

HARVARD THEOLOGICAL STUDIES

XVI

THE TWO TREATISES OF  
SERVETUS ON THE TRINITY

ON THE ERRORS OF THE TRINITY

SEVEN BOOKS · A.D. MDXXXI

DIALOGUES ON THE TRINITY

TWO BOOKS

ON THE RIGHTEOUSNESS OF CHRIST'S KINGDOM

FOUR CHAPTERS

A.D. MDXXXII

By MICHAEL SERVETO *alias* Reves  
a Spaniard of Aragon

NOW FIRST TRANSLATED INTO ENGLISH BY  
EARL MORSE WILBUR, D.D.

ISSUED AS AN EXTRA NUMBER OF THE  
HARVARD THEOLOGICAL REVIEW

CAMBRIDGE  
HARVARD UNIVERSITY PRESS  
LONDON : HUMPHREY MILFORD  
OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS

1932

# Michael Servetus

Michael Servetus (also Miguel Servet or Miguel Serveto; 29 September 1511 – 27 October 1553) was a Spanish (Aragonese) theologian, physician and humanist. His interests included many sciences: astronomy and meteorology; geography, jurisprudence, study of the Bible, mathematics, anatomy, and medicine. He is renowned in the history of several of these fields, particularly medicine and theology. He participated in the Protestant Reformation, and later developed a nontrinitarian Christology, which led to his condemnation by Catholics and Protestants alike. He was burnt at the stake by order of the protestant Geneva governing council, which was led by Calvin, as a heretic. “He desired forgiveness of his mistakes and ignorance and sins, though he could never be got to confess Christ as the eternal Son of God; and to the end he held true to his convictions. Arrived at the place of execution he fell upon his face and continued long in prayer, while Farel seized the opportunity to make an edifying address to the spectators. Again exhorted to say something, he cried, ‘O God, O God; what else can I speak of but God.’ Then he asked the people to pray for him. Being led to a pile of wood made up of small sticks and bundles of green oak with the leaves still on, he was seated on a log with his feet touching the ground, his body chained to a stake, and his neck bound to it by a coarse rope; his head covered with straw or leaves sprinkled with sulphur, and his book tied to his thigh. He besought the executioner not to prolong his torture; and when the torch met his sight he uttered a terrible shriek, while the horrified people threw on more wood and he cried out, ‘O Jesus, Son of the eternal God, have mercy on me.’ After about half an hour life was extinct. He had died and made no sign.”<sup>1</sup>

“THE BURNING OF SERVETUS settled only one of the questions raised by his appearance on the stage at Geneva. He himself was indeed now removed from the stage, and could no longer spread his ideas in person. But the burning of the man, as Calvin and other champions of the faith soon discovered, by no means put an end to his ideas; while it did bring to the front a much broader, more important and more vital question, that of religious toleration. Calvin’s critics, in centering their attention on his responsibility for this tragedy, have largely overlooked the fact that in this case he was but the conspicuous embodiment of a policy toward heretics that was at the time universally accepted in principle by Protestants no less than by Catholics. It ought therefore to cause no surprise that from the most influential leaders of the Reformation this shocking occurrence called forth an all but unanimous response of approval. All this, however, was solely on an ex parte presentation of the case by Calvin, who had drawn the terms of the indictment of Servetus which formed the basis of the prosecution and sentence, and had taken the pains to prepare their minds for it. This approval was given by men not one of whom had had a fair opportunity to read and judge the book on which his conviction had been founded, if indeed they had even seen it, but who nevertheless endorsed all that was done, without apparent hesitation or further inquiry. Bullinger not only had approved of the death of Servetus in advance, but two years later he wrote that he was persuaded that if Satan were to return from hell and preach to the world as he pleased, he would employ many of Servetus’s expressions. Years afterwards he still firmly held that the Geneva Council had done its duty in this case. Peter Martyr Wrote in 1556, ‘I have nothing to say of the Spaniard Servetus except that he was a veritable son of the Devil, whose poisonous and detestable doctrine should everywhere be hunted down; and the magistrate that condemned him to death should not be blamed, seeing that there was no hope of his amendment, and that his blasphemies were quite intolerable.’”<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> A HISTORY OF UNITARIANISM Volume II A History of Unitarianism Socinianism and its Antecedents by EARL MORSE WILBUR, D.D; page 180-181

<sup>2</sup> A HISTORY OF UNITARIANISM Volume II A History of Unitarianism Socinianism and its Antecedents by EARL MORSE WILBUR, D.D; page 186-187

# On the Errors of the Trinity

By

**Michael Serveto**

(A Spaniard of Aragon)

Written in 1531

(Edited by Chuck Cunningham 2007. Jesus has been changed to Yahshua and God to Yahweh or Elohim.<sup>3</sup> I recommend the reading of the article, "The Gospel of John is an Enigma" before reading this article. You will find the article on the web site, [www.teleiosministries.com](http://www.teleiosministries.com))

## BOOK I

### Argument

Any discussion of the Trinity should start with the man. That Yahshua, surnamed Christ, was not a hypostasis<sup>4</sup> but a human being is taught both by the early Fathers and in the Scriptures, taken in their literal sense, and is indicated by the miracles that he wrought. He, and not the Word<sup>5</sup> is also the miraculously born Son of Yahweh in fleshly form, as the Scriptures teach – not a hypostasis, but an actual Son. He is an elohim, sharing Yahweh's divinity in full; and the theory of a *communicatio idiomatum* is a confusing sophistical quibble. This does not imply two Yahwehs, but only a double use of the term elohim, as is clear from the Hebrew use of the term. Christ, being one with Yahweh his Father, equal in power, came down from heaven and assumed flesh as a man. In short, all the Scriptures speak of Christ as a man.

The doctrine of the Holy Spirit as a third separate being lands us in practical tritheism<sup>6</sup> no better than atheism, even though the unity of Yahweh is insisted on. Careful interpretation of the usual proof – texts shows that they teach not a union of three beings in one but a harmony between them. The Holy Spirit as a third person of the Godhead<sup>7</sup> is unknown in Scripture. It is not a separate being, but an activity of Yahweh himself. The doctrine of the Trinity can be neither established by logic nor proved from Scripture and is in fact inconceivable. There are many reasons against it. The Scriptures and the Fathers teach on Yahweh the Father and Yahshua Christ his son; but scholastic philosophy has introduced terms which are not understood and do not accord with Scripture. Yahshua taught that he himself was the Son

---

<sup>3</sup> 0430 אֱלֹהִים 'elohiym *el-o-heem*' 1) (plural) 1a) rulers, judges 1b) divine ones 1c) angels 1d) gods; In the beginning, Elohim [God] created the heavens and the earth. Gen. 1:1

<sup>4</sup> Hypostatic Union: A theological term used with reference to the Incarnation to express the revealed truth that in Christ one person subsists in two natures, the Divine and the human. *Hypostasis* means, literally, that which lies beneath as basis or foundation. Hence it came to be used by the Greek philosophers to denote reality as distinguished from appearances (Aristotle, "Mund.", IV, 21). It occurs also in St. Paul's Epistles (2 Corinthians 9:4; 11:17; Hebrews 1:3-3:14), but not in the sense of person. Previous to the Council of Nicæa (325) *hypostasis* was synonymous with *ousia*, and even St. Augustine (De Trin., V, 8) avers that he sees no difference between them. The distinction in fact was brought about gradually in the course of the controversies to which the Christological heresies gave rise, and was definitively established by the Council of Chalcedon (451), which declared that in Christ the two natures, each retaining its own properties, are united in one subsistence and one person (*eis en prosopon kai mian hypostasin*) (Denzinger, ed. Bannwart, 148). They are not joined in a moral or accidental union (Nestorius), nor commingled (Eutyches), and nevertheless they are substantially united. For further explanation and bibliography see: INCARNATION; JESUS Christ; MONOPHYSITISM; NATURE; PERSON. <http://www.newadvent.org/cathen/07610b.htm>

<sup>5</sup> See the supplement article on page 46 to 47 concerning "The Logos [Word] as Taught in Greek Metaphysical Philosophy."

<sup>6</sup> Tritheism is the belief that there are three distinct, each powerful gods, who form a triad.

<sup>7</sup> The term 'Godhead' is the Greek word, 2320 θεοτης *theot'-ace*, and is only used once in the scriptures, which is in Col. 2:9. The context of its usage has nothing to do with a Trinity. The word could be translated Godness as it is in the Word Study Greek – English New Testament by Paul R. McReynolds. A similar Greek word is *theiotes*, which is used in Romans 1:20. *Theiotes* means divinity, divine nature.

of Yahweh. Numerous heresies have sprung from this philosophy and fruitless questions have risen out of it. Worst of all, the doctrine of the Trinity incurs the ridicule of the Mohammedans and the Jews. It arose out of Greek [metaphysical] philosophy rather than from the belief that Yahshua Christ is the Son of Yahweh; and he will be with the Church only if it keeps his teaching.

## ON THE ERRORS OF THE TRINITY

### BOOK THE FIRST

1. In investigating the holy mysteries of the divine Triad, I have thought that one ought to start from the man; for I see most men approaching their lofty speculation about the Word<sup>8</sup> without having any fundamental understanding of Christ, and they attach little or no importance to the man and give the true Christ over to oblivion. But I shall endeavor to recall to their memories who the Christ is. However, what and how much importance is to be attached to Christ, the Church shall decide.
2. Seeing that the pronoun<sup>9</sup> indicates a man, whom they call the human nature,<sup>10</sup> I shall admit<sup>11</sup> these three things: first, this man is Yahshua Christ; second, he is the Son of Yahweh; third, he is an elohim. That he was called Yahshua at the beginning, who would deny? That is, in accordance with the angel's command, the boy was on the day of his circumcision given a name,<sup>12</sup> even as you were called John, and this man, Peter. Yahshua, as Tertullian says,<sup>13</sup> is a man's proper name, and Christ is a surname. The Jews all admitted that he was Yahshua who is called Christ,<sup>14</sup> and they put out of the synagogue those who confessed that he was Christ;<sup>15</sup> and the Apostles had frequent disputes with them about him, as to whether Yahshua were the Christ. But as to Yahshua, there was never any doubt or question, not did any one ever deny this name. See what the discourse is aiming at, and with what purpose Paul testifies to the Jews that Yahshua is the Christ;<sup>16</sup> wit what fervor of spirit Apollos of Alexandria publicly confuted the Jews, showing by the Scriptures that Yahshua was the Messiah.<sup>17</sup> Of what Yahshua do you suppose those things were said? Do you think they disputed there about a hypostasis? I am bound therefore to admit that he was Christ as well as Yahshua, since I admit that he was anointed of Yahweh; for this is thy holy Servant, whom thou didst anoint.<sup>18</sup> This is the most holy, who, Daniel foretold, should be anointed.<sup>19</sup> And Peter spoke of it as an accomplished fact: Ye yourselves know, for the saying about Yahshua is known to all men, namely, that Yahweh anointed Yahshua of Nazareth with the holy spirit and with power, for Yahweh was with him;<sup>20</sup> and, this is he who is ordained to Go to be the Judge of the living and the dead;<sup>21</sup> and, Let all the house of Israel know assuredly, that this Yahshua whom ye crucified Yahweh hath made both Lord and Christ,<sup>22</sup> that is anointed. Some,

---

<sup>8</sup> See the supplement article on page 46 to 47 concerning "The Logos [Word] as Taught in Greek Metaphysical Philosophy."

<sup>9</sup> Ille Christus.

<sup>10</sup> Humanitas, and so throughout the work.

<sup>11</sup> Throughout the discussion Servetus is addressing an imagined opponent, apparently using memoranda of oral debates had or planned with fellow students or others. He thus begins here with concessions.

<sup>12</sup> Luke I, 31; ii, 21.

<sup>13</sup> Adv. Praxean, xxviii, the argument of which Servetus follows here. (MPL. Ii, 192 f.; ANF. Iii, 624 f.; ANCL. Xv, 399 f.)

<sup>14</sup> Matt, 27:17, 22.

<sup>15</sup> John 9:22; 12:42.

<sup>16</sup> Acts 17:5.

<sup>17</sup> Acts 18:28.

<sup>18</sup> Acts 4:27

<sup>19</sup> Daniel 9:24

<sup>20</sup> Acts 10:37, 38

<sup>21</sup> Acts 10:42

<sup>22</sup> Acts 2:36

however, try to show that these pronouns mean another being. But John calls him a liar that denies that this Yahshua is anointed by Yahweh;<sup>23</sup> and, He that admits that Yahshua is the Christ is begotten of Yahweh.<sup>24</sup>

3. Tertullian also says that the term Christ is a word belonging to human nature.<sup>25</sup> And although he makes careful inquiry concerning the word Christ,<sup>26</sup> he makes no mention of that being<sup>27</sup> which some make Christ out to be. Who, he also says, is the Son of man, if not himself a man, born of a man, a body born of a body?<sup>28</sup> For the Hebrew expression son of man, son of Adam, means nothing else than man. Again, the way the word is used implies this, for to be anointed can refer only to a human nature. If, then, being anointed, as he says,<sup>29</sup> is an affair of the body, who can deny that the one anointed is a man? Moreover, in the Clementine Recognitions,<sup>30</sup> Peter brings out the meaning of the word: because kings used to be called Christ [Anointed],<sup>31</sup> therefore he, being distinguished above others by his anointing, is called Christ the king; because just as Yahweh made angel chief over the angels, and the beast over the beasts, and a heavenly body over the heavenly bodies, so he made the man Christ chief over men.
4. Again, on the authority of Holy Scripture we are taught very plainly that Christ is called a man, since even an earthly king is called Christ [Anointed].<sup>32</sup> Again, of whom was born Yahshua, the one who is called Christ.<sup>33</sup> Note the article, and note the surname; for these words and the pronouns are to be understood in the simplest sense: they denote something perceived by the senses. Again, thou shalt call his name Yahshua;<sup>34</sup> and he is very evidently writing of Yahshua as a man when he says, And Yahshua himself began to be thirty years of age, and was supposed to be the son of Joseph.<sup>35</sup> And, of David's seed hath Yahweh according to promise brought Yahshua.<sup>36</sup> And John said; Think not that I am Christ.<sup>37</sup> How absurd John's disclaimer would be, if the word Christ can not refer to a man. Moreover, to what end does Christ warn us to shun those men that called themselves Christs [Anointed]?<sup>38</sup> Christ's question and Peter's answer would be silly, when Christ said, Who do men say that I, the Son of man, am? And Peter answered Thou art the Christ, thou art the Son of the living Elohim.<sup>39</sup> Nor would it mean the living Word of Yahweh, for in speaking to a man he ought to have said, Christ is in thee, the Son of Yahweh is in thee and not, Thou art. And when he charged them there that they should tell no man that he was Christ,<sup>40</sup> tell

---

<sup>23</sup> I John 2:22

<sup>24</sup> I John 5:1

<sup>25</sup> Adv. Praxean, xxviii. (MPL. ii, 192f.; ANF. iii, 624 f.; ANCL. xv, 399 f.).

<sup>26</sup> Adv. Marcionem III. Xv, IV. x. (MPL ii, 341 f., 377 ff.; ANF. Iii, 333 f., 357 ff.; ANL. Vii, 148 ff., 205 ff.).

<sup>27</sup> RES. Servetus repeatedly uses this word in avoidance of the term Person (of the Trinity) to which he objects as unscriptural. This usage was very common among the scholastics. See par. 30).

<sup>28</sup> Adv. Marcionem IV. x. (MPL. Ii, 380; ANF. iii, 360; ANCL. Vii, 210).

<sup>29</sup> Tertullian, adv. Marionem III. xv (MPL. ii, 341 f.; ANF. iii, 334; ANCL. Vii. 150).

<sup>30</sup> I. xlv. (MPG i, 1233, ANF. viii, 89, ANCL. iii, 173).

<sup>31</sup> Christ is the English word for the Greek word, 'Christos,' which means anointed. The Hebrew word, 'mashiyach,' means anointed or anointed one. Many kings, prophets and priests were anointed by Yahweh. Christ = Christo = Mashiyach = Anointed One.

<sup>32</sup> I Samuel 12:3; II Samuel 22:51; Isaiah 14:1

<sup>33</sup> Matthew 1:16. Yahshua ille, qui

<sup>34</sup> Luke 1:31

<sup>35</sup> Luke 3:23

<sup>36</sup> Acts 13:23

<sup>37</sup> John 1:20, Acts 13:25

<sup>38</sup> Matthew 24:23, 24

<sup>39</sup> Matthew 16:13, 16 (Pagn.).

<sup>40</sup> Matthew 16:20.

me, what did he mean by that pronoun?<sup>41</sup> For it is clearer than day that he meant himself, and was speaking of himself. Do you not blush to say that he was without a name, and that the Apostles had preached him so long time without having called him by his own name; and do you on your own authority impose upon him a new and unfitting name, and one unheard of by the Apostles, calling him only the human nature.

5. Again, let not the Greek title Χριστος<sup>42</sup> deceive you; but take the word מָשִׁיחַ,<sup>43</sup> or the Latin word unctus,<sup>44</sup> and see whether you, who admit that we have been anointed, will venture to admit that he was anointed. Nor should I so strongly insist upon proving this point, which is clear enough at the very outset, were it not that I see that the minds of some are misled. Again, Christ's testimony is very clear, when he calls himself a man: Ye seek to kill me, a man that hath told you the truth.<sup>45</sup> And, a mediator between Yahweh and men, the man Christ Yahshua.<sup>46</sup> Again, pay no regard to the word homo,<sup>47</sup> which, if you hold to the *communicatio idiomatum*,<sup>48</sup> has been corrupted in

---

<sup>41</sup> Quod ipse esset CHISTUS.

<sup>42</sup> Christos, anointed.

<sup>43</sup> Mashiach anointed

<sup>44</sup> Anointed

<sup>45</sup> John 8:40

<sup>46</sup> I Timothy 2:5

<sup>47</sup> Man, human being

<sup>48</sup> Communicatio Idiomatum

("Communication of Idioms").

A technical expression in the theology of the Incarnation. It means that the properties of the Divine Word can be ascribed to the man Christ, and that the properties of the man Christ can be predicated of the Word. The language of Scripture and of the Fathers shows that such a mutual interexchange of predicates is legitimate; in this article its source and the rules determining its use will be briefly considered.

#### I. SOURCE

The source of the *communicatio idiomatum* is not to be found in the close moral union between Christ and God as maintained by the Nestorians, nor in Christ's fullness of grace and supernatural gifts, nor, again, in the fact that the Word owns the human nature of Christ by right of creation. God the Father and the Holy Ghost have the same right and interest as the Son in all created things except in the human nature of Jesus Christ. This the Son by Assumption has made His own in a way that is not theirs, i.e., by the incommunicable property of personal union. In Christ there is one person with two natures, the human and the Divine. In ordinary language all the properties of a subject are predicated of its person; consequently the properties of Christ's two natures must be predicated of his one person, since they have only one subject of predication. He Who is the Word of God on account of His eternal generation is also the subject of human properties; and He Who is the man Christ on account of having assumed human nature is the subject of Divine attributes. Christ is God; God is man.

#### II. USE

The *communicatio idiomatum* is based on the oneness of person subsisting in the two natures of Jesus Christ. Hence it can be used as long as both the subject and the predicate of a sentence stand for the person of Jesus Christ, or present a common subject of predication. For in this case we simply affirm that He Who subsists in the Divine nature and possesses certain Divine properties is the same as He Who subsists in the human nature and possesses certain human properties. The following considerations will show the application of this principle more in detail:

(1) In general, concrete terms stand for the person: hence, statements interchanging the Divine and human properties of Christ are, generally speaking, correct if both their subjects and predicates be concrete terms. We may safely say, "God is man", though we must observe certain cautions:

- The concrete human names of Christ describe His person according to His human nature. They presuppose the Incarnation, and their application to Christ previously to the completion of the hypostatic union would involve the Nestorian view that Christ's human nature had its own subsistence. Consequently, such expressions as "man became God" are to be avoided.
- Concrete terms used reduplicatively emphasize the nature rather than the person. The statement "God as God has suffered" means that God according to His Divine nature has suffered; needless to say, such statements are false.
- Certain expressions, though correct in themselves, are for extrinsic reasons, inadmissible; the statement "One of the Trinity was crucified" was misapplied in a Monophysite sense and was therefore forbidden by Pope Hormisdas; the Arians misinterpreted the words "Christ is a creature"; both Arians and Nestorians misused the expressions "Christ had a beginning" and "Christ is less than the Father" or "less than God"; the Docetists abused the terms "incorporeal" and "impassible".

meaning; but take the word vir,<sup>49</sup> and hear Peter when he says that Christ was a man<sup>50</sup> approved.<sup>51</sup> And, Concerning Yahshua the Nazarene, who was a man, a mighty prophet.<sup>52</sup> And, After me cometh a man;<sup>53</sup> and, Rejected of men, a man of sorrows;<sup>54</sup> and behold, the man whose name is the Branch;<sup>55</sup> and, Yahweh will judge by that man,<sup>56</sup> namely, Christ.

Again, do not misrepresent the law of Yahweh by circumlocutions. Consider rather the nature of the demonstrative pronoun,<sup>57</sup> and you will see that this is the original meaning of the word; for when he is pointed out to the eye it is very often admitted, This is the Christ, Thou are Yahshua; and that he speaks, asks, answers, eats, [sleeping] and that they saw him walking upon the water. Likewise, I am he whom ye seek, Yahshua of Nazareth;<sup>58</sup> and, whomsoever I shall kiss, that is he: take him.<sup>59</sup> And in another place, It is I myself: handle me, and see;<sup>60</sup> and, This Yahshua, whom ye slew, did Yahweh raise up, whereof we all are witnesses.<sup>61</sup> Just what will you mean by such pronouns? As for an eye-witness, are we not in worse case than the Samaritan woman who said, Come and see a man, who told me all things that ever I did: can this be the Christ?<sup>62</sup> No wonder that a woman founded on Christ spoke thus for when she was herself looking for a Messiah to

---

(2) Abstract terms generally stand for their respective nature. Now in Christ there are two natures. Hence statements interchanging the Divine and human properties of Christ are, generally speaking, incorrect if their subject and predicate, either one or both, be abstract terms. We cannot say "the Divinity is mortal", or, "the humanity is increated". The following cautions, however, must be added:

- Aside from the personal relations in God there is no real distinction admissible in Him. Hence abstract names and attributes of God, though standing formally for the Divine nature, imply really also the Divine persons. Absolutely speaking, we may replace a concrete Divine name by its corresponding abstract one and still keep the communication idiomatum. Thus we may say "Omnipotence was crucified", in the sense that He Who is omnipotent (Omnipotence) is the same as He Who was crucified. But such expressions are liable to be misunderstood and great care must be exercised in their use.
- There is less danger in the use of those abstract terms which express attributes appropriated to the Second person of the Trinity. We may say "Eternal Wisdom became man".
- There is no communicatio idiomatum between the two natures of Christ, or between the Word and the human nature as such or its parts. The fundamental error of the Ubiquitists consists in predicating of the human nature or of humanity the properties of the Divine nature. We cannot say that "the Word is the humanity", and still less that "the Word is the soul" or "the body of Christ".

