



**WORLDVIEW MADE PRACTICAL**  
**Volume 14 Number 45**  
**December 4, 2019**

**Conversation with a Gnostic**

By Freddy Davis

As we read certain portions of the New Testament (particularly in John's and Paul's writings), we come across references to certain false beliefs that were a problem for the early church. One of those false belief systems was Gnosticism. (For more in-depth information on the beliefs of Gnosticism, check out: <http://www.marketfaith.org/2019/04/non-christian-beliefs-mentioned-in-the-bible-gnosticism>.) These days, we don't very often come across people who actually believe in Gnosticism, but as with almost any belief that has ever existed, there are still those who are believers.

Not too long ago, I received a connection request from a person on the LinkedIn social media site. That is not, actually, an unusual thing, and I almost always accept those requests. I did in this case, as well.

This one turned out to be something I was not expecting, however. It seems that this guy was a deeply committed Gnostic, and he immediately jumped in to try to convert me. Well you know me, I also jumped right into the conversation. As we got going, he immediately began trying to convince me that Gnosticism was true. I, in turn, began sharing with him the gospel message using worldview principles to show him where his beliefs were not true.

The following is the entirety of that conversation. It is my hope that by reading it you will not only learn more about this non-biblical faith, but also how to interact with people who hold non-biblical beliefs.

**RW**

What if someone provided proof that our long-held beliefs about Jesus of Nazareth were incorrect?

I'd like to connect with those who are open-minded, interested in Biblical history or Eastern mysticism, and a new interpretation of the relationship between Jesus and Judas.

**Freddy Davis**

Great to connect with you. I don't think you will find me open minded in a way that causes me to think that your beliefs are true, but happy to connect with you anyway.

**RW**

How can you know before reading my book on it? After all, I used to believe as you probably do now. You can have a pdf free. Just ask.

**Freddy Davis**

I don't need to read your book to understand exactly where you are coming from. My specialty is worldview beliefs and I have studied and write about not only the theistic beliefs of such non-biblical theistic faiths as Gnosticism, but the Pantheism/Monism of Far Eastern beliefs, Naturalism, and Animism, as well. Sorry to hear that you switched.

**RW**

Your ignorance is noted.

**Freddy Davis**

As is yours.

**RW**

I write the books, you could, but don't read them. Nothing personal, you see.

### Permission to Reprint

If you wish to reprint this article in your own print or electronic newsletter, please include the following text:

*Reprinted from **Worldview Made Practical**; a free e-zine produced by **MarketFaith Ministries** featuring practical teaching and life tools to help Christians become more effective in their faith life. Discover **MarketFaith Ministries** at [www.marketfaith.org](http://www.marketfaith.org).*

### Speaking Schedule

If you are interested in having Freddy Davis or Tal Davis present one of our **Worldview Seminars** or to share about worldview and its practical implications at your church or organization, please contact **MarketFaith Ministries** to schedule your event. All contact information is at the bottom of this e-zine.

### Worldview Resources

It is one of the primary purposes of **MarketFaith Ministries** to provide resources to help Christians understand the practical implications of worldview. You can find many free resources that will help you in your quest at <http://www.marketfaith.org>.

### Freddy Davis

Your reply is not clear. I'm not sure if you are indicating that you write the books that I could write, or if there is some meaning related to me not wanting to read your books, or something else. It is hard to take something personal that can't really be understood.

You do realize, don't you, that you are the one that requested that I connect with you? What do you think you will gain by all the insults?

### RW

Freddy,

Being ignorant of something is a condition you choose, not my judgment. There was an insult, but it was not mine. Yours: "I DON'T NEED TO READ YOUR BOOK TO KNOW ..." So, you can spare me your feigned upset over this and just forget our exchange. As you see, I have no patience left to confront people who think that they don't need to be open to new information on something so important that it affects every person on earth

### Freddy Davis

RW,

Interesting to see how you make assumptions about what you think you know about me, and what you think I know. I have read many people's defense of both Gnosticism and Far Eastern Pantheism. Do you really think that you have produced something new that no one else has ever thought of before as a defense of those false beliefs? Gnostic theology simply does not reflect reality. Early forms of it are even spoken of in several places in the Bible, and reasons given there for why they are false (essentially because they don't reflect reality). The late 2nd century Gospel of Judas that you seem to be promoting has nothing to commend it and nothing to sup-

port its legitimacy. It contains typical late 200 era Gnostic theology that also has nothing to support it. The story that Judas was following Jesus' instructions when he betrayed him is ludicrous.

