



WORLDVIEW MADE PRACTICAL
Volume 16 Number 33
September 1, 2021

Discussion about the Trinity with a Unitarian: Part 3

By Freddy Davis

Recently, I had a discussion about the Trinity with a person who is a Unitarian – a person who doesn't believe in the Trinity (not to be confused with a Unitarian Universalist). It was too long a discussion to fit into a single post, so needed to be divided into three parts. This is part three of that dialog.

Part one can be read at:

<http://www.marketfaith.org/2021/06/discussion-about-the-trinity-with-a-unitarian-part-1>

Part two can be read at:

<http://www.marketfaith.org/2021/06/discussion-about-the-trinity-with-a-unitarian-part-2>

Unitarian

Freddy Davis Your problem is that you assume Trinitarianism is true, and twist the Scriptures to make them fit that viewpoint (2 Pt 3:15,16). I have not taken 1 Cor 8:6 out of context, I just don't accept Trinitarianism's misrepresentation of the verse. Jesus' "Father" is "the only true God". Trinitarianism's wants to have its cake and eat it too, by claiming Jesus gave up his heavenly privileges, and yet, at the same time, he is God on earth. You can't have it both ways, but that's what you want. Your problem is that I'm onto your game, I see right through the deception of Trinitarianism. By the Scriptures, I've refuted Trinitarianism many times, but you're in denial.

Freddy Davis

Unitarian If you really understood Trinitarianism, you would understand that it is not a matter of "having my cake and eating it, too," and it is not a matter of "having it both ways." That is simply not

an accurate representation. If God is really is an eternal person who is, Himself, not subject to the laws of the material universe, then it is not unreasonable at all that he would exist as a kind of being that is different from what can be understood based on the limitations of temporal reality. You are simply placing restrictions on God that you have no justification for doing. As I said before, your characterization of the Trinitarian point of view is only valid if your Unitarian point of view is true. The Bible simply does not back that up. Your assertion that you have refuted it is simply not true and is only a reflection of your lack of understanding of a Trinitarian point of view. I hate to keep saying that, but since you have yet to represent it correctly, I have no other choice.

BTW: Just curious, where did you do your theological studies?

RH (A third party inserted himself into the conversation at this point.)

Unitarian How could Jesus know Saul was on the road to Damascus and what his intentions were if there is no trinity ? Jesus knew Saul intended to persecute Christians and knew his exact location. Acts 9:1-5

King James Version

1 And Saul, yet breathing out threatenings and slaughter against the disciples of the Lord, went unto the high priest,

2 And desired of him letters to Damascus to the synagogues, that if he found any of this way, whether they were men or women, he might bring them bound unto Jerusalem.

3 And as he journeyed, he came near Damascus: and suddenly there shined round about him a light from heaven:

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.*

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>.

4 And he fell to the earth, and heard a voice saying unto him, Saul, Saul, why persecutest thou me?

5 And he said, Who art thou, Lord? And the Lord said, I am Jesus whom thou persecutest: it is hard for thee to kick against the pricks.

Freddy Davis

Unitarian I'm sorry, Unitarian, but your last comment is pure speculation, and only works if your Unitarian philosophy is true. To now, you have not, in any respect, demonstrated that to be the case. I'm not sure RH's argument holds as a great argument for Trinitarianism, but the problems associated with your position, and your reply to him, do not have any objective biblical support. It all depends on your pre-suppositions concerning the nature of God – and you have not demonstrated, in any sense, that your position can hold up.

[**Note:** As RH debated along an entirely different track from my own, and there was no connection with my conversation, his discussion has not been included here.]

Unitarian

Freddy Davis When you mention pre-supposition, you're describing Trinitarianism to a T!!!! Almost every scripture I've quoted demolishes Trinitarianism. Objective Bible reading reveals that "THERE IS ONLY ONE GOD, THE FATHER" (1 Cor 8:6 NJB), the "FATHER" is "THE ONLY TRUE GOD" (Jn 17:1, 3). "The true God" has a "Son, Jesus Christ" (1 Jn 5:20). Jesus admitted "the Father is greater than I" (Jn 14:28). The scriptures themselves kill Trinitarianism, because it's a bald-faced lie. We are warned: "Everyone who loves . . . falsehood" (Rev 22:15) is outside New Jerusalem.

Freddy Davis

Unitarian I have said this over and over, but for some reason you don't

seem to understand. Your interpretation of Scripture only kills Trinitarianism IF Unitarian philosophy is true. It is not. You have not given even one piece of evidence that it is. All you have done is to take verses out of context using proof texting and claiming that certain passages are based on metaphor that are not actually metaphor. There is not a single argument that you have made that is an "objective" interpretation of Scripture. Your arguments fail because you can't justify your interpretive methodology. I'm sorry, but your arguments are simply wrong and cannot even really be taken seriously until you justify the validity of your Unitarian philosophy. The sense I am getting, though, is that you really have no idea what I am even talking about.