(3) In statements which interchange the Divine and the human properties of Christ, care must be taken not to deny or destroy one of Christ's natures or its properties. This is apt to be done:

- In negative sentences: though it be true that Christ did not die according to His Divine nature, we cannot say, "Christ did not die", without impairing His human nature;
- in exclusive sentences: if we say "Christ is only God" or "Christ is only man", we destroy either His human or His Divine nature;
- in the use of ambiguous terms: the Arians, the Nestorians, and the Adoptionists misused the term "servant", inferring from the expression, "Christ is the servant of God", conclusions agreeing with their respective heresies. <http://www.newadvent.org/cathen/04169a.htm>

<sup>49</sup> Man

<sup>50</sup> Vir, and so in the quotations immediately following.

<sup>51</sup> Acts 2:22

<sup>52</sup> Luke 24:19, by a change of punctuation in the Latin.

<sup>53</sup> John 1:30

<sup>54</sup> Isaiah 53: 3.

<sup>55</sup> Zech. 6:12

<sup>56</sup> Acts 17:31

<sup>57</sup> i.e., ille Chrisus, cf. par. 2.

<sup>58</sup> John 18:4-8

<sup>59</sup> Matthew 24:48

<sup>60</sup> Luke 24:39

<sup>61</sup> Acts 2:32; 5:30

<sup>62</sup> John 4:29

come, who is called Christ, he replied, I that speak unto thee am he<sup>63</sup> - I, I, not the being, but, I that speak.

6. Again, to what man do you understand that the word of the Apostle refers, As by the trespass of one man,...so by the grace of one man, Yahshua Christ;<sup>64</sup> and, As by a man came death, so by a man came the resurrection of the dead?<sup>65</sup> For the Scripture does not take man connotatively;<sup>66</sup> it calls him not only man, but Adam.<sup>67</sup> Yet for our basis we would have a connotative man, and a speculative substance.<sup>68</sup> Away, I pray, with these sophistical tricks, and you shall see a great light. The foundation of the Church is the words of Christ, which are most simple and plain. Let us imitate the Apostles, who preached Christ not with words composed by art of man.<sup>69</sup> The words of Yahweh are pure words,<sup>70</sup> they are to be received with simplicity. And witness the Apostle: Not with excellency of speech is the testimony of Christ to be proclaimed,<sup>71</sup> but plainly, and as if we had become babes,<sup>72</sup> and as if we knew nothing else save Yahshua Christ, and him crucified.<sup>73</sup>
7. Again, what brotherhood shall you say that we have with Christ? Who is he that is exalted above his fellows?<sup>74</sup> What kind of comparison is it that the Apostle makes between Christ and Moses, saying, For he hath been counted worthy of more glory than Moses,...since Moses was as a servant, but Christ as a son?<sup>75</sup> To what end also does the Apostle in the same epistle<sup>76</sup> so strongly insist upon sowing that Christ was exalted even above angels? For it would be silly enough to prove that the second Person of the Godhead is by nature more exalted than the angels. Nor can his meaning be thus construed; for the Apostle is speaking in accordance with the thought of the prophet, and David is marveling at the great glory of Christ because, though he is a man, all things have been subjected to him.<sup>77</sup>
8. Again, he did miracles that we may believe that Yahshua is the Christ, the Son of Yahweh.<sup>78</sup> Note that he considers the matter settled as regards Yahshua; but, that we may believe that this Yahshua is he was to be anointed, being begotten of the only Elohim the Father. And how is the second unknown being recognized by miracles, unless it is understood of him whom they saw doing the miracles, as Nicodemus declares?<sup>79</sup> For the outward miracles are no proof of the inward speculations. Likewise Christ himself bears witness that the works that he does sufficiently show that he has been sent by the Father.<sup>80</sup> And Nathanael, from his saying, I saw thee underneath the fig tree, concludes that he is the Son of Yahweh who was to be sent as King of Israel.<sup>81</sup> They draw

---

<sup>63</sup> John 4:26

<sup>64</sup> Romans 5:15-19

<sup>65</sup> I Corinthians 15:21

<sup>66</sup> i.e., it is not speaking of man in general, but of a particular man.

<sup>67</sup> I Corinthians 15:22

<sup>68</sup> Sophisticum suppositum.

<sup>69</sup> I Corinthians 2:1, II Peter 1:16

<sup>70</sup> Psalms 12:6

<sup>71</sup> I Corinthians 2:1 1:17

<sup>72</sup> I Thessalonians 2:7 (Vulg.)

<sup>73</sup> I Corinthians 2:2

<sup>74</sup> Hebrews 1:9

<sup>75</sup> Hebrews 3:3-6

<sup>76</sup> Hebrews 1:2

<sup>77</sup> Psalms 8:6

<sup>78</sup> John 20:30,31

<sup>79</sup> John 3:2

<sup>80</sup> John 5:36

<sup>81</sup> John 1:48, 49

a similar conclusion from his stilling the wind;<sup>82</sup> and from the miracles that he did, Peter concludes, We know that thou art the Christ, the Son of the Living Elohim.<sup>83</sup>

9. These conclusions also clearly prove what I said in the second place: namely, that he whom I call Christ is the Son of Yahweh; for from the miracles that he did they conclude that he is the Son of Yahweh. And it having been proved that he is Yahshua Christ, this turns out as proved; for one who denies that he is the Son denies Yahshua Christ, since Scripture proclaims nothing else than that Yahshua Christ is the Son of Yahweh. Moreover, by many testimonies of the Scriptures he is shown to be especially the Son, and Yahweh is called Father with regard to him – really a Father, I say – because he was begotten by one filling the place of a human father. For he was not begotten of the seed of Joseph, as Carpocrates, Cerinthus and Photinus<sup>84</sup> wickedly and falsely declared. But instead of the seed of a man, the almighty power of the Word of Yahweh overshadowed Mary, the Holy Spirit [Yahweh]<sup>85</sup> acting within her; and it continues, Wherefore also that which is born shall be called holy, the Son of Yahweh.<sup>86</sup> Weigh the word, wherefore, note the conclusion, not the reason why he is called the Son of Yahweh. The same kind of sonship<sup>87</sup> in the man Yahshua Christ is disclose to us by Daniel, who calls him a stone cut out without hands.<sup>88</sup> Again, the same kind of sonship is expressed when it says that she became with child of the Holy Spirit [Yahweh], and, that which hath been conceived in her has come from the Holy Spirit [Yahweh].<sup>89</sup> Tell me, pray, what is the offspring begotten and conceived in her, which comes from the Holy Spirit [Yahweh], from which he concludes that the son whom brings forth will be the Savior, Immanuel? Take note of what Luke says: This son whom thou shalt conceive and bring forth shall be called the Son of the Most High [Yahweh]. He says furthermore, He shall be great, and Yahweh shall give unto him the throne.<sup>90</sup> Has the second Person, then, become great, and received from Yahweh the throne of his Father David? Why did he not say, He shall be called Son of the first Person, and the first Person shall give unto him the throne? But he said, the Son of the Most High Elohim, and Yahweh shall give unto him the throne. Some, striving to pervert the words of the

---

<sup>82</sup> Matthew 14:33

<sup>83</sup> John 6:69 (Pagn.); Matthew 16:16

<sup>84</sup> Carpocrates, an Alexandrian Gnostic of the early second century; Cerinthus, a Gnostic of Asia Minor at the end of the first century; Photinus, Bishop of Sirmium in the fourth century. Servetus's statement as to Photinus is hardly accurate.

<sup>85</sup> Servetus did not understand that the term 'holy spirit' represented not only the gift of Yahweh but also the Giver, who is Yahweh. The term 'Holy Spirit' as the Giver, is another title of Yahweh, as are the titles: Most High, Almighty, Ancient of Days etc. For example, see Heb. 10:15-16, which is a quotation of Jer. 31:33. Hebrews 10:15 says the Holy Spirit said while in Jeremiah 31:33 it says Yahweh said, which makes Yahweh and the Holy Spirit one in the same. (Another example would be the term Most High. The Most High is not a separate entity from Yahweh; 2Sa 22:14 Thunder from the heavens, did Yahweh give forth,—yea, the Highest, uttered his voice; the Highest and Yahweh are one in the same.) The title 'Holy Spirit,' used as another title for Yahweh is found in Acts 5:3, 13:2, 28:5. The holy spirit as the gift from the Giver, Yahweh (Holy Spirit), is also called the spirit of Yahweh, spirit of Elohim etc. The term, 'spirit of Yahweh,' is synonymous with the term; holy spirit; 1Sa 16:13 And Samuel took the horn of oil, and anointed him in the midst of his brethren. And the spirit of Yahweh came mightily upon David, from that day forward... Ps 51:11 Do not cast me away from thy presence, And, thy holy spirit, do not take from me [David]; Isa 61:1 The spirit of My Lord Yahweh, is upon me,—Because Yahweh, Hath anointed me, to tell good tidings to the oppressed... Ac 10:38 How Yahweh anointed him with holy spirit and with power, who went about doing good and healing all that were oppressed by the adversary, because, Yahweh, was with him. Yahweh, the Giver, is called the Holy Spirit and his gift is also called spirit of Yahweh, spirit of Elohim and holy spirit. Bible translators will usually always capitalize the term 'holy spirit' but in the text this is not so. The understanding of whether the usage of πνεύματος (spirit) αγίου (holy) is the Giver (Yahweh) or the gift (spirit of Yahweh, holy spirit) is determined by its context. Do not depend upon Bible translations for a correct rendering.

<sup>86</sup> Luke 1:35, cf. margin.

<sup>87</sup> Filiatio.

<sup>88</sup> Daniel 2:34

<sup>89</sup> Matthew 1:18, 20

<sup>90</sup> Luke 1:32

angel, misinterpret the word holy in this passage,<sup>91</sup> as though the first-born Christ were not worthy of it, although Luke also expressly shows in the chapter following why he had said holy; because every first-born thing shall be called holy to Yahweh.<sup>92</sup> In like manner the Apostles say, Of thy holy Son Yahshua.<sup>93</sup> Moreover, they would call the power of Yahweh something merely speculative<sup>94</sup> (but oh, that they knew what the Word of Yahweh is!). They neither show how that was instead of the seed of a man (for the angel answers the question asked by Mary as to the seed of a man);<sup>95</sup> nor do they explain what that is which, being begotten by the power which fills the place of the seed, will be called the Son of Yahweh. For Luke does not say that the power is called the Son; but, that which is begotten by the power.<sup>96</sup> He shall be called the Son of Yahweh for the reason that the power of Yahweh is instead of the seed of a man.

10. Nor do they notice how wide and deep are the mysteries of this Word and the seed, in illustration of which it says that the seed of the sower is the Word of Yahweh.<sup>97</sup> For just as Christ was begotten and born by the Word of Yahweh, so we are born again by the Word of Yahweh; born again, says Peter, through the Word of the living Elohim.<sup>98</sup> And this seed he calls incorruptible; and, He begat us by the word of truth.<sup>99</sup> They have speculated ill, therefore in denying that the Son was a man, that they may make a Son of the Word; but the truth of the matter proves to be otherwise, and John thought it more fitting to say Word than Son. Indeed, in his discussion of the Word, the Son is said to be flesh.<sup>100</sup> On the Word, I shall speak later;<sup>101</sup> for the present let us keep his proper honor and glory for Yahshua Christ, for even by this we shall understand the Word also. Again, the very nature of the word teaches us that the Son is called a man; for just as being anointed is an affair of the body, so being born is an affair of the flesh. The flesh, therefore, says Tertullian,<sup>102</sup> was born and the Son of Yahweh will be flesh. Again, who is the little boy of whom mention is so often made in Matthew 2, whom Joseph took [to Egypt] and back? Say, is boy the name of a hypostasis? See whether the boy there is the son called out of Egypt.<sup>103</sup> Again, tell me whether he whom you call the human nature was beast or man; for if man, he was both begotten and born; and if so, he had a parent. Say, then, of whom he was begotten and consequently he will be the son of him who begot him. Say whether he was begotten by Joseph as his father, or by some other father. Nor will you find any other father than Yahweh. Or will you say that he was a mere appearance,<sup>104</sup> and not flesh? For if he is flesh, he was born of some father, hence he is some one's son; nor do I believe that you can escape here, unless you make one son out of two, or conjure up imaginary sonships, unknown to Christ himself.

11. But what is there so strange, you will say (not to speak of Substances<sup>105</sup>), in acknowledging two Sons; for we admit that the two beings had two births, and very different ones, likewise that the two beings had two begettings; hence we can not deny that two were begotten and two were born.

<sup>91</sup> Luke 1:35b

<sup>92</sup> Luke 2:23, cf. Exodus 13:2, 12; 34:19; Numbers 8:17.

<sup>93</sup> Acts 4:30.

<sup>94</sup> Philosophicum.

<sup>95</sup> Luke 1:34

<sup>96</sup> Luke 1:35

<sup>97</sup> Luke 8:11

<sup>98</sup> I Peter 1:23 (Vulg.).

<sup>99</sup> James 1:18

<sup>100</sup> John 1:14

<sup>101</sup> Book III

<sup>102</sup> De carne Chrii, vi. (MPL. ii, 763; ANF. iii, 536; ANCL. xv, 176).

<sup>103</sup> Matthew 2:15

<sup>104</sup> Phantasma.

<sup>105</sup> Suppositis.

Speculate as much as ever you will on the kind of sonship, in order to make of the two one mass, one aggregate, or one connotative Substance;<sup>106</sup> for you are deceived if from this it seems to you that, taking Scripture in its plain sense, there was an only Son, when you nevertheless see before your eyes two begotten and born. Who would make any difference between born and sons?<sup>107</sup> Nor did the Scriptures ever contemplate such subtleties, but they speak in the simplest way of Yahshua, the only Son of Yahweh. And Scripture mentions no other being, no other nature, nothing besides a man born or begotten. And so Ignatius, speaking of one and the same being, says, Concerning Yahshua Christ, the Son of Yahweh, who was truly born of Yahweh and of the Virgin – of Yahweh before the world began, but afterwards of Mary without the seed of a man,<sup>108</sup> but how – this will appear below.<sup>109</sup> For the present, I most sincerely would that little old women, half-blind men, and barbers might acknowledge that Christ is the Son of Yahweh, and that their root and foundation might be in him. We shall speak of the Word more at large later on.<sup>110</sup> For Christ proclaimed even to women that he was the Messiah. Pray consider how a little old woman can understand the metaphysical Son, when most heresiarchs, and those the most subtle, have stumbled at it.

12. Again, in addition to what has been said before, Yahweh said to John, Upon whomsoever thou shalt see the spirit of Yahweh descending, and abiding upon him, the same is he... And I have seen, and have borne witness that this is the Son of Yahweh.<sup>111</sup> Pray note the words, very plain and without circumlocution. For in your opinion John would have been deceived in saying that the one whom he saw was the Son of Yahweh; nor is it credible that he himself had thought out anything about the separate being, nor had Yahweh given him any sign by which to recognize it. Or will you say that the voice from heaven was misleading in saying, Upon whomsoever thou shalt see...the same is he? It would also have been misleading when, descending, it said of a being present to all, This is my Son, or, Thou art my Son.<sup>112</sup> If by the pronoun<sup>113</sup> he meant to indicate some other hidden being, then the witness would not have been clear; it would have led the people astray. Again, when Yahshua, being asked, Who is this Son of Yahweh? Answered, Thou hast both seen him, and he it is that speaketh with thee,<sup>114</sup> what could have been said more clearly? This being plainly shown, the Centurion said, Truly this man was the Son of Yahweh.<sup>115</sup> Observe now that the pronouns indicate a being perceived by the senses; nor do I believe that the Centurion would have played the Sophist, or have spoken of the *communicatio idiomatum*. Again, hear Paul, who, as soon as he received his sight, went into the synagogue and proclaimed Yahshua, that he is the Son of Yahweh.<sup>116</sup> Nor are we seeking here to make any discussion about a hypostasis of the Word. Indeed, he was afterwards proclaimed by John in order to establish this doctrine; for he is not opposed to our view, but joins us in proving it. See also whether the high priest had a second hypostasis in mind when he said, Art thou the Son of Yahweh the blessed? And Yahshua answered, I am.<sup>117</sup> Ye say that I am the Son of Yahweh.<sup>118</sup> In like manner, have

---

<sup>106</sup> Connotativum suppositum.

<sup>107</sup> Natos et filios.

<sup>108</sup> Loosely quoted from Ep. Ad Trallianos, x. (MPG. v, 791; ANF.i, 70 f.; ANCL. i., 202).

<sup>109</sup> Book III, paragraph 1.

<sup>110</sup> Book III

<sup>111</sup> John 1:33,34.

<sup>112</sup> Matthew 3:17; Luke 3:22.

<sup>113</sup> i.e., this, or thou.

<sup>114</sup> John 9:36,37.

<sup>115</sup> Matthew 27:54

<sup>116</sup> Acts 9:20.

<sup>117</sup> Mark 14:61 (Vulg.).

<sup>118</sup> Luke 22:70

believed that thou art the Christ, the Son of Yahweh.<sup>119</sup> But with what gross perversity these most transparent words have been misinterpreted in connection with the sophisticated *communication idiomatum*, let them judge for themselves; for I understand the words of Christ in the very simplest sense, nor do I suffer any meaning to be imported into them. I would not have you press Scripture into service in order to construct fictions of your own. But because it attracts you when it is itself kept intact, I would not have you by your vain imaginings render uncertain such a manifest certainty of the Gospel.

13. If you say that nothing seems to be ascribed to Christ more than to other men, since we also are called sons of Yahweh; I reply that, on the contrary, from the fact that we are called sons of Yahweh, he himself is proved to be a real son. For men are called sons after the likeness of man; yet there is a wide difference, as will be evident when the mystery of the Word has been investigated.<sup>120</sup> And if we are called sons (that is, by the gift and grace given to us through him), the author of this sonship is therefore called a Son in a far higher sense. And when mention is made of Christ, the article is used, and it says, This is the Son of Yahweh,<sup>121</sup> in order to indicate that he is called Son not by a general term, as we are, but in a certain special and unusual way. For he is a son by nature, while others are not sons originally: they become sons of Yahweh, they are not born sons of Yahweh. We are made sons of Yahweh, through faith, in Yahshua Christ.<sup>122</sup> Hence we are called sons by adoption.<sup>123</sup> But to make Christ adopted I like manner the heresy of the Bonosians.<sup>124</sup> For with regard to Christ no such adoption is read of, but a real begetting by Yahweh, his Father. And he is called not merely a son, but a real son;<sup>125</sup> not merely an ordinary son, but his own Son.<sup>126</sup> And Yahweh is called the Father of Yahshua Christ<sup>127</sup> with just as good as earthly fathers are called the fathers of their own sons. Else Yahweh could not be called an especially efficient cause, and one productive of any certain effect. For if he chooses to have some child for himself in particular, and of himself alone merely acts to beget him, just as an earthly father can act, why will he not with just as good right deserve to be called Father? Shall I, that cause others to bring forth, myself be barren? Saith Yahweh?<sup>128</sup> Nay, rather is he himself called Father, because from him every fatherhood in heaven and on earth is named.<sup>129</sup> And that he more, because he not only begat him, but honored him with the fullness of deity,<sup>130</sup> that in this the Son may be made like the Father. Again, in another way Yahweh is said to be Father with better right than men, because he acts in the begettings of others. Others indeed do nothing in the begetting of their own sons; hence, if he is called Father with better right, Christ will with best right be said to be Son more than others.

---

<sup>119</sup> John (Servetus wrongly says Luke) 11:27.

<sup>120</sup> Book III

<sup>121</sup> John 1:34.

<sup>122</sup> Galatians 3:26, John 1:12.

<sup>123</sup> Romans 8:15; Ephesians 1:5.

<sup>124</sup> The Bonosians in Spain and southern Gaul from the fifth to the seventh centuries held that Christ was the Son of Yahweh by adoption rather than by nature.

<sup>125</sup> Wisdom 2:18 (Vul.).

<sup>126</sup> Romans 8:32.

<sup>127</sup> Romans 15:6.

<sup>128</sup> Isaiah 66:9.

<sup>129</sup> Ephesians 3:15, margin.

<sup>130</sup> Deity: divine nature or rank; divinity; a god or goodness; Christ is ruling and he is now immortal. We also will be ruling under him and we also will be immortal. Presently we are "sharers in a divine [theios] nature..." (2 Pe. 1:4); theios means a general name of deities or divinities as used by the Greeks; we are sons of Elohim; Yahshua walked on the water and raised the dead; Peter walked on the water and raised the dead.