Feigned upset? Seriously? If you want to play the victim, that is your choice. You get to believe what you want. But your belief in a false theology does not make it true. You have no "new" information, and your illusion that you do is, again, your business. The truth is, Jesus Christ was God in the flesh who came to earth for the express purpose of dying as a substitutionary sacrifice for the sins of mankind. Those who receive his message have the benefit of receiving forgiveness and entering into an eternal personal relationship with him. Those who refuse end up eternally separated from him. This is the actual important message that affects every person on earth, not some "new" belief that has nothing to support it.

### RW

I do, too. Judas is "the man who bears me." That's new information.

### RW

And all the details of the Betrayal are found in the Apocalypses of Nag Hammadi, inverted in the Gospels, but why should I tell you about it, since you think I know nothing?

### Freddy Davis

The man who bears you, huh? That doesn't even make any sense. And I'm not sure that things you make up that don't make sense actually qualify as "new information." But beyond that, new information for what end? There is nothing in Gnosticism that contributes to the spiritual development of individuals because it is simply a false theology.

So, all the details of the betrayal are found in texts that date 2-3 hundred years after the writings of the gospels,

## Subscription Information SUBSCRIPTION NOTICE:

A subscription to **Worldview Made Practical** is complementary for anyone interested in receiving it. If you received this email as a forward from a family member or a friend and wish to subscribe for yourself, you may do so at [www.marketfaith.org](http://www.marketfaith.org). If you wish to unsubscribe from this newsletter, simply follow the instructions found at the bottom of each edition.

## Contact Information

If you wish to contact us directly, you may do so by the following methods:

321 Anton Dr., Tallahassee, FL 32312

E-mail:

[info@marketfaith.org](mailto:info@marketfaith.org)

Phone: 850-383-9756 (Tallahassee, Florida)

Fax: 850-514-4571

You can order our products and examine our services at <http://www.marketfaith.org>.

This issue of **Worldview Made Practical** is a production of **MarketFaith Ministries**, © 2019. All rights reserved.

yet they are more accurate than the gospel accounts? Yeah, right. I suppose you have some kind of legitimate evidence that what you are saying is actually true? -- beyond the mere fact that you believe it?

Oh, and the reason I don't need you to tell me what Gnosticism is all about is because I already know about it. Also, I have not said you know nothing about it. In fact, I'm sure you do. What I am saying is that the belief itself is simply not true. There is nothing to support its view of ultimate reality, the nature of man, and salvation.

## RW

I don't need to know what you know to know what you don't. Judas is the sacrifice in the Gospel of Judas and that is immeasurably telling about the viability of the Bible. This is a question of reading of reading and logic. Judas asks a question of Jesus, "What will those baptized in your Name [Word, the Spirit] do?" And he answers him, You will exceed the others, as you will sacrifice the man who bears me." This is classic mysticism, something few understand. It shows, especially with the confirmation of the James Apocalypses, alone proof in themselves, that Judas is central in the narrative, not Jesus.

No one knows when the ORIGINAL Gospel of Judas was written. It was in Greek and had to be before 180 as Ireneas mentioned it. No one knows when the NT Gospels were written EITHER. No one knows who wrote any of them. There us much we don't know, but one thing we can know is that nearly EVERY DETAIL OF THE STORY is .mirrored one source to the other. A kiss. A sign, armed multitudes, Hail, Brother! And Hail, Master! (Why the subtle difference?), prayer on a rock, coming three times, 'found sleeping,' and three denials - one has Peter denying, one has Jesus, and many more parallels, all

indicate dependency. WHICH WAY? It can only be one way. HAIL BROTHER and mention that Jesus and James are not blood brothers shows originality, as virgin-birth orthodox Church doctrine came LATER. No Gnostic would have borrowed from a story of human sacrifice for material. But an orthodox writer has every reason to. Given that every mystic Master on history has taught succession m, except this one, Jesus must be the outlier. Every detail falls neatly into place. BUT only if you have an open mind TO READ ABOUT IT.

