

Author: Enyedi György. A Hungarian language copy was included in the 3rd Codex of Cluj (in Hungarian: 3. Kolozsvári Kódex) from the mid 1600's with the title: "Opposita Concioni Joh. Zilvasii apostatae, quam ex hoc loco sumserat". The sermon was delivered in 1593, October 17 in Kolozsvár.

This sermon was transcribed into contemporary Hungarian language, and published in Enyedi György Válogatott Művei, (Eds.: Balázs Mihály and Káldos János) pages 154-181. 1997. Kriterion Könyvkiadó, Bukarest, Kolozsvár, Budapest. ISBN 973-26-0510-3.

All copyrights remain with the respective publishers.

Rules applied during the translation:

The translation preserved the paragraph structure published in the contemporary Hungarian transcript.

Bible book, chapter and verses indicated in parenthesis are additions from the transcription process. These additions allow the reader to immerse themselves into the Bible passages Enyedi György mentioned in the sermon. All Bible quotations use the English of the King James Version, 1611 edition. The abbreviated Bible quotes Enyedi György closed with the word "etc." are expanded to their full length, as they were most likely delivered in his sermons.

The Latin and Greek phrases used by Enyedi György are preserved, and the English translation is provided in parenthesis right after the original phrase.

The translator wishes to acknowledge the copyediting assistance of Ms. Karen W. Burton.

UnitarianTorch contact: [kokenyesi@unitariantorch.com](mailto:kokenyesi@unitariantorch.com)

**In opposition to the sermon of the apostate Joh. Zilvasi, which he had preached from this textus.**

*I therefore, the prisoner of the Lord, beseech you that ye walk worthy of the vocation wherewith ye are called...*

Ephesians 4:1 KJV

When Christ our Lord wanted to teach his disciples how to recognize people with false teachings he said the following to them, as written in Matt. 7 (Matthew 7:16 -17): "Ye shall know them by their fruits. Do men gather grapes of thorns, or figs of thistles? Even so every good tree bringeth forth good fruit; but a corrupt tree bringeth forth evil fruit."

With those words he revealed that actions and behavior are sure signs and indicators of our innermost thoughts. In other words, the way people's thoughts are, their morals are the same way. Apostle Paul - after edifying the Ephesian Christians about the true knowledge in this epistle - cautioned them in the second part against defiling their beautiful and true learned knowledge with unclean and evil understandings, and encouraged them to show and prove through their saintly and devout lives that they indeed accepted the truth, and believed the Gospels, and that even heathen nations could conclude from their behavior that their knowledge was kind, righteous, and trustworthy. Apostle Paul begins his cautioning with the verse I chose for our textus, and through the end of his epistle, he enlightens his disciples about it. There are two parts to our chosen Bible verse. In the first part, the Apostle issues a general reminder and asks the faithful to meditate on their vocation and conduct their lives and their moral behavior according to that vocation. In the second part, the Apostle clearly lists, one by one, those virtuous behaviors and deeds that are expected of true Christians.

These are the words of the first part of our textus. "I therefore, the prisoner of the Lord, beseech you that ye walk worthy of the vocation wherewith ye are called." Let us notice first how much Apostle Paul, from all his soul and all his heart, desired the striving for salvation by the faithful. That is clear from the words, "I beseech you", as he would be saying, I'm begging you, I'm pleading with you. Apostle Paul was their master teacher and mentor, and because of his rank he had the authority to command and admonish his disciples and pupils with harsh words. The reason why the Apostle spoke the way he did is that people accept an admonishment with more contentedness and a better attitude when it is put in the form of a request, as opposed to being in the form of a command. The Apostle writes very similar words to Philemon (Philemon 1: 8 - 9) saying: "Wherefore, though I might be much bold in Christ to enjoin thee that which is convenient, yet for love's sake I rather beseech thee, being such an one as Paul the aged, and now also a prisoner of Jesus Christ."

Another aspect of the first part of our textus shows the devout faith of the Apostle when he mentions that he is a prisoner: "I, the prisoner of the Lord". With those words he wanted to express that if the Ephesians did not heed his admonishment, they would bring further hardship onto the prisoner, but, on the other hand, if they did heed his admonition, then they would ease his misery. Thus, it is expected of all faithful disciples that they not add to the hardship of their teachers; instead, they are expected to ease the burden on their teachers. In order to avoid judgement by anyone who might think that the Apostle is a prisoner because of an evil deed, he states the circumstance of his imprisonment: "of the Lord." *In other words, I am a prisoner of the true faith in order to serve God.* Let us remember that Apostle Paul wrote this letter from Rome as a prisoner for his Christian faith after he was taken there from Jerusalem, as written by Luke the Evangelist in the Book of Acts. These are the first aspects we notice in our textus.

