



Without exception the Calvinian position is Non-Trinitarian.

Why?

That's the wrong question.

The right question is the opposite - "Why would someone be Trinitarian?"

No trinitarian has yet been forced to face this as a legitimate question. Certainly many unitarians have debated many trinitarians on the subject matter, but never have trinitarians had to look their fiction dead in the face and ponder it. They presume it's from Scripture and that presumption proceeds from the centuries of the Church holding uninterrupted dominance over all viewpoints. Everyone in Christian lands had to believe in the Trinity or they were guilty of heresy and subject to judgment. A very convincing reason to be compliant to be sure but a very poor argument - believe in this baleful doctrine or burn to death. That's what we mean when we say Christians have never yet had to face the nature of their belief on this matter. It has simply been the norm for millennia and no other position was allowed. Those few who have dared debate trinitarians on this issue officially whether in challenging the establishment or simply playing devil's advocate, have done so from a defensive position which is no threat and is a failing stance.

The debate is always from a standpoint of "why we are not trinitarian". It expounds on all manner of messy logic and faulty reasoning but always forgoing the all important fact that there is not now nor has there ever been any reason to be trinitarian...and most importantly, the burden of proof is not on us who refuse a triune identity for the Almighty. Rather the burden of proof is on the trinitarians to prove this foolish doctrine.

Why should they have to prove it and not us? Because trinitarianism can not be exegetically drawn out of the Canon of Scripture but only superimposed thereupon. Because it existed nowhere in any notion before pagan-converts conquered the Christian Faith. And because the original position of scripture is The Sh'ma - "Hear oh Israel, YHWH is our Mighty One. YHWH is **One**..." Echad - A compound unity, yes. A complex singularity, true. But that unspecified complexity does not automatically imply the specific Trinity? It implies rather an infinity. And we stand on that.

Were the text to say that He is triune (three in one) then we could say He is echad (a complex unity). The specific would be mentioned, therefore the generality would automatically be true aswell. But since the generality is stated (echad) that does not mean therefore that triunity applies. It could be that or any number of explanations. We need not explain why

we don't redefine the undefined unity as a Trinity. We don't need to explain it. Complex Unity is the original position. Any who deviate from said original position must answer for why they do. No matter how much time has passed since the doctrine was thought up and no matter how many people believe it now and how many folks have been forced into it all along. Trinitarians need to give an account of themselves. We do not need to present evidence for why it is false.

What we will here present instead is the excerpts from church history which confess the source and origin of the Trinity, its inception and conceptualization. Though it has ever since been read backwards in time and superimposed onto Scripture, it nevertheless proceeds from no other place than from a certain "church" father.

*"The problem of the relationship between God the Father and His Son Jesus Christ became an acute problem in the church soon after the cessation of persecution. In western Europe, **Tertullian**, for example, **insisted** on the unity of essence in three personalities as the correct interpretation of the Trinity. Hence the dispute centered in the eastern section of the empire. It must be remembered that **the church has always had to fight Unitarian conceptions** of Christ. Modern Unitarianism has had its forerunners in Arianism and sixteenth-century Socinianism.*

***It is Tertullian's work** as a theologian, however, **that is most outstanding**. He was the founder of **Latin theology** and was **the first to state the theological doctrine of the Trinity** and to make use of that term to describe that doctrine. He did this in *Against Praxeas* (chaps. 2-3), written about 215. He seemed to emphasize the distinction that must be made between the persons of the Father and the Son. In *De Anima*, regarding the soul, he emphasized the traducian doctrine of the transmission of the soul from the parents to the child in the reproductive process. He laid great emphasis on the rite of baptism in his *Of Baptism*, believed that post-baptismal sins were mortal sins, and opposed infant baptism....*

*The church reacted against these extravagances [of the Montanists] by condemnation of the movement. The Council at Constantinople in 381 declared that the Montanists should be looked upon as pagans. But **Tertullian**, one of the greatest of the church fathers, found the doctrines of the new group appealing and **became a Montanist**.*

The movement was strongest in Carthage and Eastern lands. It represented the perennial protest that occurs in the church when there is over-elaboration of machinery and lack of dependence on the Spirit of God. The Montanist movement was and is a warning to the church not to forget that its organization and its formulation of doctrine must never be divorced from the satisfaction of the emotional side of man's nature and the human craving for immediate spiritual contact with God....