BTW: You never answered my question. Where did you get your theological education?

Unitarian

Freddy Davis My theological education comes God's Word, and from my feeble attempts to imitate the Master: "The Jews were amazed and said, 'How does he know scripture without having studied?' Jesus answered them and said, 'My teaching is not my own but is from the one who sent me'" (Jn 7:15, 16 NAB). "But who delights in the law of Yahweh and murmurs his law day and night" (Ps 1:2 NJB). "They welcomed the word very readily; every day they studied the scriptures to check whether it was true" (Acts 17:11 NJB). "God said to Moses, 'I am Yahweh--'the LORD.' I appeared to Abraham, to Isaac, and to Jacob as El-Shaddai--'God Almighty--but I did not reveal my name Yahweh to them" (Ex 6:2,3 NLT). "God said to Moses, 'I am he who is.' And he said, 'This is what you are to say to the Israelites, 'I am sent me to you.' God further said to Moses, You are to tell the Israelites, 'Yahweh the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac and the God of Jacob, has sent me to you.' This is my name for all

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. 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

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**, © 2021. All rights reserved.

time, and thus I am to be invoked for all generations to come" (Ex 3:14,15 NJB). The God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob is Yahweh, God Almighty. "The God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, the God of our fathers, has glorified HIS SERVANT JESUS" (Acts 3:13 NIV). Jesus is is Yahweh, God Almighty's Son, not God, nor is Jesus equal to God. Yahweh God Almighty, the Father of Jesus, is once again shown to be "the only true God" (Jn 17:1,3), without any equals.

Freddy Davis

Unitarian Are you familiar with Joseph Smith, Charles Taze Russell, Mary Baker Eddy, David Berg, or Charles and Myrtle Fillmore (there are others but this should make the point)? All of these are people who believed they were able to make their own private interpretations of the Bible and ended up creating cults. Asserting that your theological education comes from "God's Word" is totally meaningless if your approach to interpretation is faulty – which yours is. I'm sorry, but your answer is simply not valid unless and until you justify your approach to hermeneutics – which so far you have not even attempted. All you have done is assert that you are right. You are not right, and your attempt to justify your false interpretations are simply not acceptable. You can quote Scripture all day long but it is meaningless until you demonstrate the truth of your Unitarian philosophy. At this point, all I can say is that you are a false prophet.

Unitarian

Freddy Davis All I am is one of the "uneducated laymen" (Acts 4:13 NJB). I make no "private interpretations of the Bible", nor do I claim any special status or position, nor do I claim to be a prophet, nor have I ever made any predictions. I have no following, cult, or otherwise. I am nothing. "Interpretations come from God"

(Gen 40:8 NAB). I did not invent any of the beliefs that I hold. Others long before me have held all of the beliefs that I hold. None of the faithful ones of the OT, such as those mentioned in Heb 11, were Trinitarians. Neither Jesus, nor his Apostles, nor any Bible writers were Trinitarians. The Trinity doctrine was not even finalized until late in the 4th, or even into the 5th century. I've demonstrated numerous times in my posts to you that, according to the Bible, "there is only one God, the Father", who is "the only true God", and is only "One" "He", not three (Dt 6:4; 1 Cor 8:6 NJB; Jn 17:3; Mk 12:29,32 NAB). Because of your bias toward the Trinity, your mind has been "blinded" (2 Cor 4:4) toward these Biblical truths.

Freddy Davis

Unitarian I'm not sure I would brag about being an "uneducated layman." As you continue to promote unbiblical doctrines based on bad biblical interpretations, you are proving yourself to be true.

You have ASSERTED your Unitarian doctrine numerous times in your posts, but you have certainly not DEMONSTRATED, even once, that your interpretations are true. You yourself have defended proof texting and have asserted certain passages to be metaphor (that actually are not metaphor) in order to support your positions. Whether you claim special status or not, you do claim that your interpretations of Scripture are true without ever supporting your hermeneutic. I fully recognize that you are not the only Unitarian that has ever existed. That heresy goes way back to Arianism from around 250 A.D. (BTW: Your characterization of the history of the Trinitarian doctrine is not accurate. But even that completely misses the point. Belief in the Trinity is not based on some group of theologians "finalizing" a doctrine, it is derived from the Bible itself [perhaps you would do well to read the

articles again – if you ever read them in the first place.]). Continuing to quote Scripture out of context does not prove your point.