The second part of our textus asks us to walk in a manner worthy of the vocation. To fully appreciate these words we need to understand that the people the Apostle is addressing have been heathens, as he stated earlier in Chapter 2. Those heathens were living in great wickedness, so much so that Paul says they were living without

knowing Christ - removed from Israel, removed from the law, without promise, and without hope. Paul even states that they were living without God. Those heathens were then rescued by the Lord from their calamity through the preaching of the Apostle, and then they were made partakers in the salvation of His righteous people. They were counted as His children and were given the hope of all His promises. Thus, the Apostle could then declare that they were no longer strangers or foreigners, but fellow citizens with the believers, members of the household of God, eternal members of the body of Christ. And the holy calling the Apostle mentions is that these new believers are chosen and destined for life instead of death. The Apostle is addressing these very people, and asks them to behave in a manner worthy of that treasured, righteous, and honorable calling. That sort of expectation is common for public behavior, because, if someone is elected to be a prince they are not expected to plow or hoe the land, and when someone becomes a judge, he is not expected to rollick with drunkards in the inn, but both the prince and the judge are expected to appreciate their rank, and honor the position they occupy. Since those Christians had a righteous vocation, it was necessary that they honor that vocation, and exhibit behavior consistent with that righteousness. And now you ask: Just what is that behavior? The Apostle explains that in detail in passages outside our textus, such as in Chapter 1 (Ephesians 1:4): "According as he hath chosen us in him before the foundation of the world, that we should be holy and without blame before him in love", and in Chapter 2 (Ephesians 2:10): "For we are his workmanship, created in Christ Jesus unto good works, which God hath before ordained that we should walk in them". From these Scripture verses both church officials and worldly leaders may draw several lessons. The first lesson is that the task of the preacher is not only to teach the knowledge of truth to the audience, but to also call them to conduct a devout life, and practice the saintly morals exemplified by the Apostle himself, and by Christ our Lord in Jo. 13 (John 13:10): "Jesus saith to him, He that is washed needeth not save to wash *his* feet, but is clean every whit: and ye are clean, but not all." When Jesus talks about washing, he means understanding the true knowledge, as he explains in Chapter 15 of the same book (John 15:3): "Now ye are clean through the word which I have spoken unto you." Then, after teaching them true knowledge, he had to wash their feet. In other words, he had to carry out good and saintly deeds. In the Scripture, the path of a human life is often called a way. As written in Psalm 1 (Psalm 1:1): "In via peccatorum non stetit" (in the way of sinners). Therefore, the deeds of a human life can be called a walk, and that is what the Apostle called walk in our textus: "Walk worthy of the vocation". Thus, it is the obligation of the preacher - and that of the audience as well - to live a saintly life in addition to learning about the true knowledge.

The second lesson to learn is that while preachers could command their disciples to improve, they ought to instead ask their disciples with kind words to become better, because that is accepted easier. As it is inappropriate for preachers to direct harsh dictates at their disciples or to force actions on them, because Christ our Lord has said: "vos autem non sic sed qui maior est in vobis fiat sicut iunior et qui praecessor est sicut ministrator" (But ye shall not be so: but he that is greatest among you, let him be as the younger; and he that is chief, as he that doth serve). It is written in 1 Pet. 5 (1 Peter 5:3): "Neither as being lords over God's heritage, but being ensamples to the flock."