## RW

The denials is critical. The cartoonish cock crowing and PETER denying Jesus is derived. The origin is a beautiful passage in Apocalypse of Peter, paragraph one, about MEDITATION. Meditation is essential to seeing within. It takes much time practicing under guidance of a Master to see inner visions. This is about Peter denied inner sight three times 'in this night' because meditation is best done in the stillness of 'third watch' (3 to 6 am, same as the walking on water parallel). This comes tellingly after Jesus 'comes to them' 3 times "'in this night" and finds them sleeping. (Check your Gospels.) Three parallel details, the two, Peter and Jesus, 3 denials, and 'coming in this night,' are not coincidences. The gnostic teaching is original. There can be no doubt. It was all for a purpose: to belittle Peter, a MASTER --- Just. Like. James.

## Freddy Davis

Robert, your assertion that the gnostic teaching is original is simply not true. There is no evidence whatsoever for that point of view. Also, your allegorical interpretation of the gospel accounts is not a valid hermeneutical approach. You have no basis for making that kind of interpretation. To do it, you are not beginning with any kind of historical predicate. Rather,

you are beginning with a second or third century philosophical assumption, and are trying to interpret a first century biblical text through that. It is simply not a valid way to interpret the text. Your teaching does not represent the truth - either historically or theologically. Jesus Christ was God in the flesh who came to earth to become, for mankind, a substitutionary atonement for our sins. His resurrection from the dead is the proof that he had the power to accomplish his purpose. There is no special "gnosis" needed, from you or anyone else, to learn meditation or other techniques in order to know God - only faith in what Christ did by his death and resurrection. Gnosticism does not represent reality, and there is no evidence you can put forth to demonstrate that what you are saying is true.

**RW**

Hardly. Sounds like Trump:

"It's not true what you say, because I say so." I told you. There is literary, textual comparative evidence that Gnostics wrote the original for The Betrayal. You just aren't interested in hearing it. Just like the DSS Peshirim, the internal data is more determinative than other methods of dating. There is no terminal ad quo for any of the gnostic texts. They are just as old as the other.

**RW**

No termina a quo

**Freddy Davis**

I don't have any reason not to believe that Gnostics wrote the texts you believe in. It is just that they were written 2-3 hundred years after the time of Christ. Your belief that they are just as old as the New Testament texts has no basis in reality. Internal data? Really? How about actual textual evidence? There is none. In order to believe your theory, you have to use a hermeneutical theory that you or somebody else just made up. Gnosticism simply doesn't reflect reality.

But it is not just the textual issue. The actual content of Gnostic theology doesn't correspond with what we actually know about the nature and structure of the natural universe. The Gnostic gods and and Aeons and Archons and the Demiurge, et al, are more closely associated with ancient Egyptian animistic tradition than with the kind of God that would create the kind of universe we live in. And it certainly has nothing to do with the message of the New Testament and the gospel that Jesus' apostles preached. Gnosticism is simply not reflective of reality.

BTW: Trying to put words in my mouth is a pretty dishonest approach to conversation. I never said, "Because I say so." My argument is that your assertion that there is literary, textual, and comparative evidence to support the validity of Gnostic writings simply can't be objectively demonstrated. You have to do a lot of hermeneutical contortions to come up with your explanations.

**RW**

Well you are right about one thing. Gnosticism is not reflective of this Universe. That's because Yahweh, your God and the God of the Pauline Christians, is Yaldabaoth, not the Unspoken Word which created everything, including Yaldabaoth.

You have no evidence whatsoever to say that Gnostic texts don't predate the New Testament texts. NO ONE KNOWS when they were composed! No one knows when NT Gospels were written EITHER. Or who wrote them. You keep saying I have no evidence of Gnostic texts being original without reading my books. I don't respond to that kind of assertion of ignorance. SORRY. I wrote my books, and it took a lot of research and time. If you don't want to read them, FINE. But don't tell me what you don't know about them.

**Freddy Davis**

Yaldabaoth, huh? Right! And the reason gnostic philosophy is not reflective of this Universe is because gnostic cosmology has no relationship to actual reality. I get it that you believe it, but there is simply nothing to support your contention other than the beliefs of Gnostics like yourself.

