

The Trinity Delusion

An exposé of the doctrine of the Trinity

1 Timothy 2:5

For there is one God, and there is one mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus.

Proof of the Trinity Error

Paul identifies Jesus as someone who is necessarily not the one God

The Evidence

The Definition of a Mediator

A mediator is **by definition** someone who mediates for two parties. A mediator is an identity who is in the middle between two other identities. By definition he is neither of the two other parties for whom he mediates. This is true whether either of those two parties are single individuals or an identifiable group. By definition, a mediator cannot be the same identity as the other two identities for whom he mediates. For this reason, we have a clear declaration that Jesus is not to be identified as the one God in this passage. Jesus mediates between two other parties: (1) the one God, and (2) men/humanity. Moreover, we are told that the mediator between God and men, is the "**man**" Jesus.

The Trinitarian Response

The Trinitarian response is a word game designed to trick others and confuse the reality of the situation. It usually takes the following form:

"But by this reasoning Jesus cannot be a man, either; yet this very text says he is a man!"

- (Robert Bowman, *Why You Should Believe in the Trinity*, p.73).

Bowman is arguing that if anyone argues that Jesus cannot be the one God in this verse, then to be consistent, one must also argue Jesus is not a man either. In other words, their argument is that you can't say Jesus is not the one God or you can't say he is a man either. This is enough to trick people but it is false. There are two things wrong with this response. First, it completely disregards a certain fact. It disregards the fact that a mediator is **by definition** an identity which is neither of the other two identities for whom he mediates. Second, the argument is a deceptive fallacy because it suggestively plants the idea in your mind that the argument in question is that Jesus is mediating between the one God and "a man." But that is not what Paul said. Jesus is not mediating between one God and "a man." He is mediating between the one God and **MEN**. Hence, if we argue that this verse shows Jesus is not the one God for whom

he mediates, then we would need to consistently argue that this verse that this verse shows Jesus is not the **MEN** for whom he mediates. And yes, that is what we would argue.

This Trinitarian argument is just a deceptive tactic to nullify Paul's words by confusing the facts and dupe people. Trinitarians are not interested in what Paul's words really mean. They are only interested in their doctrinal idol, the Trinity, and nullifying anything which suggests they are wrong. So they come up with arguments like this to try and nullify the impact of Paul's words. However, as we have seen, their response is fallacious. We do not need to consistently argue Jesus is not a man. We need to consistently argue Jesus is not the group of MEN for whom he mediates. And he isn't. Jesus is not the one God for whom he mediates and Jesus is not the men for whom he mediates.

"False prophets also arose among the people just as there will also be false teachers among you who will secretly introduce destructive heresies....they will exploit you with well-turned words." (2 Peter 2:1-3).

This contrivance is nothing but a crafty ruse to distract you from what Paul actually said and attempt to nullify the fact that a mediator is in fact by definition neither of the two parties by identity for whom he mediates. Notice the Trinitarian response goes, "If you say..." or "If you argue..." and suggestively implies this is in fact your argument. But it isn't the argument. Carefully observe what Bowman said above. He is suggestively implying that if someone argues that if Jesus is not the one God then one must also argue Jesus is not a man to be consistent. But that is not what this verse is about. It isn't about mediating between the one God and a man. In the table below, carefully compare what Paul actually said against what Bowman has secretly introduced into the argument at hand.

1 Timothy 2:5			
	Party 1	Party 3	Party 2
Identities in 1 Tim 2:5	One God by identity	Jesus the Mediator	<u>Plural</u> "MEN"
What Bowman Introduces	"God"	Jesus the Mediator	<u>Δ</u> Man

Notice how Bowman's argument smuggled in the notion that Jesus is mediating between the one God and "Δ man" by suggesting one must consistently argue Jesus is not "A man" either. But this is not the argument. Paul is not taking about Jesus mediating between the one God and "Δ man" nor is anyone making this argument. Nobody has to consistently argue that Jesus is not "a man" if they argue that Jesus is not the one God because nobody is saying Jesus mediates for "a man." Paul is clearly saying, however, that Jesus mediates for the "one God." The argument is that by definition Jesus cannot be either of the other two identities in question. And he isn't. What are the two identities in question in this verse for whom Jesus is mediating? Are these two parties, (1) the one God, and (2) "a man" as Bowman is suggesting? No! The two parties are: (1) the one God, and (2) plural "men."

It is very important that you clearly see how this word trick works. Bowman's argument introduces an idea which is neither present in Paul's words nor present in the argument which non-Trinitarians are making. The argument is that Jesus cannot be the "one God" because by definition a mediator is a third party who is necessarily by definition neither of the other two parties by identity. The consistent argument then is to say that Jesus is ALSO not the "men" in this verse for whom Jesus mediates. And he isn't. But Bowman's response is designed to confuse people because it suggestively rather implies that Jesus is mediating between two identities: (1) one God and (2) "A man." But the verse has nothing to do with Jesus mediating between the one God and a man and nobody is making such an argument. This is the basis of this word trick and you must understand it and see it clearly.