However, the disciples ought to also learn that they should not make their teacher bitter, and if they see the teacher's struggles and exhaustion, the disciples ought not make the circumstances of the teacher more difficult by disregarding the rules, disobeying instruction, or mocking him. Thirdly, let us learn that Christians would have a highly respected stature if they could understand that it is unacceptable for Christians to live an unrighteous, repugnant lifestyle, and those who are evil, and live in immorality are Christians in name only. By ungodly and foul behavior such people degrade the saintly standing of true Christians, as the Apostle clearly explains it following the second part of our textus that Christian calling commanded of the heathens by God, is only compatible with a righteous and saintly life. The Apostle already cautioned them in general terms to conduct themselves worthy of the vocation they are called in, further on he explains that vocation in greater detail. He gives a detailed explanation, because a general admonishment may have been unclear, like when someone asks you how should they conduct themselves as military commander. If you answer that he should conduct himself as is proper and befitting, your answer wouldn't be very useful until you explain what constitutes proper and befitting behavior. In the second part of his discussion the Apostle provides an explanation of his statement asking Christians to conduct themselves "Worthy of the vocation wherewith they are called", and describes how Christians can accomplish that, what they ought to follow, and how to walk according to his instructions. He states that they ought to walk in lowliness, meekness, longsuffering, and others. The Apostle lists five directives and kind acts that ought to be followed by those who want to live according to their Christian calling. First of all, let us note here that he emphasizes unity, and he elaborates most extensively about that topic. Similar to the damaging effect of dissention and fragmentation in a society, a town, or a country, in the Church of God there are no acts more evil than dissention and fragmentation. That is why he is calling the believers to unity. He then lists the virtues that bring about the unity of the Spirit, the virtues without which the unity is impossible.

The first virtue is lowliness, which is the opposite of self-importance, and being puffed up. Among the believers, there is no person situated better to quickly break up unity than a strong-willed person, because such a person is unable or unwilling to yield to others. The Apostle reminds Christians to shun self-importance and live in lowliness.

The virtue of lowliness comes about when people meditate on and recognize their powerless and sinful nature, and they come to understand that everything they possess is short-lived, ephemeral. Moreover, if they ever received any gifts that elevated them over others, they are expected to acknowledge that those gifts were given to them, as the Apostle explains this in other passages. Do they have a gift that is not from someone else? And if everything they have is a gift, then why would they boast about it? In addition, they meditate about the possibility that they might be using their gift to do evil to themselves or to others if they are boastful about their gifts. Lastly, with meditation they recognize that there was a time when they did not have their gifts, therefore, it is possible for them to lose their gifts, and yet again live without them. Once people meditate over all that, then they will not be boastful, but they will be lowly. The Scripture frequently reminds us to be lowly. Christ our Lord said that those who humble themselves will enter the Kingdom of Heaven. He said in another passage: learn of me,

for I am meek and lowly in the heart. Saint Peter said that God is opposed to the proud, but gives grace to the humble.

The second virtue the Apostle reminds us is meekness. This virtue is the opposite of angry and irate behaviors. We know that the angry and wrathful people are unsuitable for unity, as they always cause chaos, start wars, and break up peacefulness and unity. The meek, on the other hand, are quiet; they don't insult or irritate anyone. That is how Christians must conduct themselves. Christ our Lord spoke about this when he said: "Blessed are the meek for they will inherit the earth."

The third virtue is longsuffering, because this earthly life brings us afflictions and calamity, and, indeed, no one can protect themselves from them, no one can avoid getting harmed by the world around us, and by other causes. Those who don't want to forebear any hardship are ill-equipped for human fellowship and peaceful existence. This is why the Apostle not only reminds us not to harm others, but also to suffer with patience if others harm us - and not to rush to avenge. We find many parables and commands about this in Scripture, but for the sake of brevity, we will not enumerate them here.

Fourthly, the Apostle calls us to be forgiving towards each other with love. In other words, if someone commits a transgression, stumbles in the faith - as we are all people and are fallible - let us not judge harshly, let us not condemn or curse, but let us be forgiving with love, and not be strict et rigide censores (uncompromising judges). As Christ our Lord said in Mat. 7:1 (Matthew 7:1): "Do not judge, and you will not be judged."

The fifth virtue is to which the previous four virtues are all connected to, and that is unity. The Apostle says the following about unity: "endeavoring to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace." When he says endeavor, he expresses just how significant of bringing about unity is for Christians. When he says: "the unity of the Spirit", he expresses the sort of unity he speaks of. He is not calling for the unity of the flesh, but for the unity of the Spirit, which is calling Christians to intentionally unite in love. Christ our Lord prayed for that as well in Jo. 17 (John 17:21). As he puts it: my Father I ask that they (my disciples) may all be one, as thou Father art in me and I in thee. Saint Luke elaborates on this in Actor. 4 (Acts 4:32). As he puts it: "... and the multitude of the believers were of one heart and one soul." The Apostle Paul is describing the same type of unity. He also explains how such unity is to be achieved. And that is in the bond of peace, that is to say that unity is kept intact by peace, meaning that unity can exist only where there is peace. Because within the Church of God it is exceedingly necessary to have unity, the Apostle beseeches the believers of unity in several writings, and he lists the reasons that ought to convince the believers to act on his words. As he puts it: one body and one Spirit in one hope of your calling. With these words the Apostle brings into view fundamental covenants, and commitments of Christians, and if anyone wishes to be part of this body, then they cannot be tyrannical, aggressive, or provocative to break up peacefulness, because those behaviors are ill-suited for Christians, and inappropriate for Christian congregations, as in them unity ought be followed.