You say there is no evidence that Gnostic texts don't predate the NT texts, but that is a silly argument. Your problem is that there is no evidence that they do. The earliest actual gnostic documents are 2-3 hundred years later.

And we do know when the NT texts were written within a very tight window. Unlike the gnostic texts, NT texts are historical in nature and can be dated based on actual historical events. We also know who specifically wrote most of them because the author identified himself in the text itself. All of the others, except the book of Hebrews, have other kinds of historical verification regarding authorship. You are simply wrong factually in your assertion that date and authorship are unknown. Again, the type of evidence you have asserted is all based on a hermeneutical philosophy, not on actual historical evidence. Operating that way, you can literally claim anything. There is simply no actual objective evidence that what you are claiming is true.

**RW**

Who wrote Matthew? Who wrote Luke? Who wrote Mark?

Objective evidence: Hail, BROTHER!

MATTHEW AND MARK HAVE HAIL, MASTER! Why are they different, both appearing in the same relative place in the narrative? I told you, I don't have time to write my book again. I offered it to you for free. Ad Eisenman said in his book, the proof for James's suppression is made in the details. Hail, Brother! is only ONE. No Gnostic would EVER borrow anything from a bloody narrative of HUMAN SACRIFICE. And someone borrowed from someone, with two dozen specific points of parity. I'm not stupid. Neither are you: You should know people will do nearly ANYTHING for money and power.

**RW**

I don't have a problem. Stop tell me that. I know this is easily proven if one has an open mind. A document's dating is not its COMPOSITION date. That was Eisenman's contention, too. No one knows, except that the Apocalypses and Gospel of Thomas show signs of being JUST AS EARLY or earlier than MMLJ. Ask apologist Dr. Hedrick Smith, who wrote James Robinson's NHL intro.

**RW**

There are higher UNIVERSES, at least five, or seven, depending on who says so. Paul even mentioned three, meaning likely that James went in and up, not him. "I knew a man..." Any ambiguity like that usually means JAMES. I show several others in my book on Saviors in the Bible.

**RW**

You have no idea who you are dealing with here. I'm a disciple of A MASTER. I also personally know the best scholar to have ever lived, in my opinion, except for Newton, and Einstein, perhaps. And HE corroborates my findings, and in fact inspired my search. If you are not interested in learning about this, let's just end it here. You certainly have better things to do if that's how you feel.

**Freddy Davis**

The supposed evidence you cite as to why we don't know the authors of the gospels is awfully shallow. There is both internal and external evidence designating authorship of all of them - which you would know if you had done any serious research on the topic. And as I said before, the evidence for your dating of Gnosticism depends entirely on a truly subjective approach to hermeneutics. What you are calling proof is nothing more than opinion. Do you really think that a few common or dissimilar words in a text proves authorship? Do you really think that various greetings and expressions were not common in that day, but were exclusive to certain individuals? The answer is "No." Trying to make a case based on that approach is simply illegitimate. Using that approach, you can claim literally anything.

You are right, the extant text of a particular ancient document does not necessarily show its composition date. But your problem is (and it is your problem) you have no evidence whatsoever of early composition of the Gnostic writings. You want them to be early so you look for reasons why they could be, but all of your

evidence is subjective, based on your own wants, not on any objective evidence. Showing "signs" of something may or may not be actually "signs."

Your "I knew a man" example definitively demonstrates you have no idea what you are talking about. Do you really not understand what Paul was sharing in that text? Do you not understand the terminology he was using in that explanation in 2 Corinthians? First, Paul was using a common way of expressing humility as he talked about his own experience. He was not referring to the experience of someone else. Second, the Hebrew conceptions of the heavens was not as you described. The first heaven is the earth atmosphere, the second was the universe (place of the sun, moon, stars, etc.), and the third was the abode of God. Gnostic cosmology is wrong to begin with, but you are doubly wrong trying to interpret the New Testament text using your approach.

Frankly, it doesn't make any difference to me who you are a disciple of. If your "master" is teaching you the things you are expressing here, he is a false master. Your cosmology is wrong, your theology is wrong, and your hermeneutic is completely off base. What you are calling evidence is not evidence, it is opinion based on untrue philosophical presuppositions. You have still not shared anything that has any kind of objective underpinning. Perhaps you should reread the gospels dropping your assumption that it can be interpreted allegorically, and read it based on the way it was actually written. If you do, you have the opportunity to know the real Jesus Christ.