14. In the third place, I said that this proposition is true: Christ is [metaphorically]<sup>131</sup> Yahweh, for he is said to be Go in appearance, because, as the Apostle says, he was in the form of Yahweh.<sup>132</sup> And according to Tertullian, he was found to be Yahweh through his power, just as he was man through his flesh.<sup>133</sup> For Christ after the inward man (to speak in the manner of Paul) means something divine, resulting from an inward anointing divinely done. According to the flesh, he is man; and in the spirit he is Yahweh, because that which is born of the Spirit is spirit,<sup>134</sup> and, Yahweh is a Spirit.<sup>135</sup> And, Unto us a child is born...his name shall be called...Mighty El.<sup>136</sup> See clearly that both the name and the might of El are attributed to a child that is born, unto whom hath been given all authority in heaven and on earth.<sup>137</sup> And Thomas calls him, My elohim, my Lord.<sup>138</sup> And in many other passages is his divinity shown, because he was exalted that he might receive divinity, and the name above every name.<sup>139</sup> Let those therefore beware who endeavor to disparage him so much that they would have his human nature called only, as it were, a sort of inferior being, and make him out so much the more imperfect because they not only deny that he is their Lord, but deny that he was anointed, by Yahweh, King of the Jews, deny that he is a reconciler, a mediator, why, even rob him of what belongs to his nature, denying that he is the son of Mary, and finally deny that he is a man. Who can but weep at so great an injury to Christ, because the man Moses was called an earthly mediator between the people and Yahweh, while it is denied that the second man from heaven in a heavenly mediator. All these they would have as the names of a hypostasis.
15. For this reason the popular school of thought has devised the *communicatio idiomatum*, namely, that the human nature shares its properties with Yahweh. They invent some new application of the term, man, so that it may be equivalent to the phrase, bearing a human nature; and then, by this *communicatio idiomatum*, they admit that man is Yahweh. This entire doctrine rests upon the passage in the first chapter of John, The Word became flesh.<sup>140</sup> but how far away they are from John's view, you shall learn hereafter.<sup>141</sup> Meanwhile ask yourself just this question: If Christ himself were to be questioned, could any such sophistical fancy be found in his mouth? For we ought so to speak, as Peter says, as if we spoke oracles of Yahweh.<sup>142</sup> After Christ commanded that he be called our Master, an answer was to be expected from his utterances. Ask yourself whether, if Christ, or his disciple Paul, were preaching to us again, he would be able to endure such inventions of men, and deliberate impositions of words and that the universal and catholic faith should depend upon them. Are these things founded on the solid rock, or on the sand? How shall every tongue confess Christ, if these artificial and sophistical words are found in their tongue<sup>143</sup> alone? What view of faith would they deem that other nations held? If you would know whether these things are founded on the Scriptures, see whether the word, man, in the Bible has the meaning they put upon it; whether in the Greek or in the Hebrew, in place of the Latin word all this is used: bearing a human nature. Do they not make Christ a great sophist and maser of

<sup>131</sup> 2Co 5:19 How that, Yahweh, was in Christ, reconciling, a world, unto himself... Joh 14:9 Yahshua saith unto him...He that hath seen me, hath seen the Father.

<sup>132</sup> Philippians 2:6.

<sup>133</sup> Adv. Marcionem IV. xviii. (MPL. ii, 375; ANCL. vii, 247).

<sup>134</sup> John 3:6

<sup>135</sup> John 4:24

<sup>136</sup> Isaiah 9:6

<sup>137</sup> Matthew 28:18

<sup>138</sup> John 20:28

<sup>139</sup> Philippians 2:9

<sup>140</sup> John 1:14

<sup>141</sup> Book III

<sup>142</sup> I Peter 4:11

<sup>143</sup> i.e., the Latin.

sophists, when they say that the expression, Christ, was employed by the Prophets, Apostles, and Evangelists to signify the second Person, by connotation, what bears a human nature? But what would they say if, in place of the word, Christ, the word ANOINTED, were used throughout the Bible? Would they, speaking in the simplest way, say that the second Person was anointed, and that it had received the spirit of Yahweh, and power, as is said of the real Christ?<sup>144</sup> Or could the second being say, All things have been delivered unto me of my Father?<sup>145</sup> Would the Father also have spoken of it in a sophistical sense, saying, Behold my servant, whom I have chosen, my beloved...I will put my spirit upon him?<sup>146</sup> You will find that the reference is not to this, but to the man Yahshua. Again, what is a “sharing of qualities,”<sup>147</sup> and what is it like? For the quality bearing a human nature, was formerly not appropriate to a man. How, then, does a man share his qualities with Yahweh, if they are not his own?

16. Rejecting these quibbles, then, we with a sincere heart acknowledge the real Christ, and him complete in divinity. But since this divinity of his depends upon the Mystery of the Word, let us for the present say roughly that Yahweh can share with a man the fullness of his deity, and give unto him the name, which is above every name.<sup>148</sup> For if we admit as touching Moses that he was made a elohim to Pharaoh,<sup>149</sup> much more, and in a way far more exceptional, was Christ made the elohim, Lord, and Master of Thomas and of us all. And because Yahweh was in him in singular measure, and because through him we find Yahweh propitious, he is expressly called Emanuel, that is, eI<sup>150</sup> with us;<sup>151</sup> nay more, he himself is called el.<sup>152</sup> Again, if we are given by Yahweh the privilege of being called sons of Yahweh,<sup>153</sup> with Christ, the privilege will be the broader not only of being the Son of Yahweh, but also of being called and of being our elohim; for, Worthy is the Lamb that hath been slain to receive divinity, that is, to receive the power, riches, wisdom, might, honor, glory and blessing.<sup>154</sup> And there is in him another and a manifold fullness of Deity, and other unsearchable riches of his, of which we shall speak below,<sup>155</sup> which are all qualities that Yahweh shares with man. But man gives Yahweh no quality *de novo*,<sup>156</sup> for what can man bestow upon Yahweh *de novo*? Either this quality is a thing trifling and indifferent; or it is perfection and thus Yahweh would have lacked this perfection before; or it is imperfection and thus you will say that a sort of imperfection is now suitable for Yahweh; and these are shocking things to say. Moreover, the fact that Yahweh gives something to man is not a detriment to Yahweh but an honor to man, nor is the change in Yahweh, but in man. For, if the pronoun indicates Christ, I admit this is an elohim, a blessed elohim, a mighty elohim. But if the pronoun indicates the invisible Yahweh, I have a great dread of admitting, this is something dead, this is a thirsting, eating man, this is an ass, this has long ears, as the Sophists with their uncircumcised lips admit without the slightest shame.<sup>157</sup> Nor will it do you any good though you move heaven and earth in

<sup>144</sup> Acts 10:38

<sup>145</sup> Matthew 11:27

<sup>146</sup> Matthew 12:18; cf. isa. xlii, 1.

<sup>147</sup> Communicatio praedicatorum, i.e., idiomatum

<sup>148</sup> Philippians 2:9

<sup>149</sup> Exodus 7:1

<sup>150</sup> 0410 אֱלֹהִים 'el ale god, god-like one, mighty one

<sup>151</sup> Matthew 1:23

<sup>152</sup> Hebr., Yahweh; Isaiah 9:6

<sup>153</sup> I John 3:1; cf. John 1:12

<sup>154</sup> Revelation 5:12

<sup>155</sup> Book VII, paragraph 6

<sup>156</sup> In general usage, *de novo* is a Latin expression meaning 'afresh', 'anew', 'beginning again'.

<sup>157</sup> Servetus follows Melanchthon's example (*Loci Theologici*, 1521, saepe) in calling his scholastic opponents Sophists, and Pharisees. Aquinas (*Summa Theol.*, pars I, q. xxx, art. 4) in discussing the relations of the Persons of the Trinity, had argued that as a horse and as ass, though distinct, are one in being both of them animals, so with the Persons. This rather unhappy

crying out against them; on the contrary, they will say, with brazen front, that these are the oracles of Yahweh, pure as fire. Nor is there any other stronger argument against such men than to recall to their memories the precept of the Apostles Peter and Paul: Hold the pattern of sound words as thou hast heard them from me;<sup>158</sup> and, if any man speaketh, let him speak as it were oracles of Yahweh;<sup>159</sup> and, he that followeth a different doctrine from that which is according to godliness, the sound doctrine of Christ, he is puffed up, knowing nothing.<sup>160</sup> See now the “godliness” of the doctrine which they have learned from Paul, which admits that Yahweh has long ears, and is an ass. No wonder, if the Turks call us ass-worshippers, seeing that we do not blush to call Yahweh an ass.

17. In opposition to what has been said you will insist, if Christ is an elohim in that way, there will then be more than one Elohim. Here I propose that Christ alone shall be my teacher, in order that he alone may defend me, for out of his words all your arguments can be refuted. To that argument of Pharisees, the Master himself replies, I said, Ye are elohims.<sup>161</sup> Christ there makes it clear that he is an elohim not in Nature but in appearance, not by nature but by grace. For when he was accused of making himself an elohim, he spoke of elohim in his reply in the same way in which the prophet spoke of gods, ascribing that sort of deity to himself. Also, seeing that he adds, If he called them elohims unto whom the word of Yahweh came,<sup>162</sup> how much more shall the Son of man, whom the Fathers sanctifies,<sup>163</sup> be called not merely the Son of Elohim. By way of privilege, therefore, it was given to him to be an elohim, because the Father sanctifies him; he was anointed by grace, exalted because he humbled himself;<sup>164</sup> exalted above his fellows.<sup>165</sup> There was given unto him the name, which is above every name;<sup>166</sup> and, as Peter says, He received from Yahweh the Father honor and glory,<sup>167</sup> which things are all according to grace. For that only the Father is called Yahweh by nature is plainly enough shown by Scripture, which says, Yahweh and Christ, Christ and Yahweh. It so joins them as though Christ were a being distinct from Yahweh. Likewise, when it says, Yahweh is the Father of Yahshua Christ,<sup>168</sup> a difference is noted between Yahweh and Christ, just as between father and son. And also when it says, the Christ of Yahweh,<sup>169</sup> the Yahweh of our Lord Yahshua Christ,<sup>170</sup> the head of Christ is Yahweh.<sup>171</sup> And Christ cries to Yahweh, My El, my El.<sup>172</sup> And by common usage of Scripture Yahweh is called Elohim; Lord, Savior and King. And Christ himself says, That they should know thee, the only true Elohim [Yahweh], and him whom thou didst send, even Yahshua Christ.<sup>173</sup> For although I

---

illustration was taken up by the later scholastic theologians (Duns Scotus, in lib. i. Sent., dist. 26, q. 1; dist. 2, q.7; Pierre d’Ailly, in lib. i. Sent., q. 5; John Major, in lib. i. dist. 4; Robert Holkot, super quator libros Sent., lib. I, q. v., prop. 2). Such as illustration of the Godhead seemed to Servetus altogether shocking; and personaliter (as they defined Person) and asinaliter were associated in his mind as equivalent terms. He thus alludes, just below, to the Turks as calling Christians asinarii, ass-followers, or perhaps ass-worshippers. cf. marginal note, par. 14.

<sup>158</sup> II Timothy 1:13

<sup>159</sup> I Peter 4:11

<sup>160</sup> I Timothy 6:3,4 (Servetus says chapter 4)

<sup>161</sup> John 10:34

<sup>162</sup> John 10:35

<sup>163</sup> John 10:36

<sup>164</sup> Philippians 2:8,9

<sup>165</sup> Hebrews 1:9

<sup>166</sup> Philippians 2:9

<sup>167</sup> II Peter 1:17

<sup>168</sup> II Corinthians 11:31, Romans 15:6

<sup>169</sup> Luke 9:20

<sup>170</sup> Isaiah 9:6

<sup>171</sup> I Corinthians 11:3

<sup>172</sup> Matthew 27:46

<sup>173</sup> John 17:3

say that Christ is very elohim, yet in the relation which he holds to the Father this very passage notes a difference. In John it speaks of Christ in distinction from idols and from those whom they falsely named gods.<sup>174</sup> Likewise, only the Father is called the invisible Yahweh.<sup>175</sup> Christ also, when he is called good, transfers the matter of goodness to the Father.<sup>176</sup>

18. Nor let any one be surprised that I bring forward Scriptures that have been cited by heretics in their own behalf; for although those have used them improperly, they have not for all that lost their integrity so that one may never use them. For I too, as well as you, understand them as referring to a man. Nor do I bring them forward for their [the heretics'] purpose. For what if I say that Yahshua Christ is the great Yahweh, and along with this what he himself says in speaking most simply: The Father is greater than I,<sup>177</sup> am I therefore an Arian? For when Arius held the very foolish view that the Son was of different Substance from the Father, having also no appreciation at all of the glory of Christ, he introduced a new creature, more exalted than man; although he might nevertheless have excluded this and every other distinction, and having admitted, The Father is greater than I.<sup>178</sup> But preferring to speculate upon a plurality of separate beings, he fell into most abominable error.

19. Again, let not the word, elohim, deceive you, for you do not and can not understand it's meaning until you know what elohim means, which, if you know Hebrew, I will make quite clear to you below. For you must bear in mind that all things that are written of Christ took place in Judea, and in the Hebrew tongue; and in all others tongues but this there is a poverty of divine names. So we, not knowing how to distinguish between elohim, fall into error. And that Christ became our elohim in the sense of the word, elohim, is no more than to say that he became our Lord, our judge, and our king, after he was given by the Father a kingdom, all judgment and all power. And Thomas shows this well enough when he says, My Lord, my elohim;<sup>179</sup> and Isaiah says, He shall be called Mighty el.<sup>180</sup> Hear also how Scripture calls Cyrus the King, who was a type of the real Christ, an elohim, the elohim of Israel: I will give thee, it saith, hidden treasures... That thou mayest get to know, That, I—Yahweh, who am calling thee by thy name, am the Elohim of Israel.<sup>181</sup> Likewise, if we admit that Moses was made Pharaoh's elohim,<sup>182</sup> why do we deny it concerning the real Christ? For Christ surpasses Moses.<sup>183</sup> These are very poor comparisons by which to prove the exalted nature of Christ; but you force me to resort to them so long as you hold so unworthy a view of human nature, and do not keep in mind that Yahweh can exalt man more than can be declared, and place him at his right hand above every exalted being. But this is thus far but a slight thing, that you should hold a sound view about Christ, until you have learned the mysteries of the Word and know that this Christ himself is and from everlasting has been, an elohim.

20. Again, this kind of deity in Christ you may learn from the Old Testament, if you observe carefully what Hebrew word is used when Christ is called an elohim. And along with this, mark the

---

<sup>174</sup> I John 5:21

<sup>175</sup> Colossians 1:15, I Timothy 1:17

<sup>176</sup> Matthew 19:17 (Pagn.)

<sup>177</sup> John 14:28

<sup>178</sup> John 14:28

<sup>179</sup> John 20:28

<sup>180</sup> Isaiah 9:6

<sup>181</sup> Is. 45:3

<sup>182</sup> Exodus 7:1

<sup>183</sup> Hebrews 3:3

difference between יהוה,<sup>184</sup> the name of the Creator, and אֱלֹהִים, אֲדֹנָי, אֵל<sup>185</sup> and other similar names applied to Yahweh. And that Thomas spoke of Christ<sup>186</sup> not as Yahweh, but as elohim and kurios, I shall prove below.<sup>187</sup> Likewise the Apostle said elohim.<sup>188</sup> But their ignorance of this matter strangely deceived the Greek [metaphysical] philosophers. Indeed, as a matter of history, Solomon is here called elohim, for this passage is from the forty-fifth Psalm. Nor does the Apostle rest all the force of his proof on the word elohim, but also on the fact that it says, His throne and kingdom are forever and ever.<sup>189</sup> For from the word elohim alone he would not have proved Christ greater than the angels, nor greater than other princes who by the same prophet are called elohims. On the contrary, by the same Apostle, and in the same passage, Angels are called elohim, when he says, Worship him, all ye angels,<sup>190</sup> and, Thou madest him a little lower than the angels;<sup>191</sup> for in both passages elohim is used. Nor shall I omit to mention here (although it seems to tell against me) that their idea is false who would have him said to be made lower than elohim, and not, than the angels; for they are far from the intention of the prophet, and from the Apostle's train of thought, which is wholly concerned with the angels. Nor do I care here to inquire concerning their Natures, but shall hold to this Hebrew expression; because with the Hebrews great beings are called by the name of elohims and of angels, and they use one common name when speaking of angels and of distinguished men. And Peter calls angels those who in Genesis are called elohim, or, sons of Elohim.<sup>192</sup> And as of those, so of the angels I heaven, it says, sons of Elohim.<sup>193</sup> Likewise, it also says אֱלֹהִים<sup>194</sup> of angels and mighty men.<sup>195</sup> This comparison serves to make the letter subordinate to the spirit. As shall below, does David, in his adversities, from which he was freed, bear the type of the passion and resurrection of Christ, and is he said to have been made lower than elohims, because he suffers some calamities which elohims and potentates are not wont to suffer? And just this is the meaning with regard to Christ, so far as concerns the time of his passion. For if you have with due care examined the saying of Paul, it contains nothing else than a translation of the Psalmist; so that this "making lower" is understood of the torment of death, and he was made lower than the angels when, being stripped of his angelic glory, he suffered a shameful death. And these homely phrases the Apostles (following, as I suppose, the Greek version)<sup>196</sup> are wont to indicate by the names of angels; as when, wishing to indicate some great thing, it says, If I speak with tongues of men and of angels;<sup>197</sup> If we shall judge angels<sup>198</sup> (that is, those things which are greater); in the presence of the angels<sup>199</sup> (that is, in the presence of princes). And the Chaldee version<sup>200</sup> also follows this in places. And in the Psalm quoted above,<sup>201</sup> both in the Greek and in the Chaldee, angels is used to render elohim. And in the Greek version that was usually quoted by the Apostles, where there is no difference in the sense. And

---

<sup>184</sup> Yahweh

<sup>185</sup> El, Adonai, Elohim

<sup>186</sup> John 20:28

<sup>187</sup> Book V par. 2

<sup>188</sup> Hebrews 1:8; cf. Psalms 44:6

<sup>189</sup> Hebrews 1:8

<sup>190</sup> Hebrews 1:6, cf. Psalms xcvi, 7

<sup>191</sup> Hebrews 2:7, Psalms 8:5

<sup>192</sup> Genesis 6:2,4

<sup>193</sup> Job 1:6, 38:7

<sup>194</sup> Elohim

<sup>195</sup> Psalms 139:6, Job 91:25

<sup>196</sup> The Septuagint

<sup>197</sup> I Corinthians 13:1

<sup>198</sup> I Corinthians 6:3

<sup>199</sup> Revelation 14:10; Psalms 88:1 (Vulg.)

<sup>200</sup> i.e., the Targums

<sup>201</sup> Psalms 8:5, as quoted above from Hebrews 2:7

from this also Peter's saying about the angels is clear, for the Septuagint called them angels.<sup>202</sup> And when a deed is related, reference should be had to the scripture narrative. And Peter, in the Clementine Recognitions,<sup>203</sup> says that there were men who lived the life of angels. And the Epistle of Jude calls angels those notable beasts that had left their proper habitation and were roving about on the face of the earth.<sup>204</sup> And it is these that are called pilgrims.<sup>205</sup> For Cain with his offspring (whom the Hebrews call great Demons) was a wanderer on the face of the earth.<sup>206</sup> But of these sayings of Peter I shall treat more at large in Book III.<sup>207</sup> Let it suffice for the present to have explained the word *elohim*, lest some one attempt to build some argument against me out of those passages in the Epistle to the Hebrews. For I not only do not reject those divine names, but I say that they apply to Christ par excellence. Thus, in order to mark a difference from other *elohims*, it adds, the *Elohim* of all the earth, a *Elohim* great, terrible, mighty, wonderful, and over all blessed.<sup>208</sup> But because of the poverty of the Greek in divine names, the Apostles could not express this matter to the Greeks otherwise than by the word *θεος*;<sup>209</sup> although they rarely use it. All which things should be carefully weighed; nor would they have caused us so much trouble had the Greeks learned Hebrew.

21. The argument made about a plurality of *elohims*<sup>210</sup> can be turned the other way, for according to Christ's answer they are driven to admit that the three beings [Moses, Joseph and Yahshua] are *elohims*, and *elohims* by Nature. Either Christ is not Yahweh by Nature, or he did not reply to the point; for the question there was concerning his deity. Hence the argument runs against them, if they are *elohims* in the sense in which the Son is an *elohim*. And let them invent for themselves as many *elohims* by Nature as ever they please; because to us, as to Paul, on Yahweh is enough, who is the Father, and one Lord Yahshua Christ, who is the Son.<sup>211</sup> Add also to the refutation of their argument, that although Christ is an *elohim*, yet he is one with the Father. Thus, no plurality is shown as they suppose, for he is an *elohim*, a kind of deity being shared by him with the Father.
22. You will insist, moreover, upon asking how Christ is said to have come down from heaven and to have been sent by the Father and come into the world. I have already said in the preceding argument<sup>212</sup> that those who rely upon argument of this sort seem to be resorting to the weapons of the Pharisees and to use the same carnal sense as they. For the Pharisees prated, is not this the son of Joseph, whose father and mother we know? How then doth he say, I am come down out of heaven?<sup>213</sup> And the Master would not explain the truth to them; but afterwards, in explaining the matter to his disciples, he said, What then if ye should behold the Son of man ascending where he was before? It is the spirit that giveth life; the flesh profiteth nothing: these words are spirit and life.<sup>214</sup> Again, Christ, speaking not of the second being but of himself, says, I am come down from heaven.<sup>215</sup> Thus the reasoning turns out against you. I say, then, that that which came down from

<sup>202</sup> Genesis 6:2,4; II Peter 2:4

<sup>203</sup> I. xxxix (MPG. I, 1223; ANF. viii, 85; ANCL. iii, 163)

<sup>204</sup> Jude 6

<sup>205</sup> Eccclus 16:15 (Vulg.)