These men, writing as philosophers rather than theologians, stressed the priority of Christianity as the oldest religion and philosophy because such writings as the Pentateuch predated the Trojan wars and because whatever truth could be found in Greek thought was borrowed from Christianity or Judaism. Much was made of the pure life of Christ, His miracles, and the fulfillment of Old Testament prophecies concerning Him as proofs of the fact that Christianity was the highest philosophy. **Trained for the most part in Greek philosophy before their acceptance of Christianity**, these writers looked upon Greek philosophy as a means to lead men to Christ. They used the New Testament more than the apostolic fathers did....

There is no doubt that Clement favored Greek learning, but any careful study of his works leaves one with the impression that for him the Bible comes first in the life of the Christian. At the same time, since all truth belongs to God, what truth there is in Greek learning should be brought into the service of God. **The danger in this position is that one may imperceptibly synthesize Christianity and Greek learning until Christianity is only a syncretism of Greek philosophy and biblical teaching....**

While the apologists of the second century sought to give a rational explanation and justification of Christianity to the authorities, the polemicists of the late second and the early third centuries endeavored to meet the challenge of false teaching by heretics with an aggressive condemnation of these false teachings and the heretical teachers. One notes again the difference in the approach used by the Eastern and Western churchmen in meeting the problems of heresy and **the theological formulation of Christian truth**. The Eastern mind busied itself with speculative theology and gave most attention to metaphysical problems; **the Western mind was more concerned with aberrations of the polity of the church and endeavored to formulate a sound practical answer to the questions involved in this problem.**

The apologists, **who had been newly converted from paganism**, wrote concerning then external threat to the safety of the church, namely, persecution. The polemicists, **who had had a background of Christian culture**, were concerned with heresy, an internal threat to the peace and purity of the church. The polemicists, unlike the apologists, who had laid much stress on the Old Testament prophecies emphasized **the New Testament as a source for Christian doctrine**. The polemicists sought to condemn by argument the false teachings they opposed. The apologists sought **to explain Christianity to their pagan neighbors and rulers**. The apostolic fathers had earlier sought to edify the Christian church....

It has often been asserted that the attempt to win the favor of the pagan world by this moral-rational approach led to a syncretism that made Christianity only another, although superior, philosophy. The fact is that while the apologies are philosophical in form, they are basically Christian in content. This can be verified by even a casual reading of the actual works of these men. The apologies are valuable to us for the light they throw on Christian thought in the middle of the

second century. Whether they accomplished the purpose their authors intended for them — the ending of the persecution of the Christian church — is open to question....

The Western apologetic writers laid a greater emphasis on the distinctiveness and finality of Christianity than they did on the similarities between the Christian faith and the pagan religions....

Tertullian (ca. 160-225) was the outstanding apologist of the Western church. He was **born into the home of a Roman** centurion on duty in Carthage.

Trained in both Greek and Latin, he was at home in the classics. He became a proficient lawyer and taught public speaking and practiced law in Rome, where he was converted to Christianity. His fiery nature and fighting spirit inclined him toward the puritan approach to the life of Montanism, and he became a Montanist about 202. **His logical Latin mind was devoted to the development of a sound Western theology** and the defeat of all false philosophical and pagan forces opposed to Christianity.!"

(Excerpts from **CHRISTIANITY THROUGH THE CENTURIES: A History of the Christian Church** by Earle E. Cairns)

And similar accounting can be found in almost any church history book as well. They don't hide these facts, but they don't focus on them either nor their impact and meaning. But we will break them down here. We won't defend our opposition to Tertullian's trinity tradition, and we won't argue against it from Scripture as it's not present in Scripture, does not proceed from Scripture, and as is Christianly admitted, a third century external invention. Therefore we will only address this nonsense doctrine from the perspective of its proceeding from these points and from no other position, for it does not deserve anything else.

Let's break this down...