### **RW**

Like I said, you don't really want to know. That's what you already said. I never said I prove authorship. Authorship isn't the point. The logic behind the proof is. It is in the book, and I haven't the time or inclination to lay it all out for you. It took long enough to write it all out. The greeting is in place with the other narrative. One depends on the other. I prove it about 5 different ways in textual comparison. But you don't seem to comprehend that type of proof. It doesn't depend on anything besides side-by-side comparing! At least SOMEONE thinks it was impressive enough to win a book award! NABE 2018 winner of Pinnacle Book Award in non-fiction. Every one of my five paid reviewers agreed. Only Christian reviewers pan it, which I totally expect.....

### **RW**

If I "drop all my assumptions and read the Gospels they way they were written," I come up with a cock crowing three times after Peter denied Jesus! And a bunch of dumb-ass Roman soldiers seeking out someone who was bedeviling Pilate for months, if not years, upsetting the Temple moneychangers' tables, feeding multitudes with a few loaves and fishes, raising The Undead, and preaching over and over again that his kingdom is coming, but revealed to them that night with a kiss since they were too dense to recognize him! I'M SORRY. I'm not STUPID! They didn't need a kiss! Especially after he came into town riding TWO DONKEYS, circus style!!!

Now, if you have something better to tell me about, go ahead, but if the Church version 'Gospels' are all you've got, I'll go with how I read them.

### **Freddy Davis**

As I said before, and you don't seem to understand, the logic behind your "proof" is bad logic.

### **Freddy Davis**

When you make up your hermeneutical rules without some kind of valid and consistent approach, all you have done is express your unsupported opinion. Simply using "textual comparison" without some way to demonstrate that the conclusion you are drawing is actually true is, as I said, nothing more than your unsupported opinion. Using that methodology, you could, literally, pick the conclusion you want to arrive at and find examples to "prove" your point - no matter what it is. It is simply not a valid hermetical approach. I do comprehend your approach, but you don't seem to be able to comprehend the flimsiness of that approach.

And you don't really think that winning some book award proves your point, do you? Were they evaluating your theology? No they weren't! They were evaluating other things that don't even deal with the truth or untruth of the content.

Finally, your personal beliefs about whether or not the biblical text is actually true or not says nothing about its actual truth. All it reflects is your personal opinion - which you have yet to demonstrate has any validity. You dismiss the biblical text as a historical record, in spite of the fact that it was written by eyewitnesses, and you embrace an allegorical hermeneutic that has literally nothing to commend it.

As I have said before, you get to choose what you will believe and what you will not. But your beliefs are not the standard for determining truth. You are advocating for the truth of texts that have nothing to back them up, using an interpretive methodology regarding the Bible that is based purely on your subjective interpretation - one that has nothing to do with what the Bible actually says. What you are advocating is simply not a viable belief. Jesus Christ actually was God in the flesh who became a man for the purpose of dying for the sins of mankind so that we can know a personal relationship with God. Nothing more and nothing less.

**RW**

You have not read it! So how can you say my contention is "flimsy"?

The awards committee evidently thought I was on to something. After all, THEY READ MY BOOK, unlike you.

B.S. about the eyewitnesses.. Pure nonsense. You have no proof of that and there is plenty of evidence they were inventing and recycling stories and miracles, and all the other crappola that passes for Christian teaching.

Then you folks always resort to unsupportable assertions that "Jesus Christ actually was God in the flesh who became man for the purpose of dying for the sins of mankind." Says WHO? Certainly not HIM.

**RW**

I'm corresponding with several Christians. I always ask why people were born to die before Jesus lived, if he was their savior, and no one ever gives a sensible response. I don't suppose you have one, do you?

**Freddy Davis**

When your methodology is wrong, your conclusions are necessarily wrong. Just because I have not read your particular book doesn't mean I have not studied the topic, and that I do not understand the hermeneutical methodologies you are espousing. I find it very interesting that you take literally things that fit your personal theology and allegorize things that don't. Your subjective approach to dealing with this topic simply has no objective foundation to it at all. And then you go and take second and third century texts, compare it with much older texts, then say similarities between them prove your newer texts are older. Your entire approach is not only unscholarly, it has absolutely nothing to back it up beyond your own opinion.