Unitarian

Freddy Davis The problem with your articles is that they contradict the Bible. "Whether it is right in God's sight to listen to you rather than to God, you must judge" (Acts 4:19 NRSV). From beginning to end, "the only true God" is the "Father" (Jn 17:1,3), who is "the only God, our Saviour, through Jesus Christ" (Jude 25 NJB). "The true God" has a "Son, Jesus Christ" (1 Jn 5:20). "Jesus Christ" is shown to be "the Son of the Father" (2 Jn 3 NJB), not Almighty God, as Trinitarians assert. Rest assured, I'll take God's Word over yours, my friend!

Freddy Davis

Unitarian The articles can only be said to contradict the Bible if your interpretive methodology is such that you "deem" them incorrect. You keep appealing to John 17 to support your assertion, and I have already specifically showed you how that interpretation is wrong. You are not taking God's word over mine in your interpretation, you are taking Unitarian philosophy over biblical hermeneutics. Your theology is wrong because your interpretive framework is wrong. You can keep objecting all you want, but until you are able to justify why leaving out certain passages of Scripture in your interpretations (proof texting), changing the clear meaning of certain texts (using metaphor when metaphor is not appropriate), and attempting to rewrite history (an new mistaken hermeneutic that you have now resorted to), you cannot be taken seriously. Your approach to interpretation is simply not valid. As a result, you have come to a false conclusion. Unitarianism is not a biblical belief.

Unitarian

Freddy Davis "The developed concept of three coequal partners in the Godhead . . . cannot be clearly detected within the confines of the canon"---Oxford Companion to the Bible

Freddy Davis

Unitarian It can't if you begin with Unitarian philosophy and assume that God's eternity is bound by the laws of the natural universe. But neither of those things are true.

Very interesting, though, that you are using the Oxford Companion to the Bible as an authority source to back up your theology. Are you aware that it is edited by Bruce Metzger, a New Testament emeritus professor at Princeton Theological Seminary (somewhat liberal theologically, but a Trinitarian)? I am very surprised that you would use a source like that – and don't even interpret it correctly. I thought you only used the Bible. One more proof that your interpretive method is not based on biblical hermeneutics, but on Unitarian philosophy. You are now just grabbing at anything that "seems" to back up your position whether it has any merit or not. Seriously?

Unitarian

Freddy Davis "The Trinity of God is defined by the Church as the belief that in God there are three persons who subsist in one nature. The belief as so defined was reached only in the 4th and 5th centuries AD and hence IS NOT EXPLICITLY AND FORMALLY A BIBLICAL BELIEF. The trinity of persons within the unity of nature is defined in terms of 'person' and 'nature' which are GK philosophical terms; actually the terms do not appear in the Bible"---Dictionary of the Bible by John L Mckenzie, S J

Freddy Davis

Unitarian The reason the word Trinity does not appear in the Bible is the same reason Unitarian doesn't appear – the biblical writers simply explained how God was revealing himself in daily life, not in "doctrinal" terms. The felt need to do that kind of explanation was not present in the early church. That said, the concept is derived from the biblical teachings and is all over the New Testament (I refer you, once again, to the articles).

You are simply wrong in your historical analysis. The term Trinity is a theological explanation of what is revealed in the text. While the need to more carefully explain the doctrine didn't come until later (actually when false doctrines, like Arianism, began becoming a problem), the beliefs were there all along and were taught

all along. The doctrine itself was not new when the Catholic church began feeling the need give more explanation.

Once again I find your sourcing quite curious. Are you aware that John L. McKenzie was a Roman Catholic theologian? Are you aware that Roman Catholics are solidly Trinitarian? In fact, the entity you are saying created the Trinitarian doctrine in the 4th and 5th centuries was the Catholic church. Are you saying that McKenzie was denouncing the beliefs of his own church? Hardly! Your cherry picking, not only of theology but of history, is simply disingenuous. The more you comment the less credible your assertions. I'm sorry, but you have over and over completely undermined your own arguments. Unitarianism is simply a false doctrine.

Unitarian

Freddy Davis "We played wedding songs and you didn't dance, so we played funeral songs and you didn't mourn" (Mt 11:17 NIV). So with you also, if I quoted from a non-Trinitarian source, you would denounce the source as being biased against the Trinity. I'm well aware of who Mckenzie was, which makes his admission all the more credible. By quoting from a Trinitarian, it cannot be said that he has any bias against the Trinity. His comments are candidly honest.

Freddy Davis

Unitarian The problem is, he was not even addressing what you are asserting. He was not refuting a Trinitarian belief. There is a lot about Roman Catholic theology that I don't agree with, but the point here is not about the theology. It is about how and why a formal explanation of the Trinity became necessary. It was because of an outbreak of heresy (Unitarianism being a major one) that the church felt it needed to address. McKenzie was not "admitting" what you think he was "admitting." Your explanation is simply in error – which makes the point of your Bible quote also mistaken. It is not a matter of me telling you that you are wrong whichever way you went, it is a matter of us dealing with entirely different subjects. The comparison you have tried to make is simply in error.