*"The problem of the relationship between God the Father and His Son Jesus Christ became an acute problem in the church soon after the cessation of persecution. In western Europe, **Tertullian**, for example, **insisted** on the unity of essence in three personalities as the correct interpretation of the Trinity. Hence the dispute centered in the eastern section of the empire. It must be remembered that **the church has always had to fight Unitarian conceptions** of Christ. Modern Unitarianism has had its forerunners in Arianism and sixteenth-century Socinianism.*

First we read Mr. Cairns statement "that the church has always had to fight Unitarian conceptions..." Of course it must be noted that even though the term church is being used muchly by him as a reference to the early centuries (and by us as a colloquialism) the term

church did not exist until the *tenth* century. As with many terms and traditions Christianity needs to apply them anachronistically.

But beyond this we need to note that the so-called “church” has *always* had to fight Unitarian conceptions. Should we ask *why* that is? Could it be that the original biblical position was and is unitarian, and disciples are ever attempting to return to their natural state?

It is Tertullian’s work as a theologian, however, that is most outstanding. He was the founder of Latin theology and was the first to state the theological doctrine of the Trinity and to make use of that term to describe that doctrine. He did this in Against Praxeas (chaps. 2-3), written about 215. He seemed to emphasize the distinction that must be made between the persons of the Father and the Son. In De Anima, regarding the soul, he emphasized the traducian doctrine of the transmission of the soul from the parents to the child in the reproductive process. He laid great emphasis on the rite of baptism in his Of Baptism, believed that post-baptismal sins were mortal sins, and opposed infant baptism....

Mr. Cairns goes on to tell us how insistent Tertullian was about this doctrine, that he was the founder of Latin theology, and that he was the first to state the doctrine of the trinity. So we are supposed to believe that this is a biblical doctrine that was only *first* mentioned in the *third* century? It’s a biblical doctrine but it required the pre-existence of Latin theology? It’s a biblical doctrine but it needed the insistence of this overly influential “church” father?

The church reacted against these extravagances [of the Montanists] by condemnation of the movement. The Council at Constantinople in 381 declared that the Montanists should be looked upon as pagans. But Tertullian, one of the greatest of the church fathers, found the doctrines of the new group appealing and became a Montanist.

The movement was strongest in Carthage and Eastern lands. It represented the perennial protest that occurs in the church when there is over-elaboration of machinery and lack of dependence on the Spirit of God. The Montanist movement was and is a warning to the church not to forget that its organization and its formulation of doctrine must never be divorced from the satisfaction of the emotional side of man’s nature and the human craving for immediate spiritual contact with God....

And as mentioned Tertullian became a Montanism, a movement known in its day as New Prophecy. This was a belief in continuing revelation by the Holy Spirit in the exact manner of the apostles and prophets of old. So what kind of kind made up the trinity? One that searched the Scriptures diligently to find the truth inside them? Or one that believed the Holy Spirit was still revealing things to new prophets?

*These men, writing as philosophers rather than theologians, stressed the priority of Christianity as the oldest religion and philosophy because such writings as the Pentateuch predated the Trojan wars and because whatever truth could be found in Greek thought was borrowed from Christianity or Judaism. Much was made of the pure life of Christ, His miracles, and the fulfillment of Old Testament prophecies concerning Him as proofs of the fact that Christianity was the highest philosophy. **Trained for the most part in Greek philosophy before their acceptance of Christianity,** these writers looked upon Greek philosophy as a means to lead men to Christ. They used the New Testament more than the apostolic fathers did....*

Mr. Cairns notes that these early church fathers were well trained in Greek philosophy before their acceptance of Christianity, and Tertullian was no exception. He notes the truth of what happened too but sloughs it off as a theory. "The danger in this position," he says, "is that one may imperceptibly synthesize Christianity and Greek learning until Christianity is only a syncretism of Greek philosophy and biblical teaching...."

That was *exactly* the danger, except it was almost never imperceptibly blended. The syncretism was nearly always intentional. And it wasn't merely a dangerous threat; it was actually the disastrous fate of the faith. *The Way* of the Messiah devolved into Christianity, and Christianity dissolved slowly into the mush of Greek philosophy and religion. The melding of pagan and Christian till one was the other and the other the one and each indistinguishable.