The Apostle lists six attributes that illustrate and clarify the idea of unity for Christians. The first is, as he states: "There is one body and one Spirit." Now you might say that the Apostle already said that we need the unity of Spirit and not our bodies, so how could he now say one body and one Spirit? Let us remember that in the Scripture there are two kinds of bodies. One is visible, but the other can only be comprehended in our thoughts, as the Apostle talks about it in 1 Cor. 15 (1 Corinthians 15:44): "it is raised a spiritual body. There is a natural body, and there is a spiritual body." In the Scripture, the church of God, and the totality of all believers are both called a spiritual body. With that, the Scripture provides evidence for just how desirable it is to have love and unity among believers. In our visible body there are different body parts, but yet, none of these parts attack another body part, or are jealous of another body part, but, rather, one body part serves others, and seeks to benefit other body parts. The hand is not jealous of the eye, but, rather, if something falls into the eye, the hand removes it. The eye reciprocates as it ensures that the hand isn't hit or injured; other parts serve one another in a similar fashion. In God's house, we see that believers have a variety of ranks and statuses, but it is unbecoming for believers to attack each other, or to be jealous of each other. Instead, the believers ought to care for each other, and support each other. That is why the Scripture states that the holy church is a body where Christ is the head as we read the words of the Apostle himself in Chapter 1 of this book (Ephesians 1:22), and in Coloss. 1 (Colossians 1:18). The people of various ranks act similar to hands and feet and other body parts. That body, as we mentioned, is a spiritual body. The Apostle calls us to unity based on such a description of the spiritual body which he speaks of in greater detail in Col. 1:12 (Colossians 1:12).

The second attribute of the unity of the Christians is that all of them have the same hope. In other words, they look forward to the same event, as they all hope for the resurrection of the body, and the eternal life. That is why the Apostle calls all Ephesians - and through that all Christians - to live in unity, because they all sustain the same hope.

The Apostle's third reasoning is that Christians have one Lord. In the words of the Scripture, there is one Lord. Here the Apostle uses the term "Lord" undoubtedly to mean Jesus Christ, as passages of Scripture provide evidence for that. This very Apostle states in 1 Cor. 8 (1 Corinthians 8:6): "One Lord, Jesus Christ, by whom are all things, and we by him". We read in Apocal. 1 (Revelation 1:5) that Jesus Christ is the "first begotten of the dead", and he is the "prince of the kings of the earth". We read in Col. 1 (Colossians 1:18) that he is the "head of the church". He is the "firstborn from the dead", and in all things, he has preeminence. The following verse also points to this. We read in Matt. 23 (Matthew 23:10) that "neither be ye called master: for one is your Master, even Christ." And similar to that in Jo. 13 (John 13:13): "Ye call me Master and Lord, and ye say well, for I am." From all those words we clearly see the lordship and high position of Christ. At this point we must understand clearly that the explanation of the Apostle does not intend to show that there is no other lord besides Christ in heaven or on earth, before or after him. Rather, the Apostle restricts his discussion to caution the Ephesians that they ought to strive for unity, because they have one lord, one head, one governor. And if anyone would interpret these verses that that there is no other lords

