial love, is the one, holy, catholic and apostolic Church.

So, each book is not infallible, they are only infallible when they are all together? So when the apostles wrote to the churches, the message was only infallible after they had the completed canon? Wow, did you learn that from your infallible guides? The Apocrypha does not support the papacy - sorry. YOU are not the Catholic Church - You are Romanists who stole the name Catholic and killed those who opposed you. Christ commissioned disciples to plant local assemblies, not a false priesthood and false Pope. God has always had a remnant that did not bow the knee, and that is His light through all time. The Romanist Cancer rose early and slowly corrupted large portions of Christendom establishing the Scarlet Harlot riding on the dragon -- it also sits on seven hills, drunk with the blood of the saints and full of blasphemies and many daughter harlots corrupted by her.

Ro 11:3 Lord, they have killed thy prophets, and digged down thine altars; and I am left alone, and they seek my life. 4 But what saith the answer of God unto him? I have reserved to myself seven thousand men, **who have not bowed the knee to the image of Baal.** 5 **Even so then at this present time also there is a remnant according to the election of grace.**

Re: Gnosticism and the Biblical Canon

From:

"Levi Self" <le*****@***.com>

To:

"Mark Bullen" <mb*****@*****.net>

Date:

Jul 12, 2025 8:25:53 PM

Dear Mark,

You seem to introduce many new topics and the content just keeps broadening, making it difficult to address every sideline issue.

I began this discourse by including you in a mass email to others about the Protestant Gnostic Canon, and it seems like you have come back and reaffirmed this position with your comments about *"quality or internal evidence speaks to those who are intimately familiar with the Scriptures and its doctrines -- kind of like - my sheep know my voice"*. Is it not troubling that one can know what Scripture is by being intimately familiar with "scripture", when one can not know what Scripture is without some authority declaring it so? Discerning *what is scripture* is not a process any individual can infallibly do. Anyone claiming they know what constitutes as Sacred Scripture just by quality, internal evidence, an internal feeling, or "hearing the voice of the shepherd" is ultimately claiming a private revelation, a special knowledge, which is not bound upon the Church for all peoples of all times.

I highly doubt that answering your every objection would either satisfy or convert you, as you are very committed to Marks'ism. But, I will address a few...

> "So who was the infallible interpreter of the infallible Old Testament?"

The Old Covenant was never guaranteed an infallible interpreter for the entire nation of for all times, as that covenant was not intended to exist forever.

The infallible interpreter of the Old Testament was Jesus Christ Himself, God made Flesh, who came before the close of the covenant and infallibly interpreted its meanings to the people.

> "AND what caused all the division in the Romanists camp for hundreds of years - Franciscans, Jesuits, Benedictines, Augustinians, etc."

I'm sorry, this is extremely laughable!!

You obviously are outside of your realm and don't understand how the Church operates.

There are different "orders" or "rules" which Catholic's may join, each dedicated to different things... They are all united in one body under one head, all united with Rome. There is no division.

I know it may seem strange, and I had to wrap my mind around it at first too, but it's not like Mennonites vs. Amish vs. German Baptist Brethren vs. Hutterites vs. Bullenites, all uniquely different, all adhering to a different faith, a different creed or different "authority". The Franciscans, Jesuits, Benedictines, Augustinians, Dominicans, Carmelites are all united in one body, are all Catholic, all have the same faith, have the same creed, worship the same God, offer the same sacrifice and are united under the same head.

> "Are you using your brain to believe the teaching of the Romanists or just blindly following?"

Natural reason alone can prove the existence of God as well as His Church. Once you have used your brain in following the evidence and logic from natural reason, and found that the Catholic Church is the one true Church established by God, you can safely trust in the institution established by Christ Himself and blindly follow the teachings of the Church, as they are true and infallible, as her builder and maker is God.

> "Name the point of Scripture that I do not understand -- name the doctrine that the Romanists hold that I am wrong on."

Why should I waste my time? There are quite a few. But you will respond with your own understanding, your own private interpretation of sacred scripture to validate yourself.

> "Was it entrusted once for all to the saints?"

Yes, most definitely. Through Sacred Scripture, Sacred Tradition and the Teaching Authority of the Church.

> "So, name the doctrines that the Romanists get from the "sacred tradition" that cannot be gained by the Written Word of God -- At least five please."

Haha, that is easy! Matthew, Mark, Luke, John and Acts.