*There is no doubt that Clement favored Greek learning, but any careful study of his works leaves one with the impression that for him the Bible comes first in the life of the Christian. At the same time, since all truth belongs to God, what truth there is in Greek learning should be brought into the service of God. **The danger in this position is that one may imperceptibly synthesize Christianity and Greek learning until Christianity is only a syncretism of Greek philosophy and biblical teaching....***

As this church history writer attests, the apologists and polemicists of the late second and the early third centuries tried giving a rational explanation and justification of Christianity and to challenge false teaching by heretics with aggressive condemnation. The theological formulation of Christian truth was their concern. Not a discovery of Biblical truth, but instead a formulation of Christian Truth. Not an aim of explaining theological doctrine from Scripture but rather using Greek reason and Roman thinking to construct from Scratch the tenets everyone would be forced to bend to in after years. The fact that these so-called "truths" needed to be formulated and were only capable of being explained through a Greco-Roman world view should have clued every in to the fact that they are fabricated pagan philosophies.

Without ever taking the time to learn Truth from Scripture, these Greco-Roman philosophers-turned-Christians took what they knew and used it to try to explain the Scriptures through domestication. That is, they tried to adapt the Text to their understanding when their job was the opposite, to learn the Scriptures in their context and adapt their understanding to it.

Lacking that prerequisite, these pagan-minded panegyrists propagandized a perverted form of religion, partly what they knew from their previous lives and partly what they learned from the pages of Holy Writ. And through their preaching that pitiful religion became the orthodox view, with all else deemed heresy.

While the apologists of the second century sought to give a rational explanation and justification of Christianity to the authorities, the polemicists of the late second and the early third centuries endeavored to meet the challenge of false teaching by heretics with an aggressive condemnation of these false teachings and the heretical teachers. One notes again the difference in the approach used by the Eastern and Western churchmen in meeting the problems of heresy and the theological formulation of Christian truth. The Eastern mind busied itself with speculative theology and gave most attention to metaphysical problems; the Western mind was more concerned with aberrations of the polity of the church and endeavored to formulate a sound practical answer to the questions involved in this problem.

The apologists, who had been newly converted from paganism, wrote concerning then external threat to the safety of the church, namely, persecution. The polemicists, who had had a background of Christian culture, were concerned with heresy, an internal threat to the peace and purity of the church. The polemicists, unlike the apologists, who had laid much stress on the Old Testament prophecies emphasized the New Testament as a source for Christian doctrine. The polemicists sought to condemn by argument the false teachings they opposed. The apologists sought to explain Christianity to their pagan neighbors and rulers. The apostolic fathers had earlier sought to edify the Christian church....

These new converts to Christianity and long time Christians alike were inventing Christian tenet and branding everyone else heretical. Yet neither type of “church” fathers were qualified to teach, because each group was trained in pagan philosophy and the Christian syncretistic beliefs of the day and none trained in Hebrew, Hebrew culture, and Hebrew world view...which is to say biblical language, biblical culture, and biblical world view. None of them knew Torah, and all of them thought it was some Jewish nonsense.

In what other area of life do we appoint the novice to the position of spokesman? In what branch of medicine, science, art, education, engineering, carpentry, masonry, plumbing, writing, mechanics, rocketry, robotics, whatever...in what other area do we hand the highest

positions and the mastery over our art and craft to a newbie? In what world do we let someone walk into our profession and tell us that we need to reinterpret the thing we've mastered through the viewpoint of some completely irrelevant thing? We never would behave in this way with any other field, yet this is precisely how we allowed our religion to be ruined in the early years. The newest members with the least knowledgeable in *The Way* were given the most opportunities to speak for the faith, and allowed the right and privilege to filter it through all their heathen beliefs. And subsequent generations well raised in that new view were set to slandering the original position along with other aberrations as heretical.

It has often been asserted that the attempt to win the favor of the pagan world by this moral-rational approach led to a syncretism that made Christianity only another, although superior, philosophy. The fact is that while the apologies are philosophical in form, they are basically Christian in content. This can be verified by even a casual reading of the actual works of these men. The apologies are valuable to us for the light they throw on Christian thought in the middle of the second century. Whether they accomplished the purpose their authors intended for them — the ending of the persecution of the Christian church — is open to question....

Again Mr. Cairns notices the part of the problem but not all of it, and he dismisses it as if it were merely a potential issue that never came to pass. He says, "It has often been asserted that the attempt to win the favor of the pagan world by this moral-rational approach led to a syncretism that made Christianity only another, although superior, philosophy." It's hardly an assertion, because that is indeed exactly what happened. The only assertion is that it was merely a moral-rational approach as opposed to the totality of the matter, that it was in reality a complete pagan worldview and heathen training approach. But either way it led inevitably to the aforementioned syncretism within Christendom - the blending of holy and heathen and the extrication of the genuine form of each.