<sup>206</sup> Genesis 4:14

<sup>207</sup> Book III, paragraph 6

<sup>208</sup> Deuteronomy 10:17 For, as touching Yahweh your *Elohim*, he, is *Elohim* of *elohims*, and Lord of lords; the great, the mighty, and the fearful El...; Psalms 118:35; Romans 9:5

<sup>209</sup> 2316 *θεος* *theos theh'-os*; a god or goddess, a general name of deities or divinities

<sup>210</sup> In paragraph 16

<sup>211</sup> I Corinthians 8:6

<sup>212</sup> Paragraph 16

<sup>213</sup> John 6:42

<sup>214</sup> John 6:62,63

<sup>215</sup> John 6:38

heaven, is the Word<sup>216</sup> of Yahweh as is said in Wisdom, Thine all-powerful word, O Lord, leaped from heaven;<sup>217</sup> because Yahweh thundered from on high, and gave his voice from heaven, and this word on earth became the Son. And Christ, pausing to discourse on the bread out of heaven, explains himself. For what is the bread which cometh down from heaven<sup>218</sup> but the Word of Yahweh, by which man lives, rather than by material bread alone.<sup>219</sup> But since these things presuppose the mystery of the Word, let them be postponed to the following Books.<sup>220</sup> Yet you might meanwhile have understood down from heaven, that is, down from above, because, as he himself bears witness, ye are from beneath; I am from above.<sup>221</sup> Also, you might have understood the words of Christ thus spiritually; for Christ was in the spirit of Yahweh before all time, and was in heaven, just as he also remains with us, even unto the end of the world.<sup>222</sup> And for this reason alone, that his words were heavenly, you ought to have admitted that he himself was from heaven;

---

<sup>216</sup> *In the beginning was the Word*; that is, the utterance or voice of Yahweh; because *In the beginning Elohim said, Light be: And light was*; and this Word became the true light, when he said, Light be. And this same Word, this same light, is the man Christ, who is the light of the world, *the true light, which lighted every man, coming into this world*. See how the words correspond to one another. Paul makes this very thing clear by the Greek word *eipon*, that is 'said.' Likewise also Irenaeus; for who will bear to wrest Scripture to another sense than that which the proper meanings of the word bears? For *logos* means not a philosophical being, but an oracle, a saying, a speech, a discourse, a declaration of Yahweh; for it is derived from the verb *lego*, which means say; and that the more because the very Genesis of the world indicates the meaning, since Yahweh even from the beginning was speaking of Christ, and was acting by speaking this Word, so that thus all things are said to exist through Christ himself. Origen also says, What is the Word of Yahweh which came to Jeremiah or to Isaiah or to any prophet you please? I know, he says, of no other word than that of which John said, *In the beginning was the Word*. For in order to seek the meaning of a word, the passages must be sought in which Yahweh has employed that word; and there is not in the whole Bible a single letter which supports their imaginary meaning of the word. Hence they are rash, and it is far more rash to make out of a word a Son. How, say, does their doctrine differ from the fictions of the Gentiles, who have the traditions that Mercury means the word through which instruction is conveyed to the understanding, that Paris means feeling, and Minerva bravery? For in like manner they say that the third being means love, and the second knowledge. They take great pride in Platonizing, by multiplying separate beings. To sow disagreements and inconsistencies in the Scriptures is their delight. They explain, *In the beginning* as meaning, in the Father; and, *In the beginning* as meaning, in the Son. What am I to understand? Do you suppose that the son of Zebedee would have been acquainted with such subtle [metaphysical] philosophy? I would rather be ignorant of this inharmonious harmony of the Scriptures than know it. But assuming with Tertullian that each word had its proper meaning, I say *principium*, means beginning, and was thus appropriate word to be used for things commencing to be made; for nothing that has to be made is without a beginning. And thus the Word is the commencement or beginning of an undertaking, and not the name of any Substance; as though we said, In the end Yahweh will do this or that. And when we mean the order of a work, we say, In the beginning a potter made a basin or an urn. Without controversy, then, explain *in the beginning* as meaning, before all things; because before a man speaks, a meditation of the mind is first required; and because the speech of Yahweh is itself wisdom, for Yahweh can not speak foolishly...Hence the Word, in Yahweh when he utters it, is Yahweh himself speaking. After the utterance is the flesh itself, or the Word of Yahweh. Before the speech became flesh the very oracle of Yahweh was understood to be within the darkness of the clouds, not being yet manifested; for the speech was Yahweh. And after the Word or Speech became man, we understand by the Word, Christ himself, who is the Word of Yahweh, and the voice of Yahweh. And there is a clear text to prove that he is now the Word of Yahweh, for it is he that John saw sitting upon a white horse, whose name is the Word of Yahweh. When therefore, the change has been made from Word to flesh, the Word is flesh. For of what use would it be to us that the Word became flesh, if the Word is not now called flesh? For John saw the Word of life, and handled it with his hands. And Irenaeus especially derides all those that say that the Word of Yahweh is a kind of philosophical being; but he declares that Yahshua of Nazareth the very one who was born of Mary, was the Word of Yahweh after the Word became flesh...It is also understood in very truth that the word which was in the beginning became flesh, because this flesh was begotten by a voice uttered from the beginning, not otherwise than as if I, uttering a word from my mouth, produced gold or pearls; for then it might be said, properly speaking, that my voice became gold. For the Almighty Word of Yahweh was able, without bonds of material things, to change into fleshly substance; and therefore Christ himself is now called, the Word. (Servetus on the Trinity, Book II, pg. 75-78)

<sup>217</sup> Wisdom 18:15

<sup>218</sup> John 6:33

<sup>219</sup> Deuteronomy 8:3, Matthew 4:4

<sup>220</sup> Books II and III

<sup>221</sup> John 8:23

<sup>222</sup> Matthew 28:20

for the baptism of John was from heaven, and the second man is of heaven, heavenly.<sup>223</sup> With regard to what you say, that he was sent by the Father, there seems to be no great difficulty. For John also is said to have been sent from Yahweh: There was a man sent from Yahweh, whose name was John.<sup>224</sup> Likewise Moses and the Prophets are said to have been sent by Yahweh.<sup>225</sup> And Christ, speaking to the Father about the Apostles, says, As thou didst send me into the world, so send I them into the world.<sup>226</sup> And, As the Father hath sent me, even so send I you.<sup>227</sup>

23. I am forced to light upon these illustrations, not because they furnish a complete analogy, but in order to persuade you that a man was sent; which you, led astray by your [metaphysical] philosophy, undertake to deny. For it is a great mistake to say that the second being is said to be passively sent, when it is the very Nature of Yahweh. It is true that this unique sending of Christ and his coming forth from the Father, has its roots fixed in Yahweh, as we shall explain when the mystery of the Word is disclosed.<sup>228</sup> Likewise, as for your saying that Christ came into the world, what wonder is it, when this is also true of others: Every man coming into this world.<sup>229</sup> Again, of what king do you understand this passage: Blessed is the king that cometh in the name of Yahweh.<sup>230</sup> Again, observe that those that are led by the spirit of Yahweh are not of the world;<sup>231</sup> and they are said to come into this earthly tabernacle of our body, and are said to put on flesh, even as when one puts on a garment. And he that speaks by the spirit observes that he is above the world. And Peter said that he was bound in this tabernacle as in something put upon him, speaking, that is, after the inward man.<sup>232</sup>

24. Moreover, you can prove in what way Christ thought it not robbery to be equal with Yahweh.<sup>233</sup> These words of Paul are so obscurely and variously interpreted by them that they can clearly convince no one by the words themselves; and that the more, since it is perfectly plain that Paul is simply speaking of Christ Yahshua. In the first place, some interpret it as meaning that the second Person, apart from robbery, thought itself to be equal with the first. And again, they warp this ignorant explanation and make it refer to [metaphysical] philosophical Natures, saying that he did not think that to be a matter of robbery, which belonged to his Nature. Others say, He did not think it robbery that he should be equal with Yahweh; that is, he did not think it a robbery of the equality with Yahweh, did not care to seize for himself equality with Yahweh. This meaning is more plausible than the first, because Paul never thought of Natures, and it is counter to Paul's purpose, who is treating of nothing but Christ's modesty and humility. Also the force of the word, but<sup>234</sup> is clearly opposed to them, which, as Lawyers say, is taken adversatively; and of necessity the meaning is bound to be this: He did not exalt himself, but he humbled himself; he did not think it [robbery], but abased, emptied, submitted himself. But in vain do I waste my labor on these things (which are all false), when the true solution lies in the words of the Master. For the objection of the Pharisees, who assailed Christ, is that he made himself equal with Yahweh; and Christ, in reply, did not deny this equality, but said, What things soever the Father did, these the Son also will do in like manner; and, As the Father raiseth the dead, giveth them life, cleanseth

---

<sup>223</sup> I Corinthians 15:47

<sup>224</sup> John 1:6

<sup>225</sup> Matthew 23:34; Luke 11:49

<sup>226</sup> John 17:18

<sup>227</sup> John 20:21

<sup>228</sup> Book III

<sup>229</sup> John 1:9 (Vulg.)

<sup>230</sup> Luke 19:38

<sup>231</sup> John 17:14; I John 2:16

<sup>232</sup> II Peter 1:13,14

<sup>233</sup> Philippians 2:6 (Vulg.)

<sup>234</sup> Philippians 2:7

lepers, giveth sight to the blind, healeth the deaf, the paralytics, the demoniacs and others, even so doth the Son; and finally, The Father hath given all judgment, all power, unto the Son, that all may honor the Son, even as they honor the Father.<sup>235</sup> Behold how Christ was made equal with Yahweh, because all things whatsoever the Father hath are his.<sup>236</sup> Behold how the *morphe*,<sup>237</sup> that is, the appearance of Deity, shone forth in him when he wrought such great miracles; and this is what Paul says, that he existed in the form and appearance of Yahweh.<sup>238</sup> From this let us observe the humility of Christ, which Paul cites to us as a model of all humility; for the greater the power he is endowed with, the greater is his humility, the more he submits and abases himself. For there are many good men who, if they are made magistrates or have reached a higher estate, prove tyrants. But not so with Christ; for Christ did not think that this great equality, which he had with Yahweh constituted robbery, and would not use it in the way of robbery. Firstly, because he did not accept the robbery when he perceived that they were about to take him by force, to make him king;<sup>239</sup> but he bore himself in humble fashion and would that his kingdom should not be of this world.<sup>240</sup> And it is this discourse<sup>241</sup> that Paul has in mind. Secondly, he thought it not robbery to seize for himself twelve legions of angels<sup>242</sup> and defend himself by force against the Jews, but chose humbly to suffer.

25. This, then, is the equality which he had while existing in the form of Yahweh: he had in himself an equal power with Yahweh by reason of the authority that was given him in equal measure with Yahweh.<sup>243</sup> Because he was found to be an elohim by his power, just as he was man by his flesh. And all things that the Father hath are his;<sup>244</sup> and through him all things are done that are performed by the Word of Yahweh, since he himself is the Word of Yahweh.<sup>245</sup> And he spoke thus of an equality of power because, The Son of man shall be seated at the right hand of power of Yahweh.<sup>246</sup> And Stephen saw him at the right hand of the power of Yahweh.<sup>247</sup> And this equality and exaltation at the right hand of Yahweh Paul proclaims saying, not of the being, but of Christ that he was placed above all rule, authority, power and dominion and every name that is named, not only in this world but also in that which is to come;<sup>248</sup> finally, that all things were put in subjection under his feet and that he was given to be head over all things to the Church itself, who filleth all in all.<sup>249</sup> Likewise equality in him with the power of Yahweh is noted in Daniel: Behold, there came...a son of man, and he came even to the ancient of days and there was given him all kingly power.<sup>250</sup> And wonder at him is expressed in Jeremiah: Who is he that thus approacheth and hath been caused to draw near to Yahweh?<sup>251</sup> So that he even comes near being equal to [Yahweh] himself. And this is the mere truth, so that Joseph was made equal to Pharaoh, although strictly speaking, he says, Pharaoh is greater than I.

<sup>235</sup> John 5:19,21-23, loosely conflated with Matthew 11:5

<sup>236</sup> Matthew 11:27; John 3:35; 13:3

<sup>237</sup> Morphe; Greek word for the shape or figure of a thing.

<sup>238</sup> Philippians 2:6

<sup>239</sup> John 6:15

<sup>240</sup> John 18:36

<sup>241</sup> i.e., in John 5:6

<sup>242</sup> Matthew 26:53

<sup>243</sup> John 5:27

<sup>244</sup> John 3:35, 13:3

<sup>245</sup> John 1:1,3

<sup>246</sup> Luke 22:69

<sup>247</sup> Acts 7:55,56

<sup>248</sup> Ephesians 1:21

<sup>249</sup> Ephesians 1:22,23

<sup>250</sup> Daniel 7:13,14

<sup>251</sup> Jeremiah 30:21

26. Again, Paul did not say that there are two beings and one Nature, or that the second Person is of equal Essence with the first. For had Paul understood that the second Person thought it not robbery to be of equal Nature with the first, wherefore did he not say that it was equal with the first Person and not with Yahweh? For the word of Yahweh is living,<sup>252</sup> and there denotes something distinct from Yahweh. Why should he also have dragged in the saying about robbery? What suspicion of robbery could there be in one who is the same being, the same Nature: Paul would have been speaking foolishly. Again, who does not see that the word, thought,<sup>253</sup> is altogether human? Who does not see that it is blasphemy for the sentence of robbery to be passed on the beings? Again, hear how he says, existing in the form of Yahweh.<sup>254</sup> How could he have said that the second Person had the appearance of Deity if it is itself a deity and that by Nature, if it is Yahweh quite as properly and as much by nature, as the first Person? Paul spoke absurdly. He who said that the Father was greater than himself spoke falsely; for, to speak without caviling, the being greater is there spoken of with regard to the Son, as is evident from the word, Father and from the related word, I. You ought also, if there is a Metaphysical equality, as readily and as properly to admit that the first Person is the Father of God and is equal to the Son, as you would the reverse, which, however, the Scripture shrinks from saying. Again, consider the words of Paul which follow: Wherefore Yahweh highly exalted him;<sup>255</sup> for the reference is to the one who “thought.” Was the second Person, then, so greatly exalted because it humbled itself? For I deem it ridiculous that say that the Nature of Yahweh humbles itself. Again, as I have said, taking into account Paul’s aim, the blindness of Theophylact<sup>256</sup> is mitigated; for Paul is here treating not of Christ’s Nature, but of his appearance. How, then, can the equality of his Nature be inferred from this passage? Again, take here the word ἰσος<sup>257</sup> used in the Greek in place of the adverb, equally; for the expression, equally, denotes not his nature but his station; and he could pronounce himself on an equality with Yahweh in power, who promises that he can do all things soever that the Father does.<sup>258</sup>

27. The unmistakable explanation of the truth is this: that though existing in the likeness of Yahweh, having the power of Yahweh, he did not deem it robbery to be on an equality with Yahweh, did not think that he should use this power of Yahweh by way of robbery. For it really would have been robbery, had he violently withdrawn from the work to which the Father had appointed him, or had he seized for himself a kingly tyranny over this world. And this is the proper meaning of the word ἀρπαγμος.<sup>259</sup> For Christ never cared to plunder, never violently robbed any one of anything. This idea is made clear by the Greek article, το<sup>260</sup> as if to say, the very fact that he was on an equality with God. As to this equality with Yahweh in him, he did not think that it constituted robbery. Nor does Paul, as some most groundlessly suppose, treat the word, on an equality, as of capital importance. But he brings this in by way of a consequence from his likeness to deity, for he says that he existed in the likeness of Yahweh. He did not think that το εἶναι ἰσὰ θεῷ<sup>261</sup> – did not think that that was a question of equality, did not think that the equality (which, that is to say, he had when existing in the form of Yahweh) constituted robbery. And this meaning

<sup>252</sup> Hebrews 4:12

<sup>253</sup> Philippians 2:6, “thought it not robbery.”

<sup>254</sup> Philippians 2:6

<sup>255</sup> Philippians 2:9

<sup>256</sup> Comment. In Ephesians ad Philippians 2:9 (MPG. cxxiv, 1166)

<sup>257</sup> 2470 ἰσος isos *ee’-sos*, equal, in quantity or quality

<sup>258</sup> Matthew 11:27, John 3:35; 5:19; 13:3

<sup>259</sup> Harpagmos; the act of seizing, robbery.

<sup>260</sup> In the Greek quoted just below

<sup>261</sup> the being on an equality with Yahweh

is clear from the passage above quoted,<sup>262</sup> nor can any other equality be treated of here than is treated of there. For when his equality with Yahweh was being treated of there, Christ did not deny it. Indeed, he showed that it was actually in him, although he did not use it, as a tyrant or a giant, by way of robbery, but bore himself humbly in the servile fashion of man, becoming obedient even unto death.<sup>263</sup> When it is said that he took the form or appearance of a servant, he says this in order to mark a distinction from the form of Yahweh of which he had been speaking; for the word μορφη<sup>264</sup> is used in both clauses and he spoke on purpose to express greater humility. For though he possessed both appearances, he used the humbler; not the appearance and might of Yahweh but as one among men. And he is said to have been found in fashion as a man,<sup>265</sup> even as the Psalmist says, Ye shall die as men, though ye be elohims.<sup>266</sup> And Sampson, because he was very strong, as though he were not a man but more than a man said I shall then be weak, as men are.<sup>267</sup> These are all the passages of Scripture that speak of equality, far removed from the disputes of our age; and the question as to the equality or inequality of Nature was unknown to the Apostles.

28. Yet some reason out the equality of Nature, because it says, using the same word, The Lord said unto my Lord.<sup>268</sup> But they should be pardoned, for not knowing the original language of Holy Scripture they know not their own selves. Yet you, if you know Hebrew, will find the prophet saying נאם יהוה לֵאדֹנָי.<sup>269</sup> It obviously also says of Christ Adon.<sup>270</sup> And this prophecy about sitting on the right hand is fulfilled in Christ, as is shown in the tenth of Hebrews.<sup>271</sup> Nevertheless the [metaphysical] philosophers invent other sittings in the eternities of the ages. Again, this is known of itself from the words of Christ, nor does he make a point of applying the name יהוה<sup>272</sup> to himself; for in that case it would have been easy for the Jews to reply to him.
29. To sum up, that you may know the trend of my thought: I say that with the single exception of the passage in John,<sup>273</sup> all the Scriptures from first to last speak of the man Christ himself; and the passage in John speaks not of what is but of what was; and the mistake lies in not understanding what that was, and how it became flesh. And let not your fancies lead you astray, but lay this up in your inmost hearts: that in all the Scriptures the man Christ himself is speaking and let your thoughts ever directed to him. Pray Yahweh to grant you a cheerful mind to hear and I will (without any pettifogging, hair-splitting or equivocation) render the Scriptures as plain to you as day and will place Yahweh himself before your eyes, provided that you always look upon the face of Christ

## The holy spirit [the gift also known as the spirit of Yahweh<sup>274</sup>]

<sup>262</sup> John 5:19-23, in paragraph 23

<sup>263</sup> Philippians 2:7,8

<sup>264</sup> 3444 μορφη morphē *mor-fay*; the form by which a person or thing strikes the vision

<sup>265</sup> Philippians 2:8

<sup>266</sup> Psalms 82:6,7

<sup>267</sup> Judges 16:7

<sup>268</sup> Psalms 110:1

<sup>269</sup> Yahweh said unto my Lord

<sup>270</sup> Hebrew, Lord; Mal. 3:1

<sup>271</sup> Hebrews 10:12; cf. Mark 16:19

<sup>272</sup> Yahweh

<sup>273</sup> John 1:1

<sup>274</sup> The term, 'spirit of Yahweh,' is synonymous with the terms; holy spirit, spirit of Elohim etc. (1Sa 16:13 And Samuel took the horn of oil, and anointed him in the midst of his brethren. And the spirit of Yahweh came mightily upon David, from that day forward. Then arose Samuel, and went his way unto Ramah. Ps 51:11 Do not cast me away from thy presence, And, thy holy spirit, do not take from me) (Isa 61:1 The spirit of My Lord Yahweh, is upon me,—Because Yahweh, Hath anointed me,

30. The [metaphysical] philosophers have invented besides a third separate being, truly and really distinct from the other two, which they call the third Person, or the Holy Spirit; thus they have contrived an imaginary Trinity, three beings in one Nature. But in reality three beings, three Yahwehs, or one threefold Yahweh, are foisted upon us under the pretense and with the names of a unity. On this matter hear the view of recent writers, which John Major states in his Sentences.<sup>275</sup> For with them it is very easy, taking the words in their strict sense, for three beings to exist, which they say are strictly, simply, truly and really so different or distinct that one is born of another and one is breathed out by the others and all these three are shut up in one jar. I, however, since I am unwilling to misuse the word Persons, shall call them the first being, the second being, the third being;<sup>276</sup> for in the Scriptures I find no other name for them and what is properly to be thought of the persons I shall say later on.<sup>277</sup> Admitting, therefore, these three, which after their own fashion they call Persons, by reasoning from the lower to the higher they freely admit a plurality of beings, a plurality of entities, a plurality of Essences, a plurality of Ousias,<sup>278</sup> and in consequence, taking the word, god, strictly, they will have a plurality of gods.
31. If this is so, why are the Tritoitae<sup>279</sup> blamed who say that there are three gods? For they also contrive three gods, or one threefold one. These three gods of theirs form one composite *ousia*;<sup>280</sup> and although some will not use a word implying that the three have been put together,<sup>281</sup> yet they do use a word implying that they are constituted together and that Yahweh is constituted out of three beings. It is clear, therefore, that we are Tritoitae and we have a threefold Yahweh: we have become Atheists, that is, men without any god. For as soon as we try to think about Yahweh, we are tuned aside to three phantoms, so that no kind of unity remains in our conception. But what else is being without Yahweh but being unable to think about Yahweh, when there is always presented to our understanding a haunting kind of confusion of three beings, by which we are forever deluded into supposing that we are thinking about Yahweh. And see how manfully they defend the one Yahweh. For even if they admitted a downright and absolute plurality of Beings and Entities, and consequently a plurality of absolute gods, yet they have one connotative Yahweh. For they say (to refer to the passage cited above)<sup>282</sup> that these words, as they use, or rather misuse, them, are not taken in the strict sense, but in a sort of artificial, sophistical and connotative way. They seem to be living in another world while they dream of such things; for the kingdom of heaven knows none of this nonsense and it is in another way, unknown to them, that Scripture speaks of the holy spirit [or the spirit of Yahweh]?

---

to tell good tidings to the oppressed... Ac 10:38 How Yahweh anointed him with holy spirit and with power, who went about doing good and healing all that were oppressed by the adversary, because, Yahweh, was with him.)

<sup>275</sup> Book I, dist. V, solution of the 6<sup>th</sup> argument

<sup>276</sup> See note 12, par. 3

<sup>277</sup> Paragraph 51

<sup>278</sup> Greek for Latin *essentia*

<sup>279</sup> The word Tritoitae has been the occasion of much discussion. The counterfeit reprint of this work uniformly replaces it by Tritheitae, as though a misprint; but that Servetus used the term deliberately is shown by the fact that it repeatedly occurs, both in this work (above and in paragraphs 50, 55) and in his *Christianismi Restitutio* (pp. 30, 108, 394, 406). It has generally been inferred from the context that it means tritheists; and precisely contemporary work, Sebastian Franck's *Chronica*, Argentorati, 1531, p. cccxxxviib, defines it thus: Tritoitae oder Tricolite, de gleich wie sy drey person in der Trifeltigkeyt zulassen, also auch drey gotter. But if etymology has any bearing (Greek *tritos*, third), it should mean worshipers of the third Person. The term with this meaning would involve tritheism, though not expressly charging it. Servetus seriously objected to worship of the Holy Spirit, as this part of his work shows.