besides Christ, that would be like reminding the Transylvanian Hungarians and Saxons to be united by saying that in Transylvania or anywhere else there aren't any other lower or higher lords besides the Transylvanian Prince. Just as that statement is untrue, so is the one about Christ. Indeed, we read in the Scripture about many other lords and rulers, besides Christ. In Gen. 1 (Genesis 1:28) the first humans were given the authority to rule, and that was transferred to future generations: "and have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over every living thing that moveth upon the earth." David sings about this in Ps. 8 (Psalm 8:6 - 8). In addition, all landowners are called rulers, as the Apostle says: "servants be obedient to your Masters." Even the Apostles are called rulers as written in Jo. 12 (John 12: 21). The worshipper pagans address Philip "Sir, we would see Jesus." Also, in Actor. 16 (Acts 16:30) the jailer tells Paul and Silas "Sirs, what must I do to be saved?" The angels are frequently addressed as "Lord" in the Old Testament. Thus, Paul stated truthfully in 1 Cor. 8 (1 Corinthians 8:5) "as there be lords many." From these words we can now see how flawed and baseless is the reasoning that says since Christ is Lord, and the Father is Lord, and because the Apostle said there is one Lord, therefore, the Lord Christ and the Father are the same. Sed negantur (they will be defeated). Responsio (the response): if such logic would be correct then I could say that Apostle Philip is Lord based on Jo. 12 (John 12:21), and that Christ is Lord, therefore, Apostle Philip and Christ are identical lords. My opponents would say that Philip and Christ are different type of lords, and I will turn their own words against them as follows. It is true that Christ is Lord, and that the Father is Lord as well, as even Christ calls the Father "Lord" in Matt. 11 (Matthew 11:25): "I thank thee, O Father, Lord of the heaven and earth." The Apostles say in Actor. 4 (Acts 4:24): "Lord, thou art God, which hast made heaven, and earth, and the sea, and all that in them is." If we accept that there is a difference between the lordship of rich princes, the apostles, and Christ, then we have to accept that there is a difference between the lordship of God the Father and Christ. To understand this better let us listen to Saint Peter from Actor. 3 (Acts 2:36): "Therefore let all the house of Israel know assuredly, that God hath made the same Jesus, whom ye have crucified, both Lord and Christ." It is written in Ephe. 1 (Ephesians 1:20): "he raised him from the dead and set him at his own right hand in the heavenly places." It is written in Phil. 2 (Philippians 2:9): "Wherefore God also hath highly exalted him, and given him a name which is above every name." Christ himself said: all power is given unto me in heaven and on earth. Therefore, Christ is Lord. But he was made Lord by God our Father. Christ was given power, but suffering was also given to him. However, the Scripture says this about God in Rom. 11 (Romans 11:35 - 36): "who hath first given to him, and it shall be recompensed unto him again? For of him, and through him, and to him, are all things: to whom be glory for ever." But you might say: *Doesn't the Apostle says that Christ is one Lord?* Responsio (the response): indeed, he says that in the Church where Christ is the head, he is the only Lord before others. However, when we hear about the power and Lordship of Christ we must keep in mind and remember the words of the Apostle in 1 Cor. (1 Corinthians 15:27): "all things are put under him" (under Christ). Without a doubt we must interpret this writing, that someone gave up what was put under him. Returning to the letter of the Apostle we conclude that when the Apostle stated that Christ is Lord, he did not intend to declare Christ a Lord to exclude the lordship of anyone else, but, instead, to remind believers that they ought to

strive for unity as they are acting under one Lord, they have one head, and, consequentially, it is improper to constrain each other, and to attack each other, instead, we ought to act in unity as servants of the very same Lord.

The fourth attribute of unity is the oneness of faith. One is our faith, and it is improper to fight each other. And just what sort of faith is this? It is the faith that converted heathens into God's people out of heathens as they covenanted with each other, as states Saint John in cap. 20 (John 20:31). He says that he wrote his Gospel and the history of the life and acts of Jesus Christ so that everyone might believe that Jesus Christ was the Son of God, and that believers might have life through his name. In Actor. 8 (Acts 8:37), Philip says to the eunuch: "if thou believest with all thine heart". The eunuch responded: "I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God". Paul states it as well in Rom. 10 (Romans 10:9): "if thou shalt confess with thy mouth the Lord Jesus, and shalt believe in thy heart that God hath raised him from the dead, thou shalt be saved." Similarly, writes Saint John in his first letter 5 (1 John 5:1): "Whosoever believeth that Jesus Christ is born of God." In the same chapter he says: "For whatsoever is born of God overcometh the world, and this is the victory that overcometh the world, even our faith." Who else then would be victorious over this world but the ones who believed that Jesus is the Son of God? That is the faith that united those Christians of Ephesus. That is why Paul cautions them to be united in their love, as they are united in their faith. The Apostle doesn't intend here to teach about the nature of one particular faith, but he uses this occasion to praise the unity of