H: Unitarianism (Theological) - minus 60 points (H1) or 72 points (H2)

By and large errors in this area—I speak as a trinitarian—are simply based on lyricists living in poor theology, even as misvisualisation is likewise based on living in poor praying.

Soft unitarianism

Since Part 2 has covered this point indepth, no more than a slight summary shall be given here. Soft unitarianism differs from the issue that is later looked at under the idea of prayer misvisualisation, in that the latter can operate within a trinitarian framework, and is essentially a problem of prayer. Unitarianism (Islam is one form) visualises God as one being, one person, one monopersonal, nonsocietal, being, so theological misvisualisation.1 Biblical revelation has various ways of handling the concept, trinity. The terms Yahweh, and God, tend to focus on God the father, as ultimate source—monarchia. Theologians speak of the eternal generation, and eternal spiration, of God the son, and God the spirit, respectively.2 I have argued elsewhere that while Jesus-is-God texts exist,3 their paucity implies that that focus is not where the Bible is at (1 Cor.8:6). So, to be biblical, we may say that Jesus is deity, but will seldom voice that fact, but if voicing will always do so in the context (as the Bible) of his father being supremely God. The Athanasian Creed (see page Error! Bookmark not defined.) noted the combined interaction of all three persons of deity. Soft unitarianism tends to limit interaction to one person, the Jesus-alone-does-this song. In principle, I leave the fatheralone songs alone, since the Bible tends to highlight the term deity to him, even though the New Testament, as a whole, advances understanding into trinity dynamics. In short, trinitarianism holds to the ultimacy of the father, not of the son. Soft unitarianism I automatically limit to a fail-just (40 points is a top D).

Hard (H2)

For this, I deduct 72 points. Hard unitarianism differs from the issue that is later looked at under the idea of prayer misvisualisation, in that the latter can operate within a trinitarian framework, and is essentially a problem of prayer. Hard differs from soft (see immediately above) in that it specifically teaches that Jesus alone is God, or that the father died on the cross and is coming back for us. Or some such nonsense. In short, it assumes that the father & spirit are needless terms, or are acting masks of God, interchangeable terms. Songs denying the deity of the son and/or the spirit would also be hard unitarianism, and issues of ontology, not merely of activity. Hard unitarianism I automatically limit to a tad under a bad-fail-just (29 points is a top E). Christians can be unitarians, whether visualising Jesus as being his father & acting successor, or God's son as being less than deity, but I deem unitarianism to be seriously failed theology and a serious undermining of good theology.⁴

- In my books the theological standard is the biblical, although in some sense we may speak of, perhaps even commend, *Islamic theology*. The Letters to the Seven Churches, shows how truth & error can be held in the same hand.
- I suspect that the term *spiration* was concocted on the idea that God's son actually breathed out the spirit into his disciples. That misreads Jhn.20:22. To move from the economic trinity (ie the trinity working in time & space) to the essential trinity (the trinity as Being, beyond time & space) is also questionable. However, the biblical terms for *spirit* overlap the idea of air, wind, breath, allowing some justification for spiration as a rough & ready term.
- ³ Charted on www.mdtc.eu/wgghuiology.html.
- Eastern Orthodoxy perhaps makes most of creedal anathematising of such heretics. It has done so (in wording which reflects Paul's), perhaps not to wish for heretics to be ultimately damned, but to wish that cancerous heresies be removed from the church on earth by major excommunication and warning (Gal.1:8f.; 5:12; 1 Cor.16:22).