<sup>280</sup> 3776 ουσια *ousia oo-see'-ah* what one has, i.e. property, possessions, estate; Lk. 15:12-13

<sup>281</sup> *Compositionis verbo...constitutionis verbo*. Cf. paragraph 57

<sup>282</sup> i.e., from John Major, in paragraph 29

32. But since this matter requires more thorough investigation, let it be reserved for the following books.<sup>283</sup> For indeed Scripture treats strangely and almost incomprehensibly of this matter, especially for those who are not acquainted with its peculiar habit of speaking. For by holy spirit it means now Yahweh himself, now an angel, now the spirit of a man, a sort of instinct or divine inspiration of the mind, a mental impulse, or a breath; although sometimes a difference is marked between breath and spirit. And some would have the holy spirit mean nothing other than the right understanding and reason of man. And with the Hebrews רוּחַ<sup>284</sup> means nothing other than breath, or breathing, which is expressed indifferently as wind and spirit; and with the Greeks πνεῦμα<sup>285</sup> is taken for any spirit or mental impulse whatsoever. Nor is it any objection that a spirit is called holy; for all these operations of the mind, when they concern the religion of Christ, are called holy and sacred to Yahweh, since no man can say, Yahshua is Lord but in the holy spirit.<sup>286</sup>
33. It remains to reply to certain passages of Scripture from which the Moderns suppose that the three beings can be deduced: [as, There are three that bear record in heaven, the Father, the Word and the Holy Spirit and these three are one.<sup>287</sup> But in order to give this a more satisfactory answer, I shall reply first to two other passages of Scripture, which they also bring forward to prove this matter:]<sup>288</sup> I and the Father are one, and The Father is in me, and I in the Father.<sup>289</sup> The first passage Augustine brings forward against Arius, because he said, one; and against Sabellius, because he said, are.<sup>290</sup> And from this he argues the two beings as against Sabellius and one Nature as against Arius. Yet I think that the words make simpler sense, for Christ is speaking and he said, are; because, being elohim and man, he said, one in the neuter, as Tertullian says,<sup>291</sup> and he did not say, one in the masculine. For the meaning of one in the masculine singular seems to be as if it denoted the singleness of one and the same being. But one in the neuter has reference not to singleness but to oneness of mind and harmony, so that the two might be credited with one power. And this is what the earlier writers rightly called one ousia, because there is one authority given by the Father to the Son. But later writers made a most wicked jest of the word homousion,<sup>292</sup> as well as of hypostasis,<sup>293</sup> and Persons, making Nature out of ousia, not only contrary to the proper meaning of the word, but contrary to all passages of Scripture in which that word is found. For in John and Matthew,<sup>294</sup> and wherever Christ speaks of the authority given him of the Father, the expression ousia is used, which to the Greeks signifies not Nature, but wealth, treasures, possessions, riches and power, which are all in Christ in rich measure; and he has one authority, one sympathy and will, with the Father. And *unum*<sup>295</sup> for Latins and εἷς<sup>296</sup> for the Greeks include those that are of one mind, are alike, and all mind the same thing; and to take *unum* in the Scriptures for one Nature is more Metaphysical than Christian; nay, it is foreign to the

<sup>283</sup> Books IV and VII

<sup>284</sup> 07307 רוּחַ ruwach *roo'-akh* wind, breath, mind, spirit

<sup>285</sup> 4151 πνεῦμα *pneuma pnyoo'-mah* spirit

<sup>286</sup> I Corinthians 12:3

<sup>287</sup> I John 5:7 (Vulg.)

<sup>288</sup> Not in the Greek Text; The Trinitarian formula (known as the *Comma Johanneum*) made its way into the third edition of Erasmus' Greek NT (1522) because of pressure from the Catholic Church. After his first edition appeared (1516), there arose such a furor over the absence of the *Comma* that Erasmus needed to defend himself. He argued that he did not put in the *Comma* because he found no Greek manuscripts that included it. [http://www.bible.org/page.php?page\\_id=1186](http://www.bible.org/page.php?page_id=1186)

<sup>289</sup> John 10:30, 14:10,11

<sup>290</sup> In Joannis Evang., Tract. Lxxi (MPL. xxv, 182; NPNF. Ser. I, ii, 328; Dods, xi, 261)

<sup>291</sup> Adv. Praxean xxv (MPL. ii, 188; ANF. iii, 621; ANCL. xv, 391)

<sup>292</sup> Of the same substance

<sup>293</sup> Substance, also Person

<sup>294</sup> John 17:2, Matthew 28:18

<sup>295</sup> One (n)

<sup>296</sup> One (n)

Scriptures. Greece never knew of εἷς being taken for one Nature. Should you say, Why, then, do the Greek doctors take it so? Let Basil the Great reply to this, where he says<sup>297</sup> that this is not in accordance with the proper meaning of the word, but is [metaphysical] philosophical reasoning. We ought therefore to get at the interpretation of the word either from its proper meaning, or from other passage of Scripture. But you will nowhere find that *unum* in the Scriptures means the Metaphysical unity of nature; indeed, quite the contrary, as appears from the words of Christ his own self, who like a faithful teacher explains himself where he prays the Father of the Apostles, that they may all be one; even as thou, Father, art in me, and I in thee, that they also may be one in us...and that they may be one, even as we also are one.<sup>298</sup> Repeating the word again and again, he prays that they may be one (*unum*). Does it follow that we, who are one in the same way as they, constitute one Nature? Of course we are one, since we are of one mind, keeping the unity of the spirit in the bond of peace.<sup>299</sup> Again, I will give them one heart and one way;<sup>300</sup> and, the multitude of them that believed had one heart and one soul.<sup>301</sup> And along with understanding this saying, Origen would have another saying expressly understood: The Father and the Son, he says, are one, for it is evident that they are two beings in Substance, but one in sympathy and harmony and in identity of will.<sup>302</sup>

34. There seems to be a similar thought in Cyprian;<sup>303</sup> and Paul concludes from our unity of faith that we are one;<sup>304</sup> and, He that is joined unto the Lord is one spirit with him.<sup>305</sup> Yet he never thought of one Nature. Nay, even had he said, I and the Father are not two, but one, you would draw no conclusion from it; for Man and Woman are not two, but one flesh;<sup>306</sup> yet one does not reason from this that they have one Nature. If you say it is not necessary that in the passage<sup>307</sup> there be all manner of likeness, because the Apostles are as properly said to be one as the Son and the Father are one; in this you say well that there is not all manner but you assume that there is none, whereas there is some. And that there is not all manner of likeness is undoubted, for he alone is in the bosom of the Father, he has one power together with the Father, has the same deity and authority. Hence he is said to be one with the Father in a far higher way, especially in those writers who understand the mystery of the Word; yet it does not therefore follow that you may argue from this the mathematical unity of nature, for that is a [metaphysical] philosophical fancy, standing much by itself and it is not set forth in the sacred records. Moreover, in that case, Christ's comparison would be inappropriate and irrelevant [if he meant] that we may be one Nature, and that we may be harmonious, when he says, May be One, even as we are one. Again, you will grasp Christ's meaning from another angle, if you do not take the words raw and undigested, but note the order and cause of what he says; for Christ added that he was one with the Father for the purpose of proving that no one can snatch his sheep out of his hand, because the Father hath given them to him.<sup>308</sup> And if no one can snatch them out of the hand of the Father, it follows that no one will be able to snatch them out of his own hand; since he and the Father are one power and he holds them by the Father's consent.

<sup>297</sup> Adv. Eunomium, IV (MPG. xxxix, 679)

<sup>298</sup> John 17:21,22

<sup>299</sup> Ephesians 4:3

<sup>300</sup> Jeremiah 32:39

<sup>301</sup> Acts 4:32

<sup>302</sup> Contra Celsum, VII. Xi (MPG. xi, 1534; ANF. iv, 643 f.; ANCL. xiii, 500), where he explains John 10:30 in the light of these texts.

<sup>303</sup> Ep. And Magnum, v (MPL. iii, 1141; ANF. v, 398; ANCL. viii, 306)

<sup>304</sup> Galatians 3:26,28

<sup>305</sup> I Corinthians 6:17

<sup>306</sup> Matthew 19:6

<sup>307</sup> John 17:21

<sup>308</sup> John 10:28,29

35. As a result of this, another passage is explained: The Father is in me and I in the Father,<sup>309</sup> and yet they are deluded about this. For Hilary says<sup>310</sup> that the nature of the human intelligence does not grasp the reason of this saying and he concludes proportionably that some beings exist in other beings, that single being exist in single beings, the first in the third and the third in the second and conversely. But one must wonder why he permits himself to be set at odds with his own good sense and pays no regard to the Master's explanation. It is a sheer waste of breath to call Christ master, if we pay no attention to his explanations. For in the same chapter Christ says to the Apostles, I am in my Father, ye in me and I in you.<sup>311</sup> Yet the Apostles are not with Christ in the sense of being crowded into one Nature. Again, what is more, in that and the following chapter Christ explains himself by saying that he is in us when we keep his words;<sup>312</sup> and he is in the Father because he keeps his commands and loves him.<sup>313</sup> Again, what is yet more, in this chapter and the tenth he infers from the fact that he does the works of the Father that he is in the Father, saying, Believe me for the very works' sake...that ye may know and believe that the Father is in me, and I in the Father.<sup>314</sup> Let Hilary consider what the Master's way of reasoning was, how from the words Christ infers the Metaphysics of the Natures, or the inherent existence of the beings in one Nature. Also in the chapter cite above Christ explains himself; and he is said to be in the Father in almost the same way in which he had said that he was one with the Father; for he says, Even as thou, Father, art in me, and I in thee, that they maybe one in us and that the love wherewith thou lovedst me may be in them and I in them.<sup>315</sup> And, Christ abideth in us and we in him.<sup>316</sup> And from faith and love the conclusion is that Christ is in us.<sup>317</sup> And from love the inference is that we are in him;<sup>318</sup> and, He that keepeth his commandments abideth in him and he in him.<sup>319</sup>

36. From this point on the main question is easily settled. In the first place, the Father testifies: The Father that hath sent me, he beareth witness of me;<sup>320</sup> for he testifies, saying, This is my beloved Son.<sup>321</sup> In the second place, the Word testifies; for the very language of Christ makes it plain enough that he is from Yahweh, as he witnesses concerning himself. From his words it is seen above all how great he is, although the world today makes Christ's words trifling and ineffectual. But when the spirit is given they will be found to be full of life. In the third place, the holy spirit testifies; but as to what this is, I say nothing here, meaning to set it forth in the following Book.<sup>322</sup> You shall also see what else can be understood by the Paraclete. For the present I say as Christ explains: For while I am present, the language that you have heard, or the words that I speak, bear testimony;<sup>323</sup> afterwards, when ye are clothed with power from on high, as Luke says,<sup>324</sup> ye shall bear witness; and when this power had been received though the spirit coming upon them, he

---

<sup>309</sup> John 14:11

<sup>310</sup> Hilary of Poitiers, De Trinitate, III (Servetus says IV), 1 (MPL. x 76; NPNF., Ser. li, ix, 62)

<sup>311</sup> John 14:20

<sup>312</sup> John 14:23; 15:7

<sup>313</sup> John 15:10

<sup>314</sup> John 14:11; 10:38

<sup>315</sup> John 17:21,26

<sup>316</sup> John 6:56

<sup>317</sup> Ephesians 3:17

<sup>318</sup> I John 2:24

<sup>319</sup> I John 3:24

<sup>320</sup> John 5:37

<sup>321</sup> Matthew 3:17

<sup>322</sup> Book II, paragraph 21 ff

<sup>323</sup> John 14:25,26; 15:26

<sup>324</sup> Luke 24:49

commanded them to bear witness.<sup>325</sup> And this is the witness of the holy spirit, even as Paul calls the witness of his conscience the witness of the holy spirit.<sup>326</sup> And these are the one, as has been explained above.<sup>327</sup> And the Glossa Ordinaria itself explains: Are on; that is bearing witness of the same thing.<sup>328</sup> For John's intention is to show the force of the truth from the agreement of the witnesses; because their testimonies do not waver or vary so that they can be objected to by some exception taken, as often happens in the case of different witnesses in law. Besides, a note on Matthew 17:3 says, You may see Moses and Elijah talking with Yahshua; for the Law and the Prophets and Yahshua say one thing and agree together.<sup>329</sup> Thus three testify there to the Word itself: Christ himself and Moses, that is, the Law given by the Father and Elijah, that is, the spirit of the Prophets; because the testimony of Yahshua is the spirit of prophecy.<sup>330</sup> And these three are one and between them there is the most complete harmony of thought. Again, an explanation is found in the words of the Master, who cites three witnesses:<sup>331</sup> firstly, of the witness of the spirit, for John bore witness when the spirit descended; secondly, his own witness, for the works that he does bear witness; thirdly, he adduces the witness of the Father who bears witness; and these three agree.

37. We can now turn their argument the other way, showing that the saying in John can not be taken in their sense, since it is counter to his whole design and intention; for it is evident that it is there a question not of the nature of the three beings, but of the credibility and agreement of the testimony. Again, see for what purpose he introduces these testimonies; observe in what direction John's proof tends. For he is not aiming to derive one idea from another, or to prove that the second being is the offspring of the first. But he is proving that Yahshua of Nazareth, whom his eyes have seen and his hands have touched, is the Son of Yahweh and not the son of Joseph. And he exhorts us to believe this, as we strictly hold it. And he that does not so believe is no Christian; he that does not so believe is not founded upon the rock: Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living Elohim.<sup>332</sup> For this is the rock (petra) from which he was named Peter (Petrus), the rock on which Peter was the first to be founded. To believe that Yahshua Christ is the Son of Yahweh is the foundation of the Church. This is the cornerstone upon which the whole building groweth unto the building up of the body of Christ, which is the Church.<sup>333</sup> You will say, Christ himself if the cornerstone; but what, pray, is Christ in us; but to believe that he is the Son of Yahweh? For Christ dwells in our hearts through faith.<sup>334</sup> It is an idle thing to say that Christ is of himself the rock, if you destroy that which builds us upon the rock.

38. A second authority which, according to Peter Lombard,<sup>335</sup> very evidently supports the Trinity is, *Of him, through him and in him are all things.*<sup>336</sup> For Augustine<sup>337</sup> explains this as referring to the three beings: of him, referring to the first; through him, to the second; in him, to the third. But I do not believe that Paul, had he been questioned about this, would philosophize thus; for this

<sup>325</sup> Acts 1:8

<sup>326</sup> Romans 9:1

<sup>327</sup> Paragraphs 33-35

<sup>328</sup> The Glossa Ordinaria of Walafrid Strabo served the West for five centuries as the chief source of biblical learning. (MPL. 64, 702 f.)

<sup>329</sup> Strabo, op. cit. (MPL 64:144

<sup>330</sup> Revelation 19:10

<sup>331</sup> John 5:33,36,37

<sup>332</sup> Matthew 16:16

<sup>333</sup> Ephesians 2:20,21; 5:12; Colossians 1:24

<sup>334</sup> Ephesians 3:17

<sup>335</sup> Sent. I, Dist. II, cap. V.

<sup>336</sup> Romans 11:36

<sup>337</sup> De Trinitate I (Servetus wrongly cites II), vi, 12 (MPL. xlii, 827; NPNF. Ser. I. iii, 22; Dods, vii, 12)

would be contrary to his wont; and it would be irrelevant for him to treat of these things in that connection. For he is merely exclaiming at the depth [of the riches] of Yahweh the Father; and all the [metaphysical] philosophy that can there be inferred is in the phrase, through him. For when in another place he says, through the Word<sup>338</sup> and here, through him, it implied that all things that Yahweh made through the Word he made through him; and of this Irenaeus also bears witness.<sup>339</sup> The following Book,<sup>340</sup> therefore, will show that, according to him, this passage makes against them. And Paul here means nothing else than to commend the manifold dispositions<sup>341</sup> of Yahweh and the greatness of his power, as when he says he is over all, through all and in all.<sup>342</sup> And that the more because the Apostle is also, in this triple phrase, not including the third Person. There is, he says, one Yahweh the Father, of whom are all things, and we in him; and one Lord Yahshua Christ, through whom are all things, and we through him.<sup>343</sup> Here are the three phrases: of him, through him and in him, whereas he makes no mention of a third Person. And again the Apostle says of the Son alone, All things have been created through him and in him.<sup>344</sup>

39. Moreover, Jerome reason to the three beings from the three measures of meal.<sup>345</sup> But it is exceedingly silly and savors somewhat of Plato, to reason to numbers in beings from parables and numbers of words. If such reasoning is allowed us, why are Marcus Calarbasus<sup>346</sup> and his like blamed, who from parables, from the letters and numbers of the words of Holy Writ, reason to ternions, quaternions and octonarians and in like manner reason out a Demirge, a Bythos, a Pleroma and in fine the various Aeons? Only in name do the latter seem to differ from the former; and even as they declare that some beings arise from others as a result of the laughter and the tears of the Aeons, so we say that the first being produces and second by being aware of itself and that these two by loving each other breathe forth the third. Pray, where in the Scriptures did you read of these marvelous things? And beyond these, we add this, the most dreadful thing of all: that these three beings, that so differ one from another, are yet one and the same being.
40. Furthermore, Lonbard says<sup>347</sup> that almost every separate syllable of the New Testament agrees in suggesting this Trinity. But to me not merely the syllables, but all the letters and the mouths of babes and sucklings, nay the very stones, cry out, One Yahweh the Father and his Christ the Lord Yahshua; for there is one Yahweh, and one mediator between Yahweh and men, the man Christ Yahshua;<sup>348</sup> and, To us there is one Yahweh, who is the Father,...and one Lord, Yahshua Christ.<sup>349</sup> John also, to whom the heavens were opened in the Apocalypse, saw only Yahweh the Father and his Christ, and only Yahweh and the Lamb are there praised.<sup>350</sup> Again, Stephen, when the heavens were opened, saw the glory of Yahweh, and Yahshua standing on his right hand,<sup>351</sup>

---

<sup>338</sup> Romans 10:17

<sup>339</sup> Adv. Haereses, IV. xx, 4 (MPG. vii, 1034; ANF. I, 488 ANCL. v, 441)

<sup>340</sup> Book II, paragraphs 5 & 7

<sup>341</sup> See note 2, paragraph 41

<sup>342</sup> Ephesians 4:6

<sup>343</sup> I Corinthians 8:6

<sup>344</sup> Colossians 1:16 (Vulg.)

<sup>345</sup> Comment. In Matthew 13:33. (MPL xxvi 91)

<sup>346</sup> Colarbasus, or Colorbasus (Servetus spells, Calarbasus), is a supposed Valentinian Gnostic of the second century, referred to by Irenaeus, *Contra Haer.* I. xii. Marcus was his follower (*ib.* xiii-xvi). Unless a coma has dropped out from between the names, Servetus fuses the two, mistaking them for a single individual.

<sup>347</sup> Sent. I, dist. II, cap. v.

<sup>348</sup> I Timothy 2:5

<sup>349</sup> I Corinthians 8:6

<sup>350</sup> Revelation 21:22; 5:12,13; 7:10

<sup>351</sup> Acts 7:55,56

yet he saw no third Person. And, One is your Father and one is your Master, even the Christ,<sup>352</sup> and I am not alone, but I and the Father.<sup>353</sup> These words of Christ, uttered with such emphasis, often pierce to my very vitals. I am not alone, he says, because the Father is with me;<sup>354</sup> and, They have not known the Father, nor me;<sup>355</sup> and That they should know thee the only true Elohim and him whom thou didst send, even Christ Yahshua.<sup>356</sup> He did not also command us to worship a third being, but the Father and himself, and the Father in his name.<sup>357</sup> Likewise, when he said, No one knoweth the Father, save the Son, nor the Son, save the Father,<sup>358</sup> was the third being asleep, or had it no knowledge of these? And John desires us to have fellowship with the Father and with his Son, Christ Yahshua;<sup>359</sup> yet of fellowship with the third being he does not speak. And Paul says, I charge thee in the sight of Yahweh and the Lord Yahshua Christ and the elect angels, that thou observe these things without prejudice.<sup>360</sup> Mark that Paul's solemn protestation is made before Yahweh, Christ and the angels and not before the third being. Likewise, I will confess his name, says Christ, before angels.<sup>361</sup> Mark the grave affront to the third being, in that Christ says, before angels and not, before it. Likewise he makes no mention of himself alone and the Father and the angels;<sup>362</sup> and John desires for us grace and peace from Almighty Yahweh, and from the seven spirits that are before his throne and from Yahshua Christ, who is the faithful witness;<sup>363</sup> yet from the third being he desires nothing for us. And Paul in all his epistles says, Yahweh the Father and the Lord Yahshua Christ; from Yahweh the Father and the Lord Yahshua Christ.<sup>364</sup> And in the Scriptures there is frequent mention of the existence of Yahweh the Father and of the Son and of seeing and praying to them; but of the Holy Spirit no mention is made, except where it speaks about doing something, as by a sort of casual statement; which is noteworthy, as though the holy spirit [spirit of Yahweh] denoted not a separate being, but an activity of Yahweh, a kind of in-working or in-breathing of the power of Yahweh.

41. Lombard, following others, establishes his triad of beings by the passage: The Elohim of Abraham, the Elohim of Isaac, the Elohim of Jacob.<sup>365</sup> If they were speaking of the Trinity in the proper sense, it might be let pass, even if this passage does not prove it. [ But it is proved by the passage, Baptize in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit.<sup>366</sup> In the name of the Father, because he is the prime, true and original source of every gift.<sup>367</sup> In the name of Yahshua Christ, because through him we have the reconciliation of this gift, neither is there any other name under heaven wherein we must be saved.<sup>368</sup> And in the name of the Holy Spirit, because all that are baptized in that name receive the gift of Holy Spirit.]<sup>369</sup> Just as we say, in the name of his Imperial Majesty, in the name of the glory of Yahweh. And Peter, in the Clementine

---

<sup>352</sup> Matthew 23:9,10

<sup>353</sup> John 8:16

<sup>354</sup> John 16:32

<sup>355</sup> John 16:3

<sup>356</sup> John 17:3

<sup>357</sup> John 16:23

<sup>358</sup> Matthew 11:27

<sup>359</sup> I John 1:3

<sup>360</sup> I Timothy (Servetus says I John) 5:21

<sup>361</sup> Revelation 3:5

<sup>362</sup> Mark 8:38, Luke 9:26; 12:8,9

<sup>363</sup> Revelation 1:4,5

<sup>364</sup> So in greeting prefixed to each epistle, from Romans to Philemon.