So back to the book awards committee, huh? Did they endorse your conclusions? No they did not. Did they assert that what you wrote was true? No they did not. It is a marketing company for Pete's sake. You winning the award had nothing to do with whether or not they thought you were "on to something."

Obviously, your understanding of the New Testament text is sorely lacking. You accuse me of not having evidence for material that has all kinds of evidence, and turn around and say you have evidence for things where there is no actual evidence. It is really hard to take you seriously when you make those kinds of claims. And actually, Jesus did claim to be God. It is just that when you insist on reading the biblical text as an allegory, you simply dismiss what is written there in plain Greek. That is a problem with your hermeneutics, not with what is actually in the text.

Did you know that Jesus even died for you? But if you continue to reject him, you cannot take advantage of the eternal life he offers you. You might want to reconsider.

Why people were born to die? It is hard to give a "sensible response" to a question that does not make sense. When you ask a Christian a question like that, they are going to respond based on a biblical worldview. The answers they give will never make sense to you as long as you are trying to interpret Christian concepts using

Gnostic philosophy. Your question does not make sense based on a biblical worldview. Your entire premise is wrong. Death is a result of the Fall. People were not born to die. God created mankind to live eternally. It was sin entering the world that screwed things up. You apparently also don't have much of an understanding of what it means that Jesus is our Savior.

I understand that you believe your Gnostic beliefs, but before you go and make claims and assumptions about what Christians believe, you really ought to do enough study to know what you are talking about. When you do what you have just done, it further destroys your credibility.

## **RW**

Give me a break. I WAS a Christian for three years, 24/7. You teach me nothing. Except maybe a big word like hermeneutical. Just say interpretation, OK? I don't like wonkish words.

You still have no idea what my "methodology" is. Sheesh. Cut out the lingo. I COMPARE TEXTS. Is that a bridge too far, somehow? There is no reliable dating of ANY early texts. It's all opinion based on understanding the material or, more commonly, not. And when you can't understand what the material even is, as is the case with Christians, how can you date them? Eisenman proved the Scrolls were much later than thought BY COMPARING TEXTS to see how they related. I did the same as he did. You can date the gnostic texts as early BY WHAT THEY SAY, not the age of ink and paper which only proves that they cannot be any YOUNGER than that. Eisenman showed that the Peshierim scrolls were same age as Paul's genuine letters, because he understands the material and they \*parry\* one another. I show the same with the Gospels to the Nag Hammadi texts because they track line for line and show clear evidence of being derived. I don't have time to cover it all, but it definitely is a worthy contribution despite your minimizing it. I have five four or five star paid reviews, on my website. They don't give those out to every author. Elaine Pagels, by phone, called my work "interesting and insightful." Marvin Meyer encouraged me to keep at it, by phone. I spoke for two hours with him about it. Christians are brainwashed. I was. It happens.

So because some dude, we know not who, wrote that Jesus said this. said that. Oh, really? So Harry Potter flies on a broom because JK Rowling says so? Give me a break! What is the difference? It's literature! Entertainment. It ISN'T HISTORY. Read Richard Pervo, "The Mystery of Acts" for how silly it is to think the Gospels and Acts are historical. Or Hyam Maccoby. Or, dare I say it again: Eisenman. The mistake you make (I don't say "YOUR problem ...") is that you assume it is history because all you read is confirmation sources. Can't learn that way. My "hermeneutics comes from association with a living perfect Master. They do exist. They are not phony. Real ones accept NOTHING from anyone for anything, and are kind, generous, magnificent human beings who serve others constantly both here on earth and beyond. I'm sorry YOU reject THEM. At least we know they are real.

You can't even understand what I was asking you. I asked why people were born to die BEFORE JESUS LIVED. This is what prompted me to finally leave Christianity. Note I didn't say leave Christ. If he was real, which he wasn't, I never denied him, so don't assume I'm lost.