Hence an honest response from Bownman would be:

If you reason that Jesus cannot be the "one God" for whom he mediates, then you must also consistently reason he is not the "men" for whom he mediates either!

And the answer to that question would be, "Yes, we would consistently argue this to be the case."

Many "Men" but only "One God"

This verse refers to Jesus mediating between two parties, (1) the one God and (2) many "men." Jesus is the third party in view. By definition, a Mediator cannot be either of the other two parties by identity. And Jesus is not either of the other two parties by identity. He is not the "one God" for whom he mediates and he is not the "men" for whom he mediates. Neither is he one of the men for whom he mediates. He is not mediating for himself.

Jesus can indeed be a man and be a mediator between God and men. The reason Jesus can be a man is because there are many men and so he can mediate for many **other** men. There isn't any reason he cannot be a man and mediate for other men. Indeed, Paul here says explicitly that the mediator is "the MAN Jesus." However, Jesus cannot be the "one God" **because there is only one God** to mediate for and not many Gods as is the case with men. And this is the reason Jesus cannot be the one God. There is only one identity called "God." On the other hand, there are many human beings. Since the mediator cannot be either of the other two parties for whom he mediates, he cannot be God since there is only one God. Jesus is necessarily mediating for someone else. And he can be a man mediating for other men.

If we said, "there is one King of the world, and one mediator between the King and all men, the man Jesus," it would be clear to everyone that Jesus is not the King. It would also be clear to everyone that there is no reason Jesus cannot be a man. And it would also be clear to everyone that Jesus cannot be the King in the same way because there is only one King and Jesus is not that King for whom he mediates. He is, rather, mediating for that one King, and by definition a mediator cannot be either party by identity.

1 Timothy 2:5		
Party One	Mediator Third	Party Two

Party		
The <u>One</u> God	The man Jesus	<u>Many</u> Men
By definition, Jesus <u>cannot be</u> this identity	By definition, Jesus <u>must be</u> this identity	By definition, Jesus <u>cannot be</u> this identity

Conclusion

The passage clearly shows Jesus to be a distinct identity from both the group of men and the one God mentioned in this verse. He is neither of those two parties from whom he mediates since he mediates between those parties. God is someone else. He is indeed a rightful mediator between the one God and man men in his risen glory. However, that is quite beside the point. The Trinitarian response, and variations therefor, are complete fallacies because they introduce new extraneous ideas into the argument which were not there in the first place. Jesus is not mediating between a divine nature and human nature but between two identities. Neither is Jesus mediating between the "one God" and "a man." Jesus cannot be the one God because he mediating for that one God and there is only one God in existence. Neither can he be the group of men for whom he is mediating. And he isn't.

Hence this passage is positive proof that Jesus is not the one God.

How to Respond to Trinitarians

If you get this argument from Trinitarians...

"If you reason that Jesus cannot be "God" then you must consistently reason Jesus cannot be a man either."

....then you should respond thusly:

"You are incorrect. I do not need to consistently argue that Jesus is not "a man." Paul is not talking about Jesus mediating between the one God and "a man." He is talking about Jesus mediating between two other parties by identity, the one God and plural "men." This is a question of identities. By definition a Mediator cannot be either of the two other parties for whom he is mediating and he isn't. He isn't the one God by identity for whom he is mediating and he isn't the group of men by identity for whom he is mediating either nor is he one of the group of men for whom he is mediating. He can't be the one God because there is only ONE God in existence and he is mediating for that one God. But he can be a man because there are MANY men in existence and one man out of all men can be appointed by God as a Mediator for all other men. And it is for this reason Paul says that the Mediator is "the MAN Jesus."

If you get this argument from Trinitarians....

"If you reason that Jesus cannot be "God" then you must consistently reason Jesus cannot be "human" either."

....then you should respond thusly:

"You are incorrect. I do not need to reason Jesus is not "human." Paul is not talking about Jesus mediating between divine natures and human natures. He is talking about Jesus mediating between two other identities, not natures, and those two identities are the one God and plural men. By definition a Mediator cannot be either of the two other parties for whom he is mediating and he isn't. He isn't the one God for whom he is mediating and he isn't the men for whom he is mediating. He can't be the one God because there is only ONE God in existence. But he can be a man because there are MANY men in existence and one man out of all men can be appointed by God as a Mediator for all other men. And it is for this reason Paul says that the Mediator is "the MAN Jesus."

1 Timothy 2:5 Proves Jesus is not the One God



Last Revision/Update: May 2, 2018

HOME