<sup>365</sup> Exodus 3:6. cf. Lombard, Sent. I, dist. xxxiv, cap. ii.

<sup>366</sup> Matthew 28:19

<sup>367</sup> James 1:17

<sup>368</sup> Acts 4:12

<sup>369</sup> In the Bible, no one was ever baptized in the name of the Father, Son and Holy Spirit, but rather they were baptized in the name of Yahshua Christ etc.

Recognitions,<sup>370</sup> speaks not of three equal beings, but of a threefold invocation of the divine name. Because there are three wonderful dispositions<sup>371</sup> of Yahweh, in each of which his divinity shines forth; and from this you might very well understand a Trinity. For the Father is the whole substance and the one Yahweh from whom these degrees and personations proceed. And they are three, not by virtue of some distinction of beings in Yahweh, but through an οικονομία<sup>372</sup> of Yahweh in various forms of Deity; for the same divinity which is in the Father is communicated to the Son, Yahshua Christ and to our spirits, which are the temples of the living Elohim; for the Son and our sanctified spirits are sharers with us in the Substance of the Father, are its members, pledges and instruments; although the kind of deity in them is varying and this is why they are called distinct Persons, that is, manifold aspects, diverse forms and kinds, of deity. Nor are the older traditions of the Apostles at variance with his view; on the contrary, they agree with it. Now as for the reason: that the three beings are not denoted in it is proved by the fact that when Yahweh spoke to Jacob he said, I am the Elohim of thy father Abraham and Isaac.<sup>373</sup> Yet you can not from this infer two [metaphysical] philosophical terms. And when he spoke to Isaac, he said, I am he Elohim of thy father Abraham.<sup>374</sup> Again, if the three beings are understood there, how will the Elohim of Abraham, the Elohim of Isaac, the Elohim of Jacob be called the Father of Yahshua Christ?<sup>375</sup> Is the imaginary Trinity called the Father of Yahshua Christ? For as the first Person begat this man, so also did the second; and thus we shall be admitting that the Son of Yahweh is the Father of Yahshua Christ!

42. Rejecting these thing, then, let us understand that Yahweh is here seeking to keep the Jews from believing in more than one Yahweh, for to this belief they were prone (even as we ourselves also today); and the Jews were wont to multiply their gods in proportion to the number of their cities: According to the number of thy cities were thy gods, O Judah.<sup>376</sup> And Yahweh, taking care lest they multiply their gods in proportion to the number of the ages or generations of men, in the belief that there had been one Elohim of Abraham, another Elohim of Isaac, another Elohim of Jacob, declared that he was the same Elohim of them all, as he shows by the words which he spoke before, saying, I [Yahweh] am the Elohim of thy fathers.<sup>377</sup> And so he is wont to say, I am the Elohim that brought thee out of the land of Egypt and out of Ur of the Chaldees.<sup>378</sup> And he says that it is he that appeared to the others: I am Yahweh, he says, who appeared unto Abraham himself, unto Isaac and unto Jacob.<sup>379</sup> And, I am he, I am the first, I am the last.<sup>380</sup>

<sup>370</sup> II. xlii (MPG. I, 1268 f.; ANF. viii, 108.; ANCL. iii, 220)

<sup>371</sup> Dispositiones. This term gives the key to Servetus's explanation of the Trinity. It is taken as the equivalent of the Greek οικονομία (oikonomia) and may be variously translated economy, management, disposition, dispensation distribution, division, arrangement, modification; through perhaps aspects suggests the author's thought as well as anything. The idea is that Yahweh disposes or manages himself in three different ways for the three different forms of his activity. Servetus has evidently taken his view from Tertullian, ADV. Praxean, ii, iii (MPL ii, 156-159; ANF iii, 598 f.; ANCL xv, 335-339). The annotator of the Latin version of Irenaeus, Adv. Haer., I. vi (MPG vii, 503) remarks: "A dispositione. So the translator is wont to render the Greek word οικονομία...but I could wish that he had agreed with the other Latin writers in translating it dispensatio; for this word denotes what the Savior did upon earth to procure the salvation of the human race, of which the incarnation is the source and beginning, which the Greeks express by the one word οικονομία and the Latins by dispensatio."

Cf. Book II, paragraph 5.

<sup>372</sup> 3622 οικονομία oikonomia *oy-kon-om-ee'-ah*, disposition, or dispensation; the management of a household or of household affairs

<sup>373</sup> Genesis 28:13; cf. 32:9

<sup>374</sup> Genesis 26:24

<sup>375</sup> Acts 3:13

<sup>376</sup> Jeremiah 2:28; 11:13

<sup>377</sup> Acts 7:32

<sup>378</sup> Genesis 15:7; Leviticus 19:36, etc

<sup>379</sup> Exodus 6:3

<sup>380</sup> Isaiah 48:12

43. The second explanation, which is gathered from the words of the Master,<sup>381</sup> is also agreeable to the first; because he said that he is the Elohim of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob in this respect: that he shows himself the Elohim not only of the present men, but also of those that have passed away. For from this saying Christ proves the resurrection; for if he is the Elohim of those that have passed away, it follows that they are all living [They are actually asleep in Sheol].<sup>382</sup> And in view of this, consider what deep meaning lies hid in the words of the law, even though the literal sense seems to be plain. Here the Master gives us wonderful doctrine, to which if you give heed, I will below clearly prove Christ to you from the law. Besides, the argument, according to their interpretations, can, if you weigh it quite correctly, be turned the other way; nor does the nature of the holy spirit denote a third being, for there it is an appearance of fire, which they say belongs to the nature of the holy spirit, as does also the appearance of a dove.<sup>383</sup> Yet hear the voice: Thou art my beloved Son;<sup>384</sup> I am the Elohim of thy fathers.<sup>385</sup> These words are not suited to a third distinct being. Likewise, just as it is written, The Holy Spirit spoke,<sup>386</sup> so also, Yahweh spake by the mouth of his saints and prophets.<sup>387</sup> Not, therefore, to a distinct being, but to Yahweh himself, can those things which belong to the nature of the Holy Spirit be ascribed as accidents;<sup>388</sup> for Yahweh is a spirit,<sup>389</sup> and, I, who sanctify you, am holy.<sup>390</sup> Nor is the term paraclete a special name of the third being, for Christ himself is called a paraclete.<sup>391</sup> And when it speaks of another paraclete<sup>392</sup> than Christ, Christ himself is also indicated there as a paraclete; and he said, another, for the reason that then, while hearing him daily, they were being comforted by the Word itself, by Christ himself and he himself was protecting them. But afterwards they will have protection not from the very presence of the Word but of the spirit; and they will be comforted by the spirit through the truth revealed to them. Besides, it is not the third being, but Yahweh, that anointed us.<sup>393</sup> And that the spirit of Yahweh abides in you<sup>394</sup> means nothing else than that the anointing which you received from him abides in you and is that which teaches you concerning all things.<sup>395</sup> And to receive the holy spirit means nothing else than that when the heavenly messenger comes upon you, you shall receive power from on high.<sup>396</sup> And that this power is not a separate being is proved by the texts in which Yahshua perceived in himself that power had gone out of him.<sup>397</sup> Say, if you, what is the entity, or being which is said to have gone forth from him; for in like manner I shall speak of another heavenly power. Again, that the holy spirit can not absolutely denote a third being but that it is spoken of by way of an accident,<sup>398</sup> is proved by the fact that the holy spirit is said to be increased or diminished: Yahweh said unto Moses, I will take away from thy spirit; and again, Taking away from the spirit that was upon Moses and putting it upon the

---

<sup>381</sup> i.e., Peter Lombard. cf. paragraph 41

<sup>382</sup> Luke 20:37,38

<sup>383</sup> Matthew 3:16, Luke 3:22

<sup>384</sup> Mark 1:11

<sup>385</sup> Acts 7:32

<sup>386</sup> Acts 28:25

<sup>387</sup> Acts 3:21 cf. Hebrews 1:1

<sup>388</sup> i.e., in the logical sense of the term

<sup>389</sup> John 4:24

<sup>390</sup> Leviticus 21:8

<sup>391</sup> Advocate. I John 2:1

<sup>392</sup> John 14:16

<sup>393</sup> II Corinthians 1:21

<sup>394</sup> Romans 8:9, I Corinthians 3:16

<sup>395</sup> I Corinthians 2:10,13; John 14:26

<sup>396</sup> Luke 24:49; Acts 1:8

<sup>397</sup> Mark 5:30; Luke 8:46

<sup>398</sup> In the logical sense of the term

seventy men.<sup>399</sup> And, let a double portion of thy spirit be upon me.<sup>400</sup> Again, because Yahweh giveth not the spirit by measure;<sup>401</sup> and, the spirit of Yahweh was in Daniel in fuller measure than in all the others.<sup>402</sup> Again, what does it mean that the Apostles were so often filled with the holy spirit?<sup>403</sup> Did the third being come to them many times, uniting itself to them in the flesh? Verily, it means nothing else than that the Apostles, as they listened, grew fervent and reasoned with and exhorted the Pharisees with the utmost warmth of faith and love. And that John was filled with the holy spirit, even from the womb<sup>404</sup> by divine power. Nor can you infer that the third being was in that way united with him; for this is worse than carnal and profane; and by parity of reasoning you would conclude that the spirit of Elijah was united with him, because it says that he came with the spirit and power of Elijah.<sup>405</sup> Again, what does it mean, pray tell, to grieve the holy spirit,<sup>406</sup> and, the spirits of the prophets are subject to the prophets?<sup>407</sup> Does the third being suffer grief? Again, to give the spirit shows that this means just what it says: I will give them a new heart and a new spirit,<sup>408</sup> and he giveth us understanding.<sup>409</sup> And, as John says, he hath given us a mind, that we may know him;<sup>410</sup> even as also to Solomon there was given a wise heart,<sup>411</sup> and there is given the spirit of wisdom, the spirit of counsel, the spirit of knowledge and of piety.<sup>412</sup> But why, as a result of this, the spirit of Yahweh is said to be in us, I shall say in what follows. For the present, observe that it belongs to Yahweh and by antonomasia<sup>413</sup> it becomes him to be wise, just as it does to be powerful, just and merciful. Hence Yahweh, by sharing those gifts with us, is said to give us his spirit [spirit of Yahweh]; for those virtues are often called copies, because just as their *idea*<sup>414</sup> shines forth from Yahweh, so when they shine forth in us, a copy of Yahweh, or his holy spirit, is said to be in us. And not only when such gifts are given, but for the mere reason that he gives the breath of life, he is said to give us his spirit.<sup>415</sup> Again, that the holy spirit is not a distinct being is proved by the fact that it is called the spirit of Christ,<sup>416</sup> and the spirit of the Son.<sup>417</sup> Likewise, the spirit of Yahweh dwelleth in you. But if any man hath not the spirit of Christ, he is none of his...but if the spirit of him (that is, of the Father) that raised up Yahshua,<sup>418</sup> etc. And because of these words Hilary says that by the Holy Spirit is meant now the Father, now the Son, now a third being,<sup>419</sup> and consequently these names of three beings are confused among them.

44. There are other grounds on which many say that the Trinity is also established by logical proof or by demonstration. Thus from the very nature of love Richard by an evident demonstration draws

---

<sup>399</sup> Numbers 11:16,17,25 (Vulg.)

<sup>400</sup> II Kings 2:9

<sup>401</sup> John 3:34

<sup>402</sup> Daniel 6:3 (Vulg.)

<sup>403</sup> Acts 2:4; 4:8

<sup>404</sup> Luke 1:41

<sup>405</sup> Luke 1:17

<sup>406</sup> Ephesians 4:30

<sup>407</sup> I Corinthians 14:32

<sup>408</sup> Ezekiel 18:31; 36:26

<sup>409</sup> Psalms 32:8 (Vulg.)

<sup>410</sup> I John 5:20

<sup>411</sup> I Kings 3:12

<sup>412</sup> Isaiah 11:2

<sup>413</sup> In Rhetoric, the substitution of an epithet for a name

<sup>414</sup> Idea, archetype, pattern

<sup>415</sup> Ezekiel 37:14

<sup>416</sup> I Peter 1:11

<sup>417</sup> Galatians 4:6

<sup>418</sup> Romans 7:9,11

<sup>419</sup> Hilary of Poitiers, De Trinitate, 8:25 (Servetus says 5:3). (MPL x, 254; NPNF ser. ii, ix, 144)

the conclusion that there can not but be a plurality in Yahweh.<sup>420</sup> For if there is affection, it is directed toward another, that is, toward the Son. And if there is affection, then the affection itself is something, hence there is a third Person. Likewise Henry of Ghent, reasoning by analogy,<sup>421</sup> draws the conclusion from any begetting whatever here below that there must needs be begettings among divine beings; because in the Father there is only speculative knowledge and in the Son practical knowledge and in them there is no impulsive love as there is in the third Person and consequently one can do nothing without the other unless they copulate together and beget.<sup>422</sup> Countless other arguments of this sort I deliberately pass by; and instead of solving all the things that might be brought up by [metaphysical] philosophers at this point, you may observe this rule, which is that of the lawyer; namely that those things which deserve special mention are, unless they are specially mentioned, understood to be disregarded.<sup>423</sup> But whether this article does deserve special mention, when it is the prime foundation of all faith, on which depends knowledge of both Yahweh and Christ, you must judge for yourself; and whether it is expressly mentioned, is learned from the reading of the Scriptures, although not one word is found in the whole Bible about the Trinity, or about its Persons, nor about an Essence, nor about a unity of the Substance, nor about one Nature of several beings, nor about their other babblings and disputes of words, which Paul says belong to the knowledge which is falsely so called.<sup>424</sup>

45. It remains for us to show by some reasons and authorities that these three beings can not exist in one Yahweh. In the first place I might attack this imaginary triad with the sixteen reasons which Robert Holkot states,<sup>425</sup> to none of which he makes a good reply, nor can he reply save by sophistry. On the contrary, he admits that this article is opposed to all natural reason. See also the Preludes of Pierre d'Ailly;<sup>426</sup> but for the present I set forth my theme in another way, and prove not only that the three beings can not exist in one Yahweh, but that they can not even be imagined and that is wholly impossible to have any notion of them. For one having a notion of the Trinity would have distinct notions of the three beings; and this would amount to having a notion of one by not having a notion of another, which all deny. You will say that one has a notion of the Trinity because he has a notion of Yahweh by conceiving that he is the three beings. O firm pillar of the Sophists! Why, pray, would you have us bound by faith to that of which your own Aristotle was never sure? Is it right that we should have so certain a faith depending upon such uncertain conceptions? How do you know? Who has revealed these conceptions to you? Indeed, as I shall show very clearly elsewhere,<sup>427</sup> there is no such difference in meaning, although those Nicanders<sup>428</sup> are found in words. Or, at least, since this is not altogether certain, no faith can be founded on these. Again, according to your philosophy, how can something be connoted by the term, white, without it's being able to be absolutely imported by another abstract term, whiteness? And so of other concrete terms connoting a certain being; or will you say that here only a disposition<sup>429</sup> is connoted? There is also the rule of Porphyry, that from any essential term agreed upon, a concept may be derived having an absolute and simple meaning.<sup>430</sup> Again, according to

<sup>420</sup> Richard of St. Victor, *De Trinitate*, III, ii (MPL. cxcvi, 916)

<sup>421</sup> *Per medium intrinsecum*

<sup>422</sup> *Quodlibet* vi, q. 2

<sup>423</sup> *Corpus Juris Civilis*, Digest xlvii, De Injuriis, x 15, 26, hoc edictum (Servetus wrongly cites Ait Praetor).

<sup>424</sup> I Timothy 6:4,20

<sup>425</sup> *Super quatuor libros Sententiarum*, I quaest. 5.

<sup>426</sup> Lib. I, quaest. 5.

<sup>427</sup> Book IV, par. 1

<sup>428</sup> Nicander, a Greek poet and grammarian of the second century, B.C., who was given a hair-splitting and sophistical distinctions, for which his name therefore became a synonym.

<sup>429</sup> *Dispositio*, see note 2, paragraph 41

<sup>430</sup> *A quacunqve convenientia essentiali abstrahibilis est conceptus absolute et incomplexe significans.* Porphyry, a third-century commentator on the Logic of Aristotle.

their rules, I should ask whether the Trinity is unknown to Christ and the angels; whether they assume three notions of three beings in the soul of Christ and in the angels and thus distinctly recognize three Yahwehs. For Christ says that the angels behold the face of his Father,<sup>431</sup> but other forms they see none. Likewise Christ saw in himself nothing other than the Father, nor does he today see anything else in heaven. Dream as much as ever you will, fix your eyes on the mental images,<sup>432</sup> and you will find that the Trinity is not to be understood without three such images; because it is necessary for one who thinks to observe these images.<sup>433</sup> Indeed, you cherish a Quaternity in your mind, though you deny it in words. For you have four ideas,<sup>434</sup> and the fourth is a mental image with respect to an Essence, because it is necessary in understanding the Essence to observe the mental images; and when you have seen these, you will comprehend clearly what I shall say elsewhere<sup>435</sup> as to the formation of the notion. And even now, if you give heed, you can realize that your Trinity is nothing else than a kind of moving of forms in you imagination, which holds you deluded.

46. If you say, All cry with one voice that it is enough to believe, though the matter be beyond one's understanding, you expose your foolishness even in the fact that you accept a matter beyond you understanding, without sufficient warrant of Scripture; as it says, Though they understand neither what they say, nor whereof they affirm,<sup>436</sup> and rail in those matters whereof they are ignorant.<sup>437</sup> And that the more, because you yourself confess that the knowing is itself an object of faith; only, if you have faith, tell me what is the understanding of your own capacity? What is it that you believe in as known by yourself? Are you perhaps reflecting upon a mere disorder of your brain as a sufficient object of faith? Again, there can be nothing in the mind that was not first in the senses, either in itself or in something similar or corresponding.<sup>438</sup> But of three beings constituting one Nature, you have never had any sensation, either from near or from far; nor can you compare some degrees to others, since neither two beings, nor three, nor more, are found meeting together in one Nature. And consequently there is discovered no foundation perceived by the senses, from which the mind derives such a conception by logical reasoning. On the contrary, it is wearied and confused by the very fact that it tries to speculate about this, as though building upon the wind without foundation in the senses. Again, let us imagine the only Person to be that of the Father, as our opponents readily admit when they formally distinguish Persons from Essence: then the question arises, since it is proper for any being to have an Essence of its own and Nature of its own, how shall I be able to imagine a multiplication of beings without a multiplication of Essence, and that a new being is added but no new Essence? Did you ever perceive these or like things by the senses? Certainly not; then do not expect to perceive such things by the mind.
47. We are taught, not only by reasons but by numberless authorities, to avoid this plurality; and unless indeed I seemed out of my mind, I should bring into the discussion all the testimonies of the Gentiles, philosophers, poets and Sybils cited by Firmianus Lactantius,<sup>439</sup> that from them you might realize what a laughing-stock you would be if you tried to sell them your three beings in place of one Yahweh. But let us prove the matter from Holy Writ, from the Old Testament as well

---

<sup>431</sup> Matthew 18:10

<sup>432</sup> Phantasmata

<sup>433</sup> See Aristotle, *De Anima*, III. vii, viii

<sup>434</sup> Simulachra

<sup>435</sup> Book V, par. 9

<sup>436</sup> I Timothy 1:7

<sup>437</sup> II Peter 2:12

<sup>438</sup> Aristotle, *De Anima*, III. viii; Anal. Poster., I. xviii

<sup>439</sup> *Divin. Institute.* I. iv-vii (MPL. vi, 127-153; ANF. vii, 13-17; ANCL. xxi, 10-20)

as the New. One is good, even Yahweh.<sup>440</sup> None is good save one, even Yahweh.<sup>441</sup> Are those not content, then, with the mere name of unity, who do not acknowledge the One in every deed and turn aside from their artificial, verbal Essence to a plurality of beings? And lest you permit anyone here to misrepresent the matter, note that it is the Son that is speaking; from which it is evident that every sort of unity of Yahweh abides in Yahweh alone. And there is a weighty text to the effect that there is only one Yahweh our Father and the Son, Yahshua Christ: There is one Yahweh it says, who is the Father,...and one Lord, Yahshua Christ;<sup>442</sup> and, There is one Elohim and Father.<sup>443</sup> I know now what madness it is in men that do not see that in the Scriptures every sort of unity of Yahweh is always referred to the Father. And, For there is one Yahweh, one mediator also between Yahweh and men, the man, Christ Yahshua.<sup>444</sup> Again, when the Apostle speaks so many times of one Yahweh and his Christ and says that this Yahweh is the Father of Yahshua Christ,<sup>445</sup> and that Christ Yahshua is mediator,<sup>446</sup> and that through him we have access to Yahweh,<sup>447</sup> do you suppose it is to be understood that the first being is Father of the second and that through the second being we have access to the first?

48. Again, when Ignatius, Irenaeus, and other early writers dispute against heretics, saying that the Almighty Yahweh, who was the Yahweh of the Old Testament, the Yahweh of the Law and the Prophets, is also the Yahweh of the New Testament and that the same one is the Father of Yahshua Christ,<sup>448</sup> do you suppose it is to be understood that they were proclaiming the three separate beings? Likewise Tertullian, though he seems not to be self-consistent, nevertheless proclaims many of the plainest truths in accordance with the Apostolic tradition. Again, while it is an apocryphal book, still it is an ancient one, namely the Clementine Recognitions, in which Christ is very clearly proclaimed even to the ignorant; and in it you will find the odor of the ancient simplicity widely diffused. But, not to build on uncertain foundations, I pass that by, but will refer to the words of Ignatius to the Philippians.<sup>449</sup> If one, he says, has proclaimed the Yahweh of the Law and the Prophets as one, but has denied that Christ is the Son, he is a liar. Also if one confesses Christ Yahshua, yet denies that the Yahweh of the Law and the Prophets is the Father of Christ, he does not stand fast in the truth.<sup>450</sup> And in the Epistle to the Tarsians, he says plainly of Christ that he is not the one who is Yahweh over all, but he is his Son.<sup>451</sup> Indeed, as Justin, the disciple of the Apostles, says, no faith would have been had in Christ himself had he said that another being than the Maker, Creator, and Father of all was Yahweh.<sup>452</sup> You have it also in Irenaeus that it was the heresy of Cerdo<sup>453</sup> that יהוה<sup>454</sup> who was proclaimed in the Law and the Prophets to be Yahweh is not the Father of Yahshua Christ.<sup>455</sup> Look in that and the following chapter and find out what is the reason why those ways of speaking are not found among our

<sup>440</sup> Matthew 19:17 (Vulg.)