>"NO, you need to explain how these churches could be so far off if Jesus promised to infallibly lead the churches in all truth without the Apostles -- without a living apostle who determines which church was right -- They all could claim it equally with apostolic succession, the claim of infallible guidance, tradition, magisterium -- if they all claimed it, then the one with the government backing and most money would come out on top and kill of the rest -- does that mean they are right? Think with your head. It is amazing how well you swallow their pills."

Again, you do not understand how the teaching authority works. Maybe read *Credo* or *The Catholic Controversy by St Francis De Sales*.

Individual churches/parishes can be led into error, can apostatize, can formally "teach" error, but this not how the Catholic Church defines the "Teaching Authority".

The Magisterium or Teaching Authority is a safeguard of truth and is exercised through Ecumenical Councils, through the consensus of Bishops in union with the Pope, or when the Pope speaks *ex cathedra* regarding faith or morals. This is how the Teaching Authority has historically operated to discern or define doctrine (see Acts 15, Jerusalem Council). This does not mean individual Bishops of local parishes is safeguarded individually against formally teaching error. It means that the Church as a living body is safeguarded through these methods against teaching error.

>So, each book is not infallible, they are only infallible when they are all together? So when the apostles wrote to the churches, the message was only infallible after they had the completed canon? Wow, did you learn that from your infallible guides?

I believe you missed my point, so in charity, I will explain.

Each book which is divinely inspired by God is infallible.

The Collection (of all 73 books) is infallible.

The 66 book collection is fallible, as it is missing books, though each book that it does contain is infallible.

Again, my point was, the 66 book canon is fallible, as it was not revealed by God through the Church, but rather by gnostic heretics eleven centuries removed.

In Christ Jesus,

Levi Self

Then was the iron, the clay, the brass, the silver, and the gold broken to pieces together, and became like the chaff of a summer's threshingfloor, and they were carried away by the wind:

and there was no place found for them: but the stone that struck the statue, became a great mountain, and filled the whole earth

But in the days of those kingdoms the God of heaven will set up a kingdom that shall never be destroyed, and his kingdom shall not be delivered up to another people, and it shall break in pieces, and shall consume all these kingdoms, and itself shall stand for ever.

Re: Gnosticism and the Biblical Canon

From:

"Mark Bullen" <mb*****@*****.net>

To:

"Levi" <le*****@***.com>

Date:

Jul 13, 2025 1:56:12 PM

> *"So who was the infallible interpreter of the infallible Old Testament?"*

The Old Covenant was never guaranteed an infallible interpreter for the entire nation of for all times, as that covenant was not intended to exist forever.

YET it was the Ethiopian Eunuch reading Isaiah that you chose to support the need for an interpreter.....

Bottom Line:

1. Those who wrote the lists of canonical books would not own your corrupt organization
2. The NT would have to be re-written very different to support your corrupt organization

May God grant you enough honesty to escape the snare you have embraced....

Re: Gnosticism and the Biblical Canon

From:

"Levi Self" <le*****@***.com>

To:

"Mark Bullen" <mb*****@*****.net>

Date:

Jul 13, 2025 8:24:35 PM

>"YET it was the Ethiopian Eunuch reading Isaiah that you chose to support the need for an interpreter....."

Of course. It's really fitting and proves the point.

Philip, ordained by the Apostles, was sent by divine providence and provided the true interpretation of Isaiah from the living apostolic tradition.

This tradition had been entrusted to the Church by Christ Himself, who, after His Resurrection, "opened the Scriptures" to the disciples and entrusted them with its true meaning.

The passage illustrates not only the need for an interpreter, but for one sent by the Church with apostolic authority.

>Bottom Line:

>1. Those who wrote the lists of canonical books would not own your corrupt organization

This is a baseless assumption.

The men who helped define and defend the canon: Athanasius, Augustine, & Jerome, were bishops, theologians, and defenders of the very Church you reject.

They affirmed her sacraments, her structure, her hierarchy, her liturgy, and her Tradition.

To claim they would reject the Catholic Church today is an anachronistic and unfounded opinion.

>2. The NT would have to be re-written very different to support your corrupt organization

That is simply your private interpretation.

Nothing in the New Testament contradicts Catholic teaching when read through the lens of the apostolic Tradition from which it emerged.

The real question is this: who has the authority to interpret Scripture? You, or the Church to whom Christ said, "He that heareth you, heareth me" (Luke 10:16)?

So, to recap:

There is no historical evidence of "lists" being distributed or even created by local assemblies during the first century.

The first known "list" was by Marcion (circa 144, 2nd century), which was condemned by the Church.

The oldest historical evidence of a "list" was the *Muratorian Fragment* dating around 170AD, but it does not mention Hebrews, James, 1st Peter, 2nd Peter, or 3rd John (could be a response to Marcion's list).

The first time the 27 book list shows up in history is in the 4th century with *Athanasius' 39th Festal Letter*; 26 years before the Council of Hippo.

The books of Hebrews, James, 2nd Peter, 2nd John, 3rd John, Jude & Revelation were contested up until the Council of Hippo, which settled the controversy and closed the New Testament Canon.

Believing that the exact 27 books were part of some "list" prior to Athanasius, though unknown to antiquity, is irrational.

The phantom list, unknown to history, that supposedly contains the 27 book canon which would have been written by apostolic churches (churches planted by an apostle) is a conspiracy theory.

Even if a 27 book list from the first century could be produced, you would be relying on post-apostolic transmission / tradition.

The supposed universal unity which the churches of the first several centuries had on a 27 book list is not recorded in history (the historical record shows the exact opposite).

The Catholic Church exercised her teaching authority in the 4th century and settled the controversy on multiple books and closed the biblical canon of both the Old Testament (46 books) and the New Testament (27 books).

In Christ Jesus,

Levi Self

For from the rising of the sun even to the going down, my name is great among the Gentiles, and in every place there is sacrifice, and there is offered to my name a clean oblation: for my name is great among the Gentiles, saith the Lord of hosts.

Re: Gnosticism and the Biblical Canon

From:

"Mark Bullen" <mb*****@*****.net>

To:

"Levi" <le*****@***.com>

Date:

Jul 13, 2025 9:45:12 PM

I'll See you in Court -- God's Court.

Re: Gnosticism and the Biblical Canon

From:

"Levi Self" <le*****@***.com>

To:

"Mark Bullen" <mb*****@*****.net>

Date:

Jul 13, 2025 9:57:45 PM

And the historical evidence and all the logic and all your rejection of truth will be stacked against you. Oh, please reconsider, for there is no salvation outside of the Church! Think of all the souls you are mindlessly leading into error! Your rejection of Christ's bride, His one, holy, Catholic & apostolic Church, can only lead to destruction! You, who claims to be a lover of truth and ready to correct your ways when more light comes, someone who "wants to be the bride", wants to be a "first century, apostolic church" should consider the Church which has withstood against every storm, as an anvil that has worn out many a hammer!

May Christ help you to see the historic and apostolic faith!

In Christ Jesus,

Levi Self

Salus extra ecclesiam non est

Re: Gnosticism and the Biblical Canon

From:

"Mark Bullen" <mb*****@*****.net>

To:

"Levi" <le*****@***.com>

Date:

Jul 14, 2025 6:23:38 AM

You are intoxicated with the dregs of the scarlet harlot and I don't have time to spend, and don't think it is even profitable.

Tit 3:10 A man that is an heretick after the first and second admonition reject; 11 Knowing that he that is such is subverted,

I remember this same energy denying Jesus and calling Paul an apostate while trying to become a Jew.

I recommend you read your Bible for a while and lay the RCC garbage aside.

Re: Gnosticism and the Biblical Canon

From:

"Levi Self" <le*****@***.com>

To:

"Mark Bullen" <mb*****@*****.net>

Date:

Jul 14, 2025 6:37:34 AM

Why? We walked through the evidence of the biblical canon.

The scriptures came from the Catholic Church.

We talked about who can define heresy.

It can not be individual autonomous local congregations.

It must be an authoritative body, that is binding on all.

Should I read the Bible with my own personal interpretation, your personal interpretation or the Church's interpretation?

If with your interpretation, what if I find points that I disagree with?

If with my interpretation, should I start a church that matches my understanding?

Who gets to authoritatively and infallibly define what the Bible means?

Me? Menno Simons? John Calvin? Ron Bruno? Jack Hyles? Mark Bullen?

Or does God have a Program? A teaching authority that can settle disputes and give understanding to the many hard and difficult things in the scriptures which the heretics wrest to their own destruction?

Thank you so much for helping set my head on straight regarding authority!

It changed my life and led me to the true Salvation Program.

In Christ Jesus,

Levi Self

Re: Gnosticism and the Biblical Canon

From:

"Levi Self" <le*****@***.com>

To:

"Mark Bullen" <mb*****@*****.net>

Date:

Jul 18, 2025 10:52:01 PM

Dear Mark,

I have worked on an article for my website regarding the topic of the canon and would like to include our email discussion with the article as an attachment. I don't think there was anything personal mentioned in it and I don't think either of us are ashamed of our position, so I am asking if you mind that and if there is anything you would like redacted from the email thread?

In Christ Jesus,

Levi Self