Unitarian

Freddy Davis You may be able to pull the wool over a lot people's eyes, but not me, on this issue, my friend. Your problem is that I have Mckenzie's "Dictionary of the Bible" book in my possession. The article that I'm quoting from is "Trinity". I may not be too bright in a lot of ways, but one thing I can do is read. I have very good reading comprehension. I've quoted Mckenzie honestly, and in context. If you don't like the facts, you really do have serious eternal problems, friend!

Freddy Davis

Unitarian You continue to miss the point. The Trinitarian doctrine was the established belief of the early church WELL BEFORE it was ever formalized by any church council. Frankly, I don't even care about the opinion of the Roman Catholic Church as regards these things (they also have a very slanted point of view that is non-biblical at many points). I was only pointing out your mistaken interpretation of history – which is still incorrect. The only thing I care about is how the biblical text describes the nature and work of God. The Bible does not support Unitarian theology. I have explained over and over why that is so, and have also pointed out your erroneous hermeneutic many times. You simply cannot build a credible argument on a false foundation.

I still find it interesting that you would try to use a liberal Roman Catholic as an authority source when you don't believe what he believes either. You cherry pick his writings for proof texts just like you do with the Bible. Obviously you see proof texting to be a valid hermeneutic as a general practice. It is not! It does not and cannot support your assertions.

Unitarian

Freddy Davis "You are in error because you do not know the Scriptures or the power of God" (Mt 22:29 NIV). I imitate the examples of Jesus, John, Peter, Philip, James, and Paul in using the scriptures honestly and in their proper context (Mt 5:21-45; Lk 24:27,44; Jn 12:37-41; Acts 2:14-39; 8:30-35; 13:32-48; 15:13-21; 17:2,3; 28:23-28; Rom 3:9-20). What you don't like is the fact that the Scripture debunk Trinitarianism.

Freddy Davis

Unitarian What you said in your last post is simply not true. You are not imitating the examples of those you mentioned, and I really don't know why you think you are. Beyond that, as I have demonstrated repeatedly, your use of the Scriptures is not honest, and you often ignore context. You have not, even once, debunked Trinitarianism, and you will never even approach doing so until you can figure out how to use legitimate hermeneutical principles. You can't just assert a philosophy, then build a theology around it without legitimately backing up the philosophy itself. I have shared with you over and over what you must do to accomplish that, but you have not even tried. You have only continued to repeat your same false statements and using the same verses out of context. Sorry, but your approach to interpreting Scripture is simply not valid, which is causing your conclusions to be false.

Unitarian

Freddy Davis Trinitarians calling me dishonest only confirms what 2 Cor 6:8 says: "WE ARE TREATED AS DECEIVERS AND YET ARE TRUTHFUL" (NAB). Trinitarians usually become angry, and often resort to name-calling (i. e., "your use of the Scriptures is not honest"), after their pet "proof texts" are proven not to support their dogma. Let's take just one example, Jn 8:58. Trinitarians claim Jesus is the "I Am" of Ex 3:14. "God said to Moses, 'I am he who is' . . . 'Yahweh, the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac and the God of Jacob has sent me to you'" (Ex 3:14,15 NJB). Acts 3:13 proves that "I am he who is" cannot be Jesus, because we're told: "It is the God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, the God of our ancestors, who has glorified his servant Jesus" (NJB). So, yes, I understand that when each and every one of Trinitarianism's "proof texts" are proven to be taken out of context and misapplied, it is upsetting. No one likes their world turned upside down. I understand that. But the Bible "cuts more incisively than any two-edged sword . . . it can pass judgment on secret emotions and thoughts" (Heb 4:12 NJB). I pray that you'll prayerfully meditate on this.

Freddy Davis

Actually, my evaluation of your arguments does not confirm your misappropriation of Scripture. You continue to make the same false arguments over and over that I have not only pointed out, but have also explained WHY they are wrong. You have never even attempted to demonstrate why your hermeneutic is correct, you just continue to repeat your same false mantra (and you obviously don't understand the difference between proof texting and solid theological study). Repeating a false assertion many times will not make it true.

At this point, Unitarian, quit interacting with me and continued his discussion with R.H. – a discussion that focused more on the two of them simply exchanging and disputing each other's Scripture quotes. Doing that kind of back and forth is one way of having this discussion, of course, but I did not find reading it particularly fruitful, since the two of them have entirely different approaches to interpreting Scripture. My purpose in taking the approach that I did was to point out how Unitarian's actual approach to biblical interpretation was not right. If his entire approach is wrong, then the interpretation he was making using that approach cannot be true. It is my hope and prayer that reading this dialog has given you some insight not only into this very important Christian doctrine, but also into how to deal with people who might try to lead you into a false belief about the Christian faith.

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. 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. 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). We are here to serve you.