<sup>441</sup> Mark 10:18

<sup>442</sup> I Corinthians 8:6

<sup>443</sup> Ephesians 4:6

<sup>444</sup> I Timothy 2:5

<sup>445</sup> Romans 15:6; II Corinthians 1:3; 11:31; Ephesians 1:3; Colossians 1:3; I Peter 1:3

<sup>446</sup> I Timothy 2:5

<sup>447</sup> Ephesians 2:18

<sup>448</sup> Ignatius, Epist. Ad Man., vii; Irenaeus, Adv. Haeres., IV. ii, v. (MPG. v, 670; vii, 976-986; ANF. i, 62, 463-467; ANCL. i, 180; v, 378-388)

<sup>449</sup> A wrong citation. I should read, Philadelphians

<sup>450</sup> Ep. Ad Philad., vi (MPG. v, 702; ANF. i, 82; ANCL. i, 230-232)

<sup>451</sup> Ep. Ad Tarsenses, v (MPG. v 891; ANF. i, 108; ANCL. i, 457)

<sup>452</sup> Quoted by Irenaeus, Adv. Haeres., IV. vi, 2 (MPG. vii, 987; ANF. i, 468 ANCL. v 390)

<sup>453</sup> A Syrian Gnostic of the Second Century, teacher of Marion

<sup>454</sup> Yahweh

<sup>455</sup> Adv. Haeres., I. xxxvii, 1 (MPG. vii, 687-689; ANF. i, 352; ANCL. v, 98)

Trinitarians.<sup>456</sup> This reason alone is very strong, if you consider well that there is a whole book of Irenaeus on this subject and yet he never mentions their nonsense.

49. Again, in the Old Testament we are commanded and that more than one, not to acknowledge many gods but only one.<sup>457</sup> I am thy Elohim and thou shalt have no other elohims besides me.<sup>458</sup> And, Hear, O Israel, that Yahweh is our Elohim and Yahweh is one.<sup>459</sup> This he [I?] wished to translate thus, because those that know not the proper meaning of the word are here most horribly deceived. And, Know therefore this day and ponder it in thy heart that Yahweh is in heaven above and upon the earth beneath and there is none else besides him.<sup>460</sup> And in countless other passages he is said to be the Elohim of Israel, the only Yahweh, even he alone.

50. To these things they think that they can easily reply; but they make a show of words and do not get the sense when they say that several beings are one Essence, as if each being did not have its own existence. Indeed, as I shall show below,<sup>461</sup> it is more fit that one being have several Essences than that several beings have one Essence. Again, their defense may seem artificial, without the witness of the Scriptures; for of the one Yahweh there is no question; but of the three beings which they call Persons I find no mention, nor does Scripture speak of an Essence, nor of all their other doctrines, disputes of words and profane babblings. O Timothy, turn away from novelties of words, which some professing have erred concerning the faith.<sup>462</sup> And elsewhere, be not carried away by diverse and strange questions.<sup>463</sup> Again, Paul forbids us to be led astray by disputes about words.<sup>464</sup> But that their defense is merely verbal is now plain from what has been said; for admitting that there are three beings, which they call Persons, by reasoning from a substitution of terms,<sup>465</sup> they admit three entities and consequently three Substances. If Yahweh, therefore, has an absolute meaning, it plainly follows that they are real Tritoitae,<sup>466</sup> and in consequence are really opposed to the Scriptures and to the unity of Yahweh and that they are sophistically defending one connotative Yahweh, wherefore they are hateful to Yahweh.<sup>467</sup> Pray look at another foundation: for while admitting that there are three beings, they deny that there are three entities and three Substances, for the reason that these nouns end in -tia,<sup>468</sup> hence relate to an

---

<sup>456</sup> So far as has yet been discovered, this is the first use of the word trinitarius as a term of theology, although it had been used since the twelfth century for the title of a monastic order. It was one of the items in Calvin's indictment of Servetus that the latter had applied this term to orthodox believers in the Trinity. It was thus resented and had doubtless been intended, as a term of reproach. Servetus seems to have used it to suggest that orthodox believers had substituted belief in a Trio for a belief in the one and true Yahweh. In the second half of the sixteenth century Catholic writers adopted the term, singularly enough, to designate deniers of the orthodox doctrine of the Trinity in Poland and Transylvania and to denote what they regarded as practically a form of tritheism; since the Unitarians of that period, while more or less admitting a divinity of Father, Son and Holy Spirit, considered separately, did not properly admit the unity of the three in one Substance. Trinitarii are thus among the heretics named in the bull of excommunication (In coena Domini) published annually from Gregory XIII. In 1583 to Clement XIV. in 1770. Those so called never admitted this designation but came toward the end of the century to call themselves by the opposed term, Unitarii, apparently coined at this time in contradistinction to the objectionable term, Trinitarii. The Catholic connotation of Trinitarii at length became obsolete and the term became the accepted designation of those holding the orthodox doctrine of Yahweh. cf. Book VII, paragraph 3.

<sup>457</sup> Pluralitatem...unitatem

<sup>458</sup> Exodus 20:2,3

<sup>459</sup> Deuteronomy 6:4

<sup>460</sup> Deuteronomy 4:39

<sup>461</sup> Book V, paragraph 9

<sup>462</sup> I Timothy 6:4,29 (Vulg.)

<sup>463</sup> Hebrews 13:9

<sup>464</sup> II Timothy 2:14

<sup>465</sup> A convertibilibus arguendo

<sup>466</sup> cf. note, paragraph 31

<sup>467</sup> Eccles. 37:23 (Vulg.). Qui sophisticè loquitur, odibilis est

<sup>468</sup> Entia, Substantia

Essence.<sup>469</sup> O monsters of the world, that Yahweh sold be a jest to us because the ending of words requires it; and that we should confess a plurality in Yahweh because one word requires it and not because another does; as though Hebrews, Greeks and Barbarians ought to have nouns ending in –tia, so that all languages may have a fixed rule for making sport of Yahweh. Are these the verbal disputations, which Paul abhors? And if you ask them why they utter those utterly meaningless things as fundamental truths, they will reply that they learned so by the usage of their masters. It is no concern of theirs if they make void the word of Yahweh, provided they preserve the leaven of their tradition.<sup>470</sup>

51. Again, hear what view Scripture holds about Persons, that you may understand that their usage is mightily like that of Scripture! For in Scripture the outward form and appearance of a man is called his person, as when we say, He has a beautiful person; and it is so taken when it is said that Yahweh is no respecter of persons,<sup>471</sup> because he has no respect to those outward differences, as to whether one is male or female, bond or free, Jew or Greek.<sup>472</sup> And it is so taken when it says that we are not to respect the person of the poor, or the countenance of the mighty.<sup>473</sup> And so the Greek word *Prosopon* is used, which in Latin is rendered *vultus, persona, aspectus* and *facies*.<sup>474</sup> But, apart from the Scriptures, the meaning of the word *persona* is in itself so well known to the Latins that some devil must have suggested to them to invent mathematical Persons and to thrust their imaginary and metaphysical beings upon us as Persons. For in Christ shone forth one Person of the Deity; and in the appearances or utterances of Yahweh, another; and in the appearances or utterances of Yahweh, another; and in the sending of the spirit; another; and thus in the Gospel we know three Persons, that is to say, by a divine manifestation. And it says, another Comforter<sup>475</sup> according to Tertullian,<sup>476</sup> not as representing the Substance, but the Person; because there was another aspect and another form and disposition of Deity. For Scripture considers the manners of the appearances and not the metaphysical Natures of the beings. Here investigate the causes from the beginning, what view tradition formerly held of Persons and how all things have been corrupted by the damage of the times. What a monster they have also made of the hypostasis I shall say later on, when we speak of the Word.<sup>477</sup>

52. Again, referring to what is proclaimed in Mark; Hear, O Israel, that Yahweh is one...and there is none other but him;<sup>478</sup> and the second commandment is about one's neighbor, on which two commandments it says that the whole law hangeth and the prophets.<sup>479</sup> Thus among all the commandments of the Law there is no command to believe in an imaginary Trinity. But there is one alone who said, I am, I am and besides me there is no savior,<sup>480</sup> and, I, am Yahweh, and there is none else, Besides me, there is no, Elohim,—I gird thee, though thou hast not known me: That men may get to know, From the rising of the sun, And from the west, That there is none besides me,—I, am Yahweh, and there is none, else.<sup>481</sup>

---

<sup>469</sup> Sunt essentialia

<sup>470</sup> Mark 7:13; Matthew 16:6,12

<sup>471</sup> Roman 2:11; Ephesians 6:9; Colossians 3:25; Acts 10:34; I Peter 1:17

<sup>472</sup> Galatians 3:28

<sup>473</sup> Leviticus 19:15; cf. I. Samuel 16:7; James 2:9; Deuteronomy 1:17

<sup>474</sup> Countenance, person, looks, face. II Corinthians 1:11, 2:10, 3:7,13,18;4:6; 8:24; 10:1,7; 11:20

<sup>475</sup> John 14:16

<sup>476</sup> Adv. Praxean, 9 (MPL.ii, 164, ANF. iii, 604; ANCL xv, 350)

<sup>477</sup> Book III

<sup>478</sup> Mark 12:29,32 (Vulg.)

<sup>479</sup> Matthew 22:40

<sup>480</sup> Isaiah 43:11 (Vulg.)

<sup>481</sup> Isaiah 45:5,6

53. The Hebrews are supported by so many authorities that they naturally wonder at the great division of Gods introduced by the New Testament and they deem our Testament schismatical when they see us hold their Yahweh in such abhorrence. But if we have to dispute against them, we ought to follow the example of the Apostles, namely, say to them plainly that this Yahshua is the Christ,<sup>482</sup> and the Son of Yahweh: which the Master also teaches us, who in this way sought to persuade the Jews, saying, יהוה<sup>483</sup> of whom ye say that he is your Elohim, he is my Father.<sup>484</sup> See how plainly and intelligibly he addressed their minds concerning his Yahweh; and for this cause they sought to kill him, because he had said that Yahweh was his own Father.<sup>485</sup> And, He is worthy of death, because he made himself the Son of Yahweh.<sup>486</sup> Why not consider in what sense they said these things? Nor does Christ deny this sense; on the contrary, he confirms it, replying, Ye say that I am the Son of Yahweh.<sup>487</sup> Again, if Paul were in Damascus today, trying to persuade the Jews that this is the Son of Yahweh,<sup>488</sup> what do you think he would be referring to by the pronoun? What sort of reasoning should you rely upon in order that such Jews might be persuaded as you see expecting that Messiah today, even as the woman who expected the Messiah was persuaded by the Word of Christ?<sup>489</sup> Nevertheless, some seem to themselves so grand that they do not deign to turn their eyes to look at the man and deem it something improper and absurd for a man to be called Son of Yahweh. But it is something else, more exalted, that they make the Son of Yahweh; and as for the Son, they say that it is necessary that he be of the same Nature, or as they say, of precisely the same kind<sup>490</sup> with the Father; and so from the very start they reject this sonship of the man as blasphemy. But let the Master himself answer from me, who shows himself the Son of Yahweh, when the Father has sanctified me beyond all my fellows?<sup>491</sup> See plainly that he who was sanctified is called the Son of Yahweh; this is he that shall be called holy, the Son of Yahweh;<sup>492</sup> that he is of whom the Apostles say, Thy holy child Yahshua.<sup>493</sup> That precisely his kind is unknown also is dumb beasts is evident; and they supply that lack by inventing something out of their own heads. I would that they might get a little nearer to Yahweh, for they judge of him too much from afar.

54. Again, let them bring the Old Testament into harmony with the New. Why is it that the Hebrews it is so often said of the Messiah-king, He glorified, adorned, crowned him; glorious, comely, renowned, noble; glory, praise, comeliness, beauty, majesty, honor – which things in the New Testament also are very often attributed to Yahshua Christ, the Son of Yahweh? But they attribute none of these things to the man, nor do they care about the Old Testament Messiah. They ascribe everything to the second being by the *communicatio idiomatum*; for they say there are not two kings, nor two glorified ones.

55. Let us now hear the monstrosities which this Trinity controversy has brought forth, for it will be sufficient confutation of all the philosophers to drag them out into the light. The Tritoiters, since this philosophy about three beings entered into the world, have said that there are three Gods; because, although they deny it with the mouth, our brethren confess it in fact. The Arians divide

---

<sup>482</sup> Acts 17:3

<sup>483</sup> Yahweh

<sup>484</sup> John 8:54

<sup>485</sup> John 5:18

<sup>486</sup> Matthew 26:66, John 19:7

<sup>487</sup> Luke 22:70

<sup>488</sup> Acts 9:20

<sup>489</sup> I John 4:25,29

<sup>490</sup> Eiusdem speciei specialissimae

<sup>491</sup> John 10:35,36; Hebrews 1:9

<sup>492</sup> Luke 1:35, margin

<sup>493</sup> Acts 4:27,30 (Vulg.)

the second being from the Substance of the first, as being less than it. Macedonius<sup>494</sup> denies that the third being is Yahweh, but says that it is subject to the Father and the Son. Behold how, when a wrong foundation is once laid, men are driven out to sea utterly lost, adding a greater matter to a less; and any one who pleases thinks up a new Yahweh and forever joins blasphemies to it. Moreover, the Aetians and the Eunomians<sup>495</sup> say that these beings are unlike. The followers of Origen rave that the Son can not see the Father, or the Holy Spirit the Son. Maximinus<sup>496</sup> said that the Father is a part of Yahweh, and that whichever Person you please is a third part of the Trinity. The Metangismonites<sup>497</sup> said that the second being is in the first, just as a smaller vessel is contained in a larger one. The Nestorians says that Yahshua is one Son of Yahweh and another son of man; and this in fact our brethren confess. For, as appears in the disputations of Maxentius<sup>498</sup> of Constantinople, Nestorius never admitted that there were two Sons but defended himself by certain sophistical tricks, quite in the manner of men today. Read what is said there and you shall clearly see that these are Nestorians. The Eutychians asserted that the only nature in Christ is a divine one, as though it were a phantom fallen from heaven, as the Marcionites said. The Monarchians, such as Praxeas and Victorinus,<sup>499</sup> said that Yahshua Christ was Yahweh the Father almighty and that he sat at his own right hand. And after them the Sabellians confuse the person and the names of Christ and Father and are also called Patripassians, since they believe that the Father suffered. The Alogi, not understanding the mystery of the Word, say that John lied when he said that the Word was Yahweh. Very recently, as the Decretal relates,<sup>500</sup> Joachim was arguing against the Master<sup>501</sup> that there is a Quaternity in the divine beings, or the reason that the Essence, according the Master Lombard, is a kind of Nature, not begetting like the Father; nor begotten like the Son, nor proceeding like the Holy Spirit; but it is a kind of supreme being and according to this it seems to be a kind of fourth appearance.<sup>502</sup> Hence Joachim admitted that the three beings are not a Substance, nor an Essence, nor a Nature; but they are said to be one in a collective sense; just as many men are one people. He was certainly right in arguing for a fourth appearance, though he drew his conclusions stupidly. A good many others spew out errors in other ways, because, according to them, when on inconsistency occurs more follow and the last error is worse than the first.

56. Not only among heretics but in our own Church, countless monstrosities have arisen, countless questions have arisen, not only doubtful, insoluble and knotty, but also most absurd, confirming what the Master says, He that walketh in darkness knoweth not whither he goeth.<sup>503</sup> The first of these questions to arise is, What is the difference between proceeding and being begotten, and why is the third being not called Son and not said to be begotten like the second? Of this [Peter

<sup>494</sup> A heresiarch Bishop of Constantinople about the middle of the fourth century; cf. Sozome, *Ecl. Hist.* IV, xxvii (MPG.lxvii, 1199; NPNF. Ser. ii, ii, 322).

<sup>495</sup> Aetius, a deacon of Antioch, reviving Arianism a generation after the Council of Nicaea, and his pupil Eunomius, Bishop of Cyzicus in Mysia, taught that the Son was a different Substance from the Father; cf. Epiphanius, *Adv. Haeres.*, lib. iii, tom. i, haeres. lxxxvi (MPG. xlii, 515-550); Basil. Magn., *Liber Eunomii Apolog.* (MPG. xxx, 835-868)

<sup>496</sup> Arian Bishop of Hippo, contemporary of St. Augustine; cf. Augustine, *Coll. Cum Maximino* (MPL. xlii, 709 ff.)

<sup>497</sup> cf. Augustine, *De Haeres.*, lviii (MPL. lxxxvxi, 124.f)

<sup>498</sup> *Dialogi contra Nestorianos* (MPG. lxxvxi, 124 f.)

<sup>499</sup> Praxeas, a heretic at Carthage and Rome late in the second century, against whom Tertullian wrote his *Adv. Praxean* (MPL. ii, 153 ff.; ANF. iii, 597 ff.; ANCL. xv, 333 ff.). Victorinus afer, a Roman rhetoricia and theologian of the fourth century; cf. MPL. viii, 993 ff.

<sup>500</sup> Joachim of Flora (c. 1132-1202), a Calabrian monk, held heretical views on the Trinity and also attacked Peter Lombard, for which he was condemned by Innocent III; cf. Innocent's Decretal in *Corpus Juris Canonici*, Lib. I, tit. i, *De summa Trinitate*, cap. ii, *Dannamus*.

<sup>501</sup> i.e., Peter Lombard, called "Master of Sentences"

<sup>502</sup> *Simulachrum*

<sup>503</sup> John 12:35

Lombard speaks in the passage<sup>504</sup>] where Gregory<sup>505</sup> says that it is not possible for him to know, although he confesses that he believes; but Yahweh knows what sort of faith he had, when placed in such a difficult situation. Likewise Augustine,<sup>506</sup> John of Damascus,<sup>507</sup> and all the rest have a great horror of this question. But I dispatch the matter in a very few words and say that the flesh is begotten in the natural way, but the spirit is no begotten at all; for to say that the Word is begotten is a mere dream and a great misuse of words. This will come out very clearly when I have said how the holy spirit is said to proceed.<sup>508</sup> Moreover, they say that one Essence is derived from another; yet the Essence does not beget, while the Demiurge does beget. They ought therefore to have said that he had a kind of spiritual wife, or that he alone was masculo-feminine or hermaphrodite, was at once father and mother; for the meaning of the word does not allow that one be called a father apart from a mother. And so they surpass Ptolemy,<sup>509</sup> the Valentinian, in this, that they tacitly condemn their own dreams, which are included in their very notion of Yahweh, as he explicitly and separately states. They also say that the first being is continually begetting, not from another, nor from nothing, but from itself, one who is identical with itself. Not that it begot but once, as Valentinus<sup>510</sup> said, but by abusing its spiritual wife is forever breathing forth, is forever in travail; nor can he cease from this intercourse, for he is continually bound to it and the spiritual Bythos is said to be brought forth daily, though it is the same in nature with the eternal Demiurge (I use Valentinus's own words), because between these and those there is only a verbal distinction. Besides, they say that by these two Aeons a third Pleroma is naturally brought forth; and this third one in proceeding, like the second one in being born, receives the fact that it is an Essence. And you must forever insist upon the conclusion that these three spirits, or these three beings, with origins so different and unlike one another, are one and the same being; and this one is not that one and that one is not the other one and all are one – which is something so monstrous that I had rather, like Valentinus, break in pieces a hundred octonarians of demons than thus to despise and break up the nature of supremely Good and Great Yahweh and to cut it up in various ways into three unlike beings. Try as they may to cloak this division under various kinds of names, et unless you were used to speaking of these beings with great reverence, you will easily decide, if you open your eyes, that to make Yahweh out so unlike is of all blasphemies the greatest. Moreover, notwithstanding these derivations, they say, in opposition to Donatus, that the three beings are equal and of the same power; so that, according to Augustine,<sup>511</sup> the Son is able to utter a son for himself and a grandson for the Father; and consequently the third Spirit is able to impregnate a Chimaera<sup>512</sup> and to breathe forth offspring; yet he says that the Son did not beget because it was not necessary. Moreover, they say that the third being is ours, but the second is not ours but the Father's; and they say that the second being is united with the human nature hypostatically, that is, asswise,<sup>513</sup> and that the other two are not in Christ. But I should like to know why when the Master himself spoke he did not say, The Son, or the second Person, that abideth in me, instead of, The Father that abideth in me, The Father is in me.<sup>514</sup> Likewise, when it says that the spirit of Yahweh is in him, why did it not say that he had not the third, but the

<sup>504</sup> Sent. I, dist. xiii, cap. iii

<sup>505</sup> A mistake in citation for Augustine, *Contra Maximinum*, II. xiv, 1 (MPL. xlii, 770)

<sup>506</sup> *De Tinitate*, XV. xxv, 45 (MPL. xlii, 1092, NPNF. Ser. i. iii, 223, Dods, vii. 430)

<sup>507</sup> *De fide orthodoxa*, I. viii (MPG. xciv, 819 823, NPNF. Ser. ii. ix, 8, 9)

<sup>508</sup> Book II, paragraph 27

<sup>509</sup> A second century Gnostic; cf. Irenaeus, *Adv. Haeres.*, I. xii (MPG. vii, 569 ff.; ANF. i, 333 f.; ANCL. v, 49-51)

<sup>510</sup> A second century Gnostic; cf. Tertullian, *Adv. Valent.*; Irenaeus, *Adv. Haeres.* (MPG. vii, 433 ff.; MPL. ii, 525 ff; ANF. iii, 503 ff.; i, 315 ff.; ANCL. xv, 119 f., v, 1 ff)

<sup>511</sup> *De Tinitate*, XV. xiv (NPL. xlii, 1076; NPNF. ser. i. iii, 213, Dods, vii, 407)

<sup>512</sup> She was of divine race, not of men, in the fore part a lion, in the hinder a serpent, and in the middle a goat, breathing forth in terrible manner the force of blazing fire. And Bellerophon slew her, trusting the signs of the gods.