The Western apologetic writers laid a greater emphasis on the distinctiveness and finality of Christianity than they did on the similarities between the Christian faith and the pagan religions....

*Tertullian (ca. 160-225) was the outstanding apologist of the Western church. He was **born into the home of a Roman** centurion on duty in Carthage.*

Trained in both Greek and Latin, he was at home in the classics. He became a proficient lawyer and taught public speaking and practiced law in Rome, where he was converted to Christianity. His fiery nature and fighting spirit inclined him toward the puritan approach to the life of Montanism, and he became a Montanist about 202. His logical Latin mind was devoted to

the development of a sound Western theology and the defeat of all false philosophical and pagan forces opposed to Christianity.!"

And of this group of people Tertullian was a titular figure, rather than an aberration. He was born to Roman parents, raised in the Roman world, and well trained in Roman law. As Mr. Cairns mentioned Tertullian was at home among the Greek classics. He was well learned in Greek and Latin but was not learned in Hebrew. He was a Roman lawyer and a Greek orator, as well as a teacher of both. And his fighting ambition was to develop western theology from Greek logic and Latin thought. And all this in a Montanist belief that the Holy Spirit was continuing to speak to people and indeed through people like himself.

All of this, not Scripture and history, gave us the trinity.

It wasn't carefully extracted from the eternal living Word. It wasn't hermeneutically extracted from the Holy Writings of old. It was not exegetically discovered and drawn forth from the text. No. Instead Tertullian used His Latin thinking and Roman training to concoct the entire doctrine out of thin air, mixing the mention of Father, Son, and Holy Spirit with the notion of polytheistic philosophy. And then used his Greek oratory skills to sell that slop to simpletons longing for a Savior.

He believed the Holy Spirit was speaking through him. And though the Christian bishops later deemed Montanism a heresy, nevertheless, they still embraced much of the works of Tertullian, developing them further and further until they were beyond all possible recognition from the original.

So no, we who hold the original non-trinitarian position will not be explaining ourselves or taking up a defensive position. The fact is this doctrine was dirt cheap to start with, and didn't deserve our time and attention. It did not proceed from Scripture. It was developed in the 3rd century and read backward in time onto the text of Scripture. It was made by a Greco-Roman from a Greco-Roman mind reflecting a Greco-Roman perspective. Knowledge of the Hebrew Scriptures and Hebrew language and Hebrew culture were not taken into consideration. Concern for accuracy to history was not a consideration. And fidelity to the old ways was not known or considered at all.

Tertullian, as with every other of his fellow so-called "church" fathers used their life experience from the pagan world, their own imagination, ignorance of Hebrew culture, and private interpretation to declare the meaning of Hebrew Scripture. His goal was developing new doctrine not holding fast to the changeless Text. And with a hungry drive to shape

dogma as he saw it with his western eyes and an overeagerness to decide whose religion was right or not, also based on his own limited vision, Tertullian concocted a monster deity - 3 in 1 but not 3, really only just one, yet not just one in the biblical sense. Anyone who believed as much was branded a heretic, and as often as could be carried out, burnt alive with pride.

No indeed, we don't defend against trinitarian tradition as it has no foundation from which to be believed in the first place. It required ignorant teachers to invent it, a myriad of novices as advocates, and the powers that be, blindly believing whatever was the majority view of the day. It required a milieu mired in monarchic domination, and the death penalty applied to all challengers. The doctrine was never justified and no one ever was required to give reason for its rise, therefore it doesn't matter how much time has passed nor how many unfortunate millions have been force-fed this spiritual slop, it remains unjustified and unjustifiable.

Yes it's been dominating for hundreds and hundreds of years. But time doesn't make something true. It just makes it old...yet not quite old enough. And no matter how much time has passed, the burden of proof is still on trinitarians to prove their case not for us to prove ours. In all these ages, we have not changed. We hold fast to *The Way* incorruptible, and to the eternal command - Hear oh Israel YHWH is our Mighty One. YHWH is **One**....

If you think there's three in there somewhere, so be it...But *you* prove it.



templecrier.com