

The Anti-Christ in the Temple of God

“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.” ο αντικειμενος και υπεрайρομενος επι παν το λεγομενον θεον η σεβασμα ωστε αυτον εις τον ναον του θεου ως θεον καθισαι αποδεικνυντα εαυτον οτι εστιν θεος
2 Thessalonians 2:4

This passage certainly has intrigued believers in Christ down throughout the centuries, for it speaks of the final anti-christ, the man of sin who will be ruling the earth when Christ returns in the Second Advent.

The standard interpretation concerning this passage, because of the words **temple**, to **worship** and to **sit**, is that the anti-christ will take his place in a temple at Jerusalem to be worshipped as a god. From this interpretation they look forward to a rebuilding of a Jewish temple in Jerusalem for all this to come about. And along with this, they believe that the Church will be raptured from the earth before he even sets himself up as a god to be worshipped in the temple, even before he “comes on the scene”, as they put it.

But is this what this passage is teaching? Could it be possible that it is teaching something else, that the words to **sit**, the **temple** and to be **worshipped** refer to something else, with the result it would be referring to another concept and that the time of its fulfillment would be much closer than they ever imagined? Obviously Paul expected believers to see these events for he stated that the return of Christ would not occur until the apostasy of the Church came first and then the revealing of the man of sin.

We won't go into the anti-christ *opposing* everything that is called god, and *exalting* himself above all other deities, but we will touch in this passage on the idea of being worshipped, *sebasma*, that he will be regarded with *sebasma*. This means that the anti-christ will be regarded with awe, a religious awe, a sense of wonder and respect will surround him. It had the idea of maintaining one's distance from someone because of his holiness and dignity. The anti-christ will be regarded in this manner. Remember that one of the ideas of the number 666 is that fallen man has become perfect and therefore a god.

This certainly fits in with the pope of Rome, for out of all the religious leaders on earth he is viewed above all with awe, respect and holiness. In fact, he is addressed as, “Your Holiness”. But remember, that from ancient Babylon to this present day, the **religious leader** of Babylon was the **representative of the political leader** of Babylon. And it was around 1962 that the pope handed over the rule of the world to the Secretary-General of the UN, who is the political ruler of the world.

But the phase I've had problems with over the years is “*sets himself up in God's temple*”. There was something spiritually there that bothered me, that it didn't seem to fit, that something else was in mind other than what we have been taught. We have all accepted

the interpretation at face value about the anti-christ setting himself up in a rebuilt temple in Jerusalem as the explanation for this. But what if it was referring to something else?

We need to consider the meaning of the word to sit, *kathizo*. *Kathizo* meant to sit, or to sit down, to be seated, but it meant more than that. One, it was used of teachers. The teacher in those days sat while he taught. So, when one said that he sat in a classroom, you were stating that he was a teacher. It wasn't necessary to outright state that he was a teacher; the simple statement, "he sat in class", said it all.

The second use of *kathizo* was used of judges. He sat in court meant that he presided over it as a judge. He didn't sit in court to take a rest, but to function as a judge. So the statement, "he sat in court", tells us that he was the judge of that court.

The third use of *kathizo* was used of kings. The king sat on his throne, his throne being a fancier seat than other people's seats. But why did he do that? Was it to have a place to sit down and rest? No! It was a place to receive his subjects and carry on the affairs of state. The king's throne was his seat of rule, and to take his seat on his throne meant that he was now entering into his function of governing his subjects.

So sitting was a natural act, but it also referred to something else other than merely sitting down, and all understood that the concept of sitting was not in view at all, but what it represented. It mattered not that the king sat; it was his position as king that mattered. So, in this matter of the anti-christ sitting, the real issue is **what does "sitting" mean in his situation?**

The fourth use of *kathizo* is that sitting always spoke of holding a position of honor and authority. Which meant that sitting, or the act of sitting, meant that the person held a position of honor and authority, that the individual held power over those under him; he ruled over them. Which tells us that the final anti-christ, the one ruling at the time of the return of Christ to earth, will hold a position of honor, authority and rule.

This brings us down to our next question, where will the anti-christ ultimately be holding his position of honor and authority and over whom? Will it be in a rebuilt temple in Jerusalem? Will it be in the hearts of the world's inhabitants? Will it be in the halls of the Babylonian religion in Rome? (That's obvious). Where? The answer lies in the clause, "*in the temple of God, εις τον ναον του θεου.*" The preposition eis used here shows that there has been a goal concerning that idea, movement toward it and an actual penetration into the temple of God. But what is actually meant when it says **the temple of God?**

And that is where I have a problem because most believers have automatically assumed that this is a reference to an earthly temple in Jerusalem, that the anti-christ will take his seat in a temple in Jerusalem, which presupposes that the temple has to be built again. But the Bible actually speaks of there being **three temples**. An earthly temple in Jerusalem, the temple or tabernacle of God in heaven, **and the Church**.

There are two Greek words for temple, *heiron* and *naos*, but both are called the temple. *Heiron* referred to the entire temple grounds including the temple proper, while *naos*

spoke of the holiest place in the temple. These two words for temple grounds and holy place were not only used of the temple in Israel, but also the temples of the pagans.

Now in understanding these things we have to understand what the differences are between the two words, where and how they were used and who the author was of the particular book they were found in. We know the difference between the two words and where and how they were used in the Gospels and the rest of the NT, but we need to see **how they were used by the Apostle Paul**, for he was the author of 2 Thessalonians.

Paul used both *heiron* and *naos* in his letters. He used the word *naos* seven times in his letters outside this passage **and in every instance he used the word *naos* to refer to the Church!** And he only used the word *heiron* one time and that was when he was referring to the earthly temple at Jerusalem! *“Do ye not know that they which minister about holy things live of the things of the temple? and they which wait at the altar are partakers with the altar?”* 1 Corinthians 9:13 When Paul was referring to the temple in Jerusalem he did not use the word *naos*, but ***heiron***.

But in every instance that Paul used the word *naos* in the NT he always referred to the **Church**. *“Know ye not that ye are the temple of God, and that the Spirit of God dwelleth in you?”* 1 Corinthians 3:16 *“If any man defile the temple of God, him shall God destroy; for the temple of God is holy, which temple ye are.”* 1 Corinthians 3:17 *“What? know ye not that your body is the temple of the Holy Ghost which is in you, which ye have of God, and ye are not your own?”* 1 Corinthians 6:19 *“And what agreement hath the temple of God with idols? for ye are the temple of the living God; as God hath said, I will dwell in them, and walk in them; and I will be their God, and they shall be my people.”* 2 Corinthians 6:16 *“In whom all the building fitly framed together groweth unto an holy temple in the Lord.”* Ephesians 2:21

Why did Paul refer to the Church as the temple of God, the *naos*? Because in the OT temple there was the Holy Place and the Most Holy Place. God dwelt in the room called the Most Holy Place or the Holy of Holies. Paul had to call the church the *naos*, the Most Holy Place because **that is where God now dwells!** He no longer dwells in an earthly temple but in Christ's Church here on earth! There could be no confusion over where the dwelling place of God is now, and to refer to an earthly temple as the *naos* would say that this is the most holy place.

If Paul only used *heiron* when referring to the temple in Jerusalem, and if he only used *naos* when referring to the Church, how is it that they can take *naos* here in this one passage that is left, break his pattern and doctrine, and refer to it as a rebuilt earthly temple in Jerusalem? Context, Paul's usages and Paul's definitions, which he uses for his doctrines on the Church, demands that the word for temple in 2 Thessalonians 2:4 applies to the Church on earth! Some scholars and Christians can't handle this because of the idea that they have of the Church worshiping the anti-christ.

But we need to remember that the idea of *sebasma* was not so much the idea of worship, but of one having a position of honor and authority. **What is in view is that the anti-christ will be held in honor by the Church and having authority over the Church.**

What most Christians are unaware of is that this is already occurring! Many of the leaders in Christianity are holding the pope forth as a moral and spiritual authority and being held in high esteem and honor! Not to mention the legal control (authority) that Rome has over the churches in America through various international laws and treaties.

We are already seeing this in apostate Laodicean Christianity where many Christians and well known Christian leaders are now looking to the pope as a great man, a sincere man, a man of dignity and respect, a man of holiness, a man of religious awe and wonder, a man who holds a position of honor and authority. Is not this the meaning of *sebasma*? The true definition of being worshipped? Many are trying to build a bridge from Protestantism back to Rome making the pope their authority. Is this not what is being spoken of here?

The pope already claims to be Christ's vicar here on earth, that he holds the power of the forgiveness of sins and entrance into heaven. He claims to be the high priest and that he has the keys to heaven, that he alone unlocks the doors into heaven. So "sitting in the temple" means that the Church now holds him in a position of honor and that, to a degree, he has authority over Christianity and this is what we're presently seeing going on in Christianity today in apostate America and around the world.

The problem of the apostasy of the Church plays a very big role in this matter of the end times, for it will be a universal condition that will be found prior to the time of the revealing of the end time and final anti-christ. There are three interpretations of what this apostasy is all about; two of them are feeble and have no scriptural basis at all.

The first is that the *apostasy* speaks of unbelievers falling away from God. This is preposterous for unbelievers never had a relationship with God to fall away from in the first place! Upon entrance into this world by physical birth they have been under the dominion of Satan from the beginning and are under the wrath of God.

The second is that the *apostasy* speaks of the rapture of the Church. They come up with this idea by taking *apostasia* to mean a departure. "*Let no man deceive you by any means: for that day shall not come, except there come a falling away first, and that man of sin be revealed, the son of perdition;*" 2 Thessalonians 2:3 So what they're saying is that the rapture of the Church will not occur until the rapture occurs first! 1 Thessalonians 4:17 tells us that we are snatched up by the angels, "*Then we which are alive and remain shall be caught up together with them in the clouds, to meet the Lord in the air: and so shall we ever be with the Lord.*" And 2 Thessalonians 2:1 tells us that we are then gathered unto the Lord, "*Now we beseech you, brethren, by the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ, and by our gathering together unto him,*" These verses follow the idea found in Matthew 24:31 where the Lord first mentioned it saying, "*And he shall send his angels with a great sound of a trumpet, and they shall gather together his elect from the four winds, from one end of heaven to the other.*"

The third one is that the *apostasy* refers to the Church's rebellion from God, that it departs from the protocol life established for it by God, which is what the Laodicean Church of Revelation is all about. Christ summed it up well when he asked the rhetorical question that when the son of man returns will he find the faith? The answer is no! He also says

that the love of the majority of believers will grow cold in those days. And Paul defines quite well what the dynamic of believers living in the last days will be in 2 Timothy 3:1-5. *“This know also, that in the last days perilous times shall come. For men shall be lovers of their own selves, covetous, boasters, proud, blasphemers, disobedient to parents, unthankful, unholy, Without natural affection, trucebreakers, false accusers, incontinent, fierce, despisers of those that are good, Traitors, heady, highminded, lovers of pleasures more than lovers of God; Having a form of godliness, but denying the power thereof: from such turn away.”*

Throughout the OT the concept of *apostasy* was of Israel's rebellion against God and its departure from his Word. *“The LORD God of gods, the LORD God of gods, he knoweth, and Israel he shall know; if it be in rebellion, or if in transgression against the LORD, (save us not this day,)”*, Joshua 22:22 *“Thine own wickedness shall correct thee, and thy backslidings shall reprove thee: know therefore and see that it is an evil thing and bitter, that thou hast forsaken the LORD thy God, and that my fear is not in thee, saith the Lord GOD of hosts.”* Jeremiah 2:19

In all these instances we have Israel breaking faith with *Yahweh*. *Yahweh* had called Israel unto himself and entered into covenant with her. In this covenant there were certain terms and conditions she was obligated to keep. She was to worship only *Yahweh* **and in the manner prescribed by him** that she was to meticulously follow. When Israel didn't, **when she turned away from his Word, his teachings and commandments to follow other teachings, she had rebelled against God. She was now in apostasy.**

We now come down to the Church, the body of Christ,. She is not under the same protocol for worship as ancient Israel was because she is under a different covenant, a new one, a better one. But there still is a protocol for the worship of God that she is to follow today and there are teachings that she is to learn and apply. A departure from God's established protocol of worship to another one is apostasy! And a departure from the teachings of the faith unto other teachings is also apostasy!

Israel was to follow a strict protocol in their worship of *Yahweh* involving the tabernacle, the altar, the sacrifices and the priesthood. All the things outlined in the OT were for the purpose of worshiping the Lord, for that is how *Yahweh* established that he was to be worshipped! Any departure from any of these concepts meant that one was not worshiping the true God but someone else! Israel was to strictly follow the teachings of Bible doctrine that God had given them in his Word because that is how you knew that you were on the right track in the matter of truly worshiping the Lord. Any departure from his teachings to follow after other teachings showed that you were following after someone other than the Lord. A departure from either of these concepts was a departure from the Lord and that is apostasy!

The Church's protocol for worshiping *Yahweh* is much different than Israel's, but it still has a protocol to follow. It is much less formal than Israel's and without the ritual, but there still is a protocol and substance in it. Obviously there is not temple to go to and that's because **we** are the temple! And there are no sacrifices to be offered and that's because Jesus Christ has become the one sacrifice for all time for us. And there are no

priests to be used in all this and that's because we are the **new** priests.

But there is to be a protocol of substance that must be there if we are to worship the Lord. **And that is we are to worship him in spirit and truth!** The true worship of God is accomplished through the filling of the Holy Spirit and by his Word! **Without the Spirit of God and Bible doctrine there is no worship of God.** This worship of God, which is done through his Spirit and his Word, (notice how he provides what is necessary for us to worship him), is accomplished as we study his Word, under the filling concept of the Holy Spirit, and metabolize it by faith into our souls.

If we come up with another vehicle for the worship of God, whether it be formalism, ritualism, emotionalism, entertainmentism, or whatever idea that man might think of in his works, then we are not worshiping Yahweh! For to worship Yahweh we must worship him in spirit and truth! If we adopt any other system of worship, say Romanism (Babylon), then we are again, not worshiping the Lord, but the god of Babylon. To depart from the NT protocol of worship, which is centered only around his Spirit and his Word is apostasy. The Church is to strictly follow the teachings of the Lord Jesus Christ and his apostles, whom he commissioned, in this matter of worshiping God. By doing so we know that we are truly worshiping the Father and not something or someone else.

The issue has always been Bible doctrine, the Word of God! Loving it, being positive to it, learning it, believing it and applying it to our lives. And when we follow the doctrines of the Bible, then we know that we are following the God of the Bible. Rejection of Bible doctrine is a rejection of the God of doctrine and is apostasy.

The central issue for the Church on earth is faith and the word of God. In our pulpits and in our day to day living the Word of God is to be studied, taught, believed, absorbed into our new natures and applied in our day to day living. This is our protocol for worship and this is how we are to live our lives on earth as God's people. Any departure from this is apostasy. And if the departure is widespread and permeates the church as a whole, then the Church has become apostate. It is this apostasy of the Church that puts it into the position of holding the anti-christ in a position of honor.

It's important for us to understand the nature of apostasy in regard to the people of God, so that we can better understand how the end time Church will look up to the anti-christ and false prophet with honor and respect. We need to remember the relationship that exists between cause and effect; one thing occurring that leads to something else. One does not become apostate by going into some other form of worship or idolatry. One, first of all, departs from the Word of God and its teachings, then they go into other things. **It is at the point of departure from Bible doctrine that one is in apostasy.**

If the church as a whole went into the Romanist worship, (the back to Rome movement has been operating for decades), then it would be in apostasy, but it would have already been in apostasy before that. And if the Church as a whole departed from the format of teaching Bible Doctrine and went into programs, legalism, emotionalism, social activism, entertainmentism, or whatever, it is apostate. **The issue concerning what constitutes apostasy is departing from Bible Doctrine, not what one goes into!**

So what we would expect to see at the end times, and we're already seeing it today, is a departure from the sound teaching of the Word of God from our pulpits; believers not having a love for the teaching of the Word of God and departing from the principles of grace, faith and truth in our lives as well as our pulpits. **The people of God's departure from Bible Doctrine is the apostasy!**

From this departure we then see believers and their churches going into: social activism, social programs, programism in general, emotionalism, emphasis on entertainment, emphasis on subjective issues, ritualism, formalism, legalism, conforming to the world's values, conforming to the world's viewpoint; not basing one's life and values on the doctrines of the Bible, but on the current trend of thought circulating in society, **and a building of bridges back to Rome!** All of these things we are currently seeing in apostate Christianity today and they are rapidly expanding. You would be shocked in how many well known TV preachers and Christian celebrities are already embracing the pope in Rome!

But, in spite of all this apostasy in the Church in the final days, there will be those believers in Christ who hold true to the Word of God. *“And the dragon was wroth with the woman, and went to make war with the remnant of her seed, which keep the commandments of God, and have the testimony of Jesus Christ.” Revelation 12:17 “Here is the patience of the saints: here are they that keep the commandments of God, and the faith of Jesus.” Revelation 14:12*

Going back to this matter of the temple; it's interesting that Paul never referred to the priesthood in Jerusalem and neither did Peter. The only reference that Peter made to a priesthood is when he stated that believers in Christ constituted God's priesthood. *“Ye also, as lively stones, are built up a spiritual house, an holy priesthood, to offer up spiritual sacrifices, acceptable to God by Jesus Christ.” 1 Peter 2:5 “But ye are a chosen generation, a royal priesthood, an holy nation, a peculiar people; that ye should shew forth the praises of him who hath called you out of darkness into his marvellous light:” 1 Peter 2:9 Which the Apostle John confirmed in Revelation 1:6, “And hath made us kings and priests unto God and his Father; to him be glory and dominion for ever and ever. Amen.” Revelation 5:10, “And hast made us unto our God kings and priests: and we shall reign on the earth.” Revelation 20:6, “Blessed and holy is he that hath part in the first resurrection: on such the second death hath no power, but they shall be priests of God and of Christ, and shall reign with him a thousand years.”*

So, even though the temple was still standing and functioning in Jerusalem at that time, **neither Peter, Paul or John made any reference to its priesthood.** To do so would have validated it as having the status quo of still being God's recognized priesthood, which it wasn't. And, at the same time, it would have denied that the believers in Christ's Church were now God's new priests on earth, which they were and are. God has had only one priesthood at a time on earth. First it was the order of Melchizedek, then it was Aaron's order, the Levities, then it was the Church. For the Apostles to refer to the priests in Jerusalem as the priesthood of God would have given it official standing before God and at the same time denied that Christ's believers are his new priests.

It is this same idea when we come to the matter of the temple. Matthew, Mark, Luke and John made many references to the temple in Jerusalem. Much, if not all of it, is historical narrative. And they used both words, *heiron*, to describe the temple complex, and *naos* to describe the actual room of the holy of holies where God dwelt.

But when it came to the Apostle Paul, the apostle to the Gentiles, he only refers to the temple complex once and when he did he used the word *heiron*. But when he went to speak of the *naos*, the holy place where *Yahweh* dwelt, he never once used the word, *naos*, to describe that room in the temple complex, but only **to describe the Church!**

If Paul, the apostle to the Gentiles and the one who established Church doctrine, had used *naos* to describe the earthly temple, it would have been a repudiation of everything that Christ had accomplished and a denial that God was now dwelling in believers in Christ. It would have stated that *Yahweh* was still dwelling in the temple in Jerusalem and not in Christians. **The Church, the body of Christ, made up of millions of believers in Christ, is the new temple of God; it is the *naos*!**

You see, words have meanings, and the meaning of *naos* was that it was the place where the deity actually dwelt. And if Paul had used that word to describe the temple in Jerusalem, he would have been stating that *Yahweh* dwelt in that building! But by transferring *naos* over to the Church, to believers in Christ, he is now saying that **Yahweh now dwells in them!** That **they** are his temple!

Paul could no longer use the term *naos* to describe the temple in Jerusalem **because God no longer dwelt there.** Christ's death on the cross, his resurrection from the dead, his victorious ascension into heaven, his being seated at the right hand of God as Lord over heaven and earth, his being made High Priest in the order of Melchizedek, the sending of the Holy Spirit to earth to indwell believers in Christ, all state **that God had done something new and different. God had established a new priesthood and a new temple for him to dwell in.**

So, when it comes to this passage in 2 Thessalonians 2:4, we have to take the view that Paul, (and Paul is the one talking here and these are the words that he uses), is not talking about a temple room in Jerusalem, (besides, when he did talk about the temple complex in Jerusalem he used the word *heiron*), **but he is talking about the Church! He's saying that the Church at the end of the Age will afford the anti-christ a position of honor, respectability and authority.**

Sound too far-fetched? Not so when one considers that it is already occurring in the person of the present pope, John Paul II. The Church in England, America, Europe and all over the world is not only making overtures to him, but looking to him as a moral authority, a religious leader, as the central person that they can all get behind. They are getting behind the man who claims to be God's high priest, who claims to pardon sinners and who claims to have the power of salvation. These are all positions and functions that belong only to Jesus Christ. **And by arrogating these things to himself he has made himself the anti-christ!**

By the Church, and many of its leaders, making overtures back to Rome demonstrates that it has become apostate! It is bad enough that it has rejected Bible Doctrine, making it carnal and worldly, but by going back to Rome it has become apostate and evil. It is as if a spirit of delusion has overtaken all of it so that it will believe the lie, as God also stated in 2 Thessalonians 2:11, “*And for this cause God shall send them strong delusion, that they should believe a lie:*”

The apostasy of the Church, which has been going on for around one hundred years, has put it into the position that it is not only basically ignorant of the doctrines of Christianity, but also of the person and work of the Roman Pontiff. The Church of the Reformation was well aware of the situation in Rome, that the Roman Pontiff claimed to be Christ's Vicar here on earth and all that that means, but Christianity today, as a whole, is uninformed and being misled; it's too caught up in emotional concepts and their own brand of works.

Religious leaders from the Pentecostal, Charismatic, Protestant and Evangelical groups are rushing to meet with the man who claims to be God's high priest on earth, who claims to be God's representative to the world, to the man who arrogantly claims to hold the keys to the kingdom of heaven, who claims that all men must be subject to him to be saved!

How can they even talk to the man who claims to be God's High Priest when only Jesus Christ is the High Priest of God? How can they come to a man who claims to pardon man's sins, when only Jesus Christ can pardon sins? How can they even talk to such a man, let alone look up to him, who blasphemes in such a manner and is **against** everything that Christ is and does?

How much more apostate can one get than this? Many Christians are looking at this phenomenon as a Last Days concept to come after the Church is raptured, but it is happening right now! How much more apostate can one become than honoring, respecting and looking up to such a man who puts himself **in the place of** Christ, as a **substitute** for Christ and as the **equivalent** of Christ. This is what the *anti* in anti-christ is all about, and this is what the pope is!

Even the number of his title, “Vicarius Filii Dei”, the Vicar of the Son of God, adds up in the Latin to 666. And yet we have Christian leaders and millions of Christians esteeming this man with honor, dignity, respectability, authority and holiness. Even the word for worship, *proskuneo*, does not have the idea of formal worship as we would know it, but really the idea of obeisance! And why is all this happening? It's because the believers living at the end of the Church Age will be ignorant of the pope's true stature, because they were negative to the truth and had rejected Bible Doctrine!

Just to remind ourselves once again what the real meaning of the anti-christ is we need to go back to the definition of the preposition *anti*. The most common definition put forth in the Church today is that it means opposed to Christ, or against Christ. And while this is true, it gives us a simplistic understanding of the concept and is somewhat misleading.

The Greek preposition *anti* has three meanings: equivalence, exchange and substitution. And these three ideas are found in the final man of lawlessness. In fact they were also found in certain religions in the first century.: Gnosticism, Judaism, Mithraism and Freemasonry, etc..

The first meaning of *anti* was equivalence, that **one thing is equal to the other**; equal in value, equal in power and equal in effect. Which tells us that the anti-christ will claim, (and has for years), that his position is equal to Christ's, that he has the same degree of power and authority that Christ does, and has the same effect. He claims to be able to pardon sinners, which only Christ can do; that he can bring the sinner into heaven, which only Christ can do; that he functions as God's High Priest, which only Christ can do. He claims to be equal to Christ in position, function and power, and that he can and does function in the capacity of Jesus Christ here on earth.

The second meaning of *anti* is exchange, that **one person has been exchanged for another**. Which tells us that this man, the anti-christ, has been exchanged for Christ. He has exchanged himself for Jesus Christ, and those who are following him today, such as in Catholicism, have exchanged him for the Lord.

The third meaning of *anti* is substitution, that **one person has been substituted for another**. The French term is “in lieu of”; he has been **put in place of another**. And here the anti-christ has taken the place of Christ, his position, his power, his authority, his glory and his effect, by having the world look to him to do what only Christ can do.

So what we have to consider is that there is a possible second interpretation to the anti-christ taking his seat in a rebuilt temple in Jerusalem. It is the popular approach in today's theology, which presupposes that a new temple must be built in Jerusalem. And although a new temple may be built as well, there is also the distinct possibility that all this action centers, not around a temple in Jerusalem, but **around the Church of Christ!**

We have seen that the words, to **sit**, **temple** and **worship** have different meanings that one would think on the surface. That the word for **worship**, *sebasmas*, means to view with honor, awe, respect, to look up to someone in a sense of admiration, or as being special above the others. We have seen that the word **temple**, *naos*, when used by the Apostle Paul did not refer to an earthly temple, but to the body of Christ. And we have seen that the word to **sit** meant to hold a position of honor, respect and authority. And that another word for **worship**, *proskuneo*, actually meant to obey the one over you in authority, that you are in subjection to their authority.

So, to sit in the temple of God, could also be interpreted to mean that the Church on earth, due to its apostasy, could actually get to the place where it looks up to the pope, esteems him as a man of God and submits to his authority! It would mean that he is ruling over the Christ's Church on earth. Too far-fetched? Well it's happening right now.

Pastor Mike