<sup>513</sup> *Asinaliter*; cf. paragraph 16, note 5

<sup>514</sup> John 14:10

second, being included within himself? Nor can I see whence come so many profane babblings,<sup>515</sup> to the effect that only the second Person sustains, cries out, takes up into the unity of the Substance,<sup>516</sup> limits its dependence; especially since they so glue the Persons together that they act without division. For they say that they works of the Trinity are outwardly undivided and the themselves can neither say nor understand how the human nature depends upon the second being alone and not substantially<sup>517</sup> upon the others; and that only the second being is there united with the flesh, for here Yahweh is manifestly divided. Or it is necessary to reason like Scotus; and the Realists say that Occam,<sup>518</sup> when he was devising relations on this subject; was forced to confess the truth. But Yahweh is truth and they are both liars: he that speaketh from himself, says Christ, is a liar.<sup>519</sup>

57. Moreover, if the second person assumes Mary as it assumed Christ, then the Sophists admit that Mary is Christ, Christ bore the Son of Yahweh, Christ is his own mother, Christ is man and woman (pray restrain your laughter, if you can); and with all this they keep a brazen front so that they know not how to blush. Moreover, they say there is a great difference between constitution and composition;<sup>520</sup> for they assume a constitution in divine beings, because the Son is constituted of an Essence, but is not composed. Moreover, just as they assume two births of the two beings in Christ and different ones, so also they assume two in-breathings in the third being. In the first place, it flows from within the first two by a kind of chimerical<sup>521</sup> and monstrous branching off. In the second place, they say that by another mutation it is breathed in from without and in time, by the other two. Furthermore, they say that this and the second being are being daily made or produced. These are clearly the artificial emissions of aeons which are being daily produced, begotten, born and made; and at this point, strangely enough, they would have the fourth appearance a very simple one, so that notwithstanding these deformities in its womb, the two beings when brought forth, together with the other being begetting but not begotten, nor breathed upon nor breathing. Moreover, there is great controversy as to what names belong to the human nature and what to the second being; for at the first they apply the title of Son not to the man but to the second being. And in consequence of this, when Yahshua Christ is called the Son of Yahweh, the words Yahshua Christ and Christ both flocked together to that. Finally, they maintain that he is called Son of man not from a man but from this being. Nay more, they deny that the man himself is a man and so his human nature has remained nameless. Moreover, Basil the Great<sup>522</sup> maintains with singular mistakenness that he is called begotten and not a created being; a Son and not born. And the great theologian Nazianzen, in his Theology<sup>523</sup> holds that the third Spirit was neither begotten nor un-begotten, a view which Augustine<sup>524</sup> and others follow. And whether the third Person proceeds from the Father and the Son, or from the Father only, as the Greeks say, is a very bitterly debated, vain and ancient problem, which I shall later<sup>525</sup> solve wit ease. In fact, I wonder why they do not also debate whether the second proceeds from the third, just as the third does from the second, so that each in turn may be the cause of the other. For it is written, And, now, My Lord Yahweh hath sent me, and his spirit.<sup>526</sup> Hence the Son is sent by the spirit and is

<sup>515</sup> I Timothy 6:20; II Timothy 2:16

<sup>516</sup> Suppositum

<sup>517</sup> Suppositaliter

<sup>518</sup> Johannes Duns Scotus, c 1265-1308; William of Occam, c. 1289-1349, distinguished scholastic theologians

<sup>519</sup> John 5:31; 8:44

<sup>520</sup> cf. paragraph 31

<sup>521</sup> The Chimaera of classical mythology was part lion, part goat and part dragon

<sup>522</sup> Adv. Eunomium, ii (MPG. xxix, 615-618)

<sup>523</sup> Gregory Nazianzen, Fifth Theological Oraton, de Spiritu Sancto, viii (MPG. xxxvi, 142; NPNF. ser. ii, 320)

<sup>524</sup> De Trinitate, V. vi. vii (MPL. xlii, 914-916; NPNF. ser. i. iii, 89-91; Dods, vii, 150-154)

<sup>525</sup> See Book II, par. 27

<sup>526</sup> Isaiah 48:16

said to have been conceived of the Holy Spirit,<sup>527</sup> and the spirit of Yahweh is said to be upon him.<sup>528</sup>

58. Again, whether the Father and the Son are called one breather collectively, or are called on beginning because they are one Essence; and thus whether the Essence is the beginning of the inbreathing, is an intelligible question. For they would have the fourth appearance, which they call Essence, be inactive in all respects- at least the Moderns would. Furthermore, it is of great importance whether the notions are the common ones, or are those of Persons by [technical] definition. Likewise, it makes a great difference whether a thing is said to be a Substance<sup>529</sup> or not; it even makes so great a difference that the whole kingdom of heaven depends on it. For they deny that the man Yahshua Christ is a Substance. And there is a long discussion, from the 25<sup>th</sup> to the 35<sup>th</sup> distinction, in which Occam<sup>530</sup> strongly insists, while they lay the foundations of our faith upon certain notions, relations, formalities, quiddities and filiations of which Paul never thought. They are founded upon the sand and not upon the solid rock; and regarding the majesty of the faith as not firm, they seem to make game of it. Pray hear the sound reasoning of Lombard Rabbi<sup>531</sup> in his Sentences,<sup>532</sup> where he treats of the very subtle question, as to what befits the truest majesty of Yahweh; that is, what is the reason of the difference, that the Father is said to love with the love which proceeds from him; and being wholly and thoroughly terrified by the difficulty, he wavers, and knows not whither he goes. Likewise in another chapter<sup>533</sup> is the question which, though difficult, is yet ridiculous: namely, What is the reason of the difference, that properties can not be in the Persons without limiting them and yet they are in the Essence without limiting it? Pray what Turk, Scythian, Barbarian could bear these disputes of words, as Paul calls them,<sup>534</sup> without laughter? But it would be superfluous here to follow them through one by one, although there are among them many other horrible inventions on the subject of the incarnation, both far removed from the terms of the law and foreign to them. Reflect only upon this: whether these questions savor at all the Apostolic mind. See whether this is the teaching of our Master, Christ. At present we have grown accustomed to them, but future generations [year 2007] will judge these things amazing. Verily they are amazing, more so than the things that Irenaeus relates of Valentinus;<sup>535</sup> nor is there in the whole Bible one letter which leads to these fancies.

59. Furthermore and worse than all this, how much this tradition of the Trinity has, alas! been a laughing-stock to the Mohammedans, only Yahweh knows. The Jews also shrink from giving adherence to this fancy of ours, and laugh at our foolishness about the Trinity; and on account of its blasphemies they do not believe that this is the Messiah who was promised in their law. And not only Mohammedans and Hebrews but the very beasts of the field, would make fun of us did they grasp our fantastical notion, for all works of Yahweh bless the one Elohim.<sup>536</sup> Hear also what Mohammed says; for more reliance is to be given to one truth which an enemy confesses than to a hundred lies on our side. For he says in his Alcoran<sup>537</sup> that Christ was the greatest of the prophets, the spirit of Yahweh, the power of Yahweh, the breath of Yahweh, the very soul of Yahweh, the

---

<sup>527</sup> Matthew 1:20

<sup>528</sup> Matthew 3:16; Mark 1:10; John 1:32

<sup>529</sup> Suppositum

<sup>530</sup> Quaestiones et Decisiones, dist. 26

<sup>531</sup> Longobardus Rabinus. Servetus here employs the Hebrew title as an equivalent for the title Magister commonly applied to Peter Lombard as the "Master of Sentences."

<sup>532</sup> Lib. I, dist. xxxii, cap. vi

<sup>533</sup> Lib. I, dist. xxxiii, cap. ii

<sup>534</sup> I Timothy 6:4

<sup>535</sup> Adv. Haeres. I. i (MPG. vii, 445-452; ANF. i, 316 f.; ANCL. v, 4-6)

<sup>536</sup> Daniel 3:57 (Vulg.)

<sup>537</sup> The statements following are apparently not quoted, but only loosely based on Surahas 3, 4, 5 and 19 passim

Word born of a perpetual virgin by Yahweh's breathing upon her; and that it is because of the wickedness of the Jews toward him that they are in their present wretchedness and misfortune. He says, moreover, that the Apostles and Evangelicals and the first Christians were the best of men and wrote what is true and did not hold the Trinity or three Persons in the Divine Being but men in later times added this.

60. This most burning plague, therefore, was added and superimposed, as were the new gods which have recently come, which our fathers did not worship. And this plague of [metaphysical] philosophy was brought upon us by the Greeks, for they above all other men are most given to [metaphysical] philosophy; and we, hanging upon their lips, have also become [metaphysical] philosophers. Perhaps some will deem it a slight fault if I admit that they may have erred. But I prove this in no other way than by showing that they never understood the passages of the Scriptures, which they adduce with regard to this matter. If they distinguished the brightness that then was from their own darkness so utterly confused, they might realize that Paul will said that the Church of Yahweh is the ground and pillar of the truth,<sup>538</sup> which is no more than to say that the word of the Gospel is true; and the word of the Gospel is this, namely, that Yahshua Christ is the Son of Yahweh. For, as I have said, and shall say more at large below,<sup>539</sup> the most solid support and foundation of the truth on which the Church is founded is to believe that Yahshua Christ is the Son of Yahweh; and it was on account of this foundation that Paul said, pillar of the truth. Therefore our Church is not said to be founded without a foundation, for its observation of this firm truth gives it the name of rock, pillar and Church of Yahweh. For a church can remain without remaining the Church of Yahweh; Peter<sup>540</sup> can remain in it, though no rock remains. These are matters too small to deserve mention, were there not some who have teeth of iron, so that if they bite hold of but a single passage of Scripture, they are content. But I would that they might as diligently observe other passages of Scripture.
61. Again, what good, pray, does it do them, that Christ said to the Apostles, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world?<sup>541</sup> For Christ remained with the Apostles and with all who were of their number and is to remain, unto the end of the world. But we are not of their number; for had we been of their number, we should have abode in their teaching.<sup>542</sup> Again, mark what follows and you shall understand the condition. Preach the Gospel, he says, teach them to observe all things, which I commanded you; and lo, I am with you.<sup>543</sup> Where, pray, are those who are preaching Christ; where are those who are keeping his commandment, namely, about believing that he is the Son of Yahweh, that Christ may be with them? I will show you at the end of Book III,<sup>544</sup> something that you do not know: what this Gospel is that is committed to them to be preached. Nay more, I will prove to you that you are no Christian. They believe that a congregation is a kind of mathematical body, holding the spirit of Yahweh bound by the hair, even though none of them knows Christ nor his spirit. As often, he says, as you are gathered together in my name.<sup>545</sup> But how are those gathered together in the name of Christ who know not who the Christ is? Besides, how will the holy spirit be in the congregation, if in individuals of it there be a spirit full of fornication and robbery? Beware, then, lest by mere persistence in saying, The Church can not err, you oppose knowledge of Christ and defend the error of ignorance of him.

---

<sup>538</sup> I Timothy 3:15

<sup>539</sup> Paragraph 37; also Book III, paragraphs 20-22

<sup>540</sup> Petrus...petra

<sup>541</sup> Matthew 28:20

<sup>542</sup> I John 2:19

<sup>543</sup> Mark 16:15; Matthew 28:19,20

<sup>544</sup> Book III, par. 21

<sup>545</sup> Congregati. Matthew 18:20

May the Lord grant you understanding, that you may conform to the simplicity of the Scriptures. If you have sought after Christ with your whole heart, he will without fail be gracious to you.

## Excerpts from Servetus on the Trinity Book II, The Word

*In the beginning was the Word*; that is, the utterance or voice of Yahweh; because *In the beginning Elohim said, Light be: And light was*; and this Word became the true light, when he said, Light be. And this same Word, this same light, is the man Christ, who is the light of the world, *the true light, which lighted every man, coming into this world*. See how the words correspond to one another. Paul makes this very thing clear by the Greek word *eipon*, that is 'said.' Likewise also Irenaeus; for who will bear to wrest Scripture to another sense than that which the proper meanings of the word bears? For *logos* means not a philosophical being, but an oracle, a saying, a speech, a discourse, a declaration of Yahweh; for it is derived from the verb *lego*, which means say; and that the more because the very Genesis of the world indicates the meaning, since Yahweh even from the beginning was speaking of Christ, and was acting by speaking this Word, so that thus all things are said to exist through Christ himself. Origen also says, What is the Word of Yahweh which came to Jeremiah or to Isaiah or to any prophet you please? I know, he says, of no other word than that of which John said, *In the beginning was the Word*. For in order to seek the meaning of a word, the passages must be sought in which Yahweh has employed that word; and there is not in the whole Bible a single letter which supports their imaginary meaning of the word. Hence they are rash, and it is far more rash to make out of a word a Son. How, pay, does their doctrine differ from the fictions of the Gentiles, who have the traditions that Mercury means the word through which instruction is conveyed to the understanding, that Paris means feeling, and Minerva bravery? For in like manner they say that the third being means love, and the second knowledge. They take great pride in Platonizing, by multiplying separate beings. To sow disagreements and inconsistencies in the Scriptures is their delight. They explain, *In the beginning* as meaning, in the Father; and, *In the beginning* as meaning, in the Son. What am I to understand? Do you suppose that the son of Zebedee would have been acquainted with such subtle [metaphysical] philosophy? I would rather be ignorant of this inharmonious harmony of the Scriptures than know it. But assuming with Tertullian that each word had its proper meaning, I say *principium*, means beginning, and was thus appropriate word to be used for things commencing to be made; for nothing that has to be made is without a beginning. And thus the Word is the commencement or beginning of an undertaking, and not the name of any Substance; as though we said, In the end Yahweh will do this or that. And when we mean the order of a work, we say, In the beginning a potter made a basin or an urn. Without controversy, then, explain *in the beginning* as meaning, before all things; because before a man speaks, a meditation of the mind is first required; and because the speech of Yahweh is itself wisdom, for Yahweh can not speak foolishly.

...Hence the Word, in Yahweh when he utters it, is Yahweh himself speaking. After the utterance is the flesh itself, or the Word of Yahweh. Before the speech became flesh the very oracle of Yahweh was understood to be within the darkness of the clouds, not being yet manifested; for the speech was Yahweh. And after the Word or Speech became man, we understand by the Word, Christ himself, who is the Word of Yahweh, and the voice of Yahweh. And there is a clear text to prove that he is now the Word of Yahweh, for it is he that John saw sitting upon a white horse, whose name is the Word of Yahweh. When therefore, the change has been made from Word to flesh, the Word is flesh. For of what use would it be to us that the Word became flesh, if the Word is not now called flesh? For John saw the Word of life, and handled it with his hands. And Irenaeus especially derides all those that say that the Word of Yahweh is a

kind of philosophical being; but he declares that Yahshua of Nazareth the very one who was born of Mary, was the Word of Yahweh after the Word became flesh...It is also understood in very truth that the word which was in the beginning became flesh, because this flesh was begotten by a voice uttered from the beginning, not otherwise than as if I, uttering a word from my mouth, produced gold or pearls; for then it might be said, properly speaking, that my voice became gold. For the Almighty Word of Yahweh was able, without bonds of material things, to change into fleshly substance; and therefore Christ himself is now called, the Word. (Servetus on the Trinity, Book II, pg. 75-78)

## **The Logos (Word) as Taught in Greek Metaphysical Philosophy**

Philo of Alexandria (20 BC – 50 AD), a Hellenized Jew, is a figure that spans two cultures, the Greek and the Hebrew. When Hebrew mythical thought met Greek philosophical thought in the first century B.C.E. it was only natural that someone would try to develop speculative and philosophical justification for Judaism in terms of Greek philosophy. Thus Philo produced a synthesis of both traditions developing concepts for future Hellenistic interpretation of messianic Hebrew thought, especially by Clement of Alexandria, Christian Apologists like Athenagoras, Theophilus, Justin Martyr, Tertullian, and by Origen. He may have influenced Paul, his contemporary, and perhaps the authors of the Gospel of John (C. H. Dodd) and the Epistle to the Hebrews (R. Williamson and H. W. Attridge). In the process, he laid the foundations for the development of Christianity in the West and in the East, as we know it today. Philo's primary importance is in the development of the philosophical and theological foundations of Christianity. The church preserved the Philonic writings because Eusebius of Caesarea labeled the monastic ascetic group of Therapeutae and Therapeutrides, described in Philo's *The Contemplative Life*, as Christians, which is highly unlikely. Eusebius also promoted the legend that Philo met Peter in Rome. Jerome (345-420 C.E.) even lists him as a church Father. Jewish tradition was uninterested in philosophical speculation and did not preserve Philo's thought. According to H. A. Wolfson, Philo was a founder of religious philosophy, a new habit of practicing philosophy. Philo was thoroughly educated in Greek philosophy and culture as can be seen from his superb knowledge of classical Greek literature. He had a deep reverence for Plato and referred to him as "the most holy Plato" (*Prob.* 13). Philo's philosophy represented contemporary Platonism which was its revised version incorporating Stoic doctrine and terminology via Antiochus of Ascalon (ca 90 B.C.E.) and Eudorus of Alexandria, as well as elements of Aristotelian logic and ethics and Pythagorean ideas. Clement of Alexandria even called Philo "the Pythagorean." But it seems that Philo also picked up his ancestral tradition, though as an adult, and once having discovered it, he put forward the teachings of the Jewish prophet, Moses, as "the summit of philosophy" (*Op.* 8), and considered Moses the teacher of Pythagoras (b. ca 570 B.C.E.) and of all Greek philosophers and lawgivers (Hesiod, Heraclitus, Lycurgus, to mention a few). For Philo, Greek philosophy was a natural development of the revelatory teachings of Moses. He was no innovator in this matter because already before him Jewish scholars attempted the same. Artapanus in the second century B.C.E identified Moses with Musaeus and with Orpheus. According to Aristobulus of Paneas (first half of the second century B.C.E.), Homer and Hesiod drew from the books of Moses which were translated into Greek long before the Septuagint.

## **Doctrine of the Logos in Philo's Writings**

The pivotal and the most developed doctrine in Philo's writings on which hinges his entire philosophical system, is his doctrine of the Logos. By developing this doctrine he fused Greek philosophical concepts with Hebrew religious thought and provided the foundation for Christianity, first in the development of the Christian Pauline myth and speculations of John, later in the Hellenistic Christian Logos and Gnostic doctrines of the second century. All other doctrines of Philo hinge on his interpretation of divine existence

and action. The term *Logos* was widely used in the Greco-Roman culture and in Judaism. Through most schools of Greek philosophy, this term was used to designate a rational, intelligent and thus vivifying principle of the universe. This principle was deduced from an understanding of the universe as a living reality and by comparing it to a living creature. Ancient people did not have the dynamic concept of "function," therefore, every phenomenon had to have an underlying factor, agent, or principle responsible for its occurrence. In the Septuagint version of the Old Testament the term *logos* (Hebrew *davar*) was used frequently to describe God's utterances (Gen. 1:3, 6,9; 3:9,11; Ps. 32:9), God's action (Zech. 5:1-4; Ps. 106:20; Ps. 147:15), and messages of prophets by means of which God communicated his will to his people (Jer. 1:4-19, 2:1-7; Ezek. 1:3; Amos 3:1). *Logos* is used here only as a figure of speech designating God's activity or action. In the so-called Jewish wisdom literature we find the concept of Wisdom (*hokhmah* and *sophia*) which could be to some degree interpreted as a separate personification or individualization (hypostatization), but it is contrasted often with human stupidity. In the Hebrew culture it was a part of the metaphorical and poetic language describing divine wisdom as God's attribute and it clearly refers to a human characteristic in the context of human earthly existence. The Greek, metaphysical concept of the *Logos* is in sharp contrast to the concept of a personal God described in anthropomorphic terms typical of Hebrew thought. Philo made a synthesis of the two systems and attempted to explain Hebrew thought in terms of Greek philosophy by introducing the Stoic concept of the *Logos* into Judaism. In the process the *Logos* became transformed from a metaphysical entity into an extension of a divine and transcendental anthropomorphic being and mediator between God and men. Philo offered various descriptions of the *Logos*.

## Summary of Philo's Concept of the Logos

Philo's doctrine of the *Logos* is blurred by his mystical and religious vision, but his *Logos* is clearly the second individual in one God as a hypostatization of God's Creative Power - Wisdom. The supreme being is God and the next is Wisdom or the *Logos* of God (*Op.* 24). *Logos* has many names as did Zeus (LA 1.43,45,46), and multiple functions. Earthly wisdom is but a copy of this celestial Wisdom. It was represented in historical times by the tabernacle through which God sent an image of divine excellence as a representation and copy of Wisdom (Lev. 16:16; *Her.* 112-113). The Divine *Logos* never mixes with the things which are created and thus destined to perish, but attends the One alone. This *Logos* is apportioned into an infinite number of parts in humans, thus we impart the Divine *Logos*. As a result we acquire some likeness to the Father and the Creator of all (*Her.* 234-236). The *Logos* is the Bond of the universe and mediator extended in nature. The Father eternally begat the *Logos* and constituted it as an unbreakable bond of the universe that produces harmony (*Plant.* 9-10). The *Logos*, mediating between God and the world, is neither uncreated as God nor created as men. So in Philo's view the Father is the Supreme Being and the *Logos*, as his chief messenger, stands between Creator and creature. The *Logos* is an ambassador and suppliant, neither unbegotten nor begotten as are sensible things (*Her.* 205). Wisdom, the Daughter of God, is in reality masculine because powers have truly masculine descriptions, whereas virtues are feminine. That which is in the second place after the masculine Creator was called feminine, according to Philo, but her priority is masculine; so the Wisdom of God is both masculine and feminine (*Fug.* 50-52). Wisdom flows from the Divine *Logos* (*Fug.* 137-138). The *Logos* is the Cupbearer of God. He pours himself into happy souls (*Somn.* 2.249). The immortal part of the soul comes from the divine breath of the Father/Ruler as a part of his *Logos*.

<http://www.iep.utm.edu/p/philo.htm#SH11m>