## **Freddy Davis**

Robert, simply saying, "I was a Christian," doesn't make it so. There are certain core beliefs associated with Christianity that are the line that can't be crossed and one still be in Christianity (which is the case with every belief system including your own). I would never presume to judge your salvation, as only God is capable of seeing the heart. There are many people, however, who self-identify as Christian but who don't follow Christian beliefs. I have no way of knowing what you believed during your "Christian" era. However, is it possible to evaluate people's words and actions to see if they are expressing Christian beliefs. Obviously you don't (and certainly don't claim to).

What do you mean, "I have no idea what your 'methodology' is?" You have made no bones about it. You compare texts - which doesn't produce the kind of information you are claiming for it. It is very possible for people to copy another person's style and grammar. Have you been able to prove that the Gnostic writers were not doing that? It is also very possible for a particular style and particular expressions to be common to



an entire population. Unless you have some kind of evidence beyond simply "comparing texts," you cannot demonstrate anything like what you are claiming. What you and Eisenman have done is not based on any recognized standard of proof.

I can't believe that you are continuing to lean on your book awards as evidence of the truth of your approach. The way those book awards work is that people pay to enter their book for the award, judges read them, then they give out their awards based on style and presentation - not on content. Congratulations on winning the award, but don't think for a second that gives the theology of your point of view any extra credibility. You got your award, and the award company got a big paycheck.

I tell you what, I will read your book. Send me the link. I will be very surprised if things are not exactly as I have already expressed it to you.

## RW

I've heard that trope before, too. "You were never REALLY a Christian." I'm way beyond all the evaluating and analyzing. Once recognizing a true Master, all is certain. I don't believe you are seriously interested. You can read my book on Kindle for only \$2.99. The paperback at B & N or Amazon is \$15. Such a deal! How much is your salvation worth?

## RW

If \$2.99 is still too much, a third of my book is visible in the "Look Inside" feature at Amazon. Best of luck whatever you decide to do!

## Freddy Davis

LOL. You begin by offering it to me free, then over and over you criticize me for not reading it, then you back out when I agree to read it. You are too much.

I never said you were never really a Christian. Apparently you didn't really read what I wrote. Might want to reread that part.

I find it quite humorous that you criticize the Christian faith for being unbelievable because you seem to have problems believing in miracles, yet you assert mythology as being objectively true. Then, you tout your "Master" as being something next to supernatural. Humorous indeed.

If I was not serious about reading your work, I would not have offered, but it is your choice. I have already, more than once, pointed out the fatal flaws in your approach, and your only response is to deny it and tell me to read your book.

My salvation? Really? You are the one who is rejecting God. You might want to actually read the Bible the way it was written and truly understand its message. God loves you, died for you to pay the penalty for your sin. All you need to do is receive him.

## Conclusion

I never heard from RW again after my last comment. This result is not unusual, though. I have found that those who promote false beliefs will, at some point, come to a place where they realize they will never make

### Would You Consider Supporting Us?

Would you consider financial support for **MarketFaith Ministries**? I feel confident that what we are doing is consistent with your beliefs about spreading the gospel and equipping the saints for ministry. Would you let us be one element of your hands and feet in this process? **MarketFaith Ministries** is a 501 (c) (3) not for profit corporation, so your contributions are tax deductible. If you would consider this we would be very grateful. Also, if you would like to know more about the ministry, it would be my pleasure to share with you personally what we are working on and how you can plug in. I can be reached at 850-383-9756 or by e-mail at [Freddy@marketfaith.org](mailto:Freddy@marketfaith.org). As for any donations, they may be sent directly to **MarketFaith Ministries** at 321 Anton Dr., Tallahassee, FL 32312, or you can contribute through our secure website at [www.marketfaith.org](http://www.marketfaith.org). Simply click on the "Donate" button at the bottom of the homepage. We are deeply grateful for your support of this ministry.

And, as always, if you have any thoughts, opinions or suggestions about how **MarketFaith Ministries** can help you, please feel free, at any time, to call (850-383-9756) or e-mail ([info@marketfaith.org](mailto:info@marketfaith.org)). We are here to serve you.

any headway, or they finally begin to see some of the flaws in their own thinking and do not want to continue the discussion.

It is always a sad thing to me to see people rejecting Christ the way RW has done. However, I also recognize that I am only one witness to him. In God's economy there are those who prepare the soil, those who plant, and those who reap. I trust that as RW continues his search for truth, God will use my witness as a part of the process to touch his life and show him the truth about Jesus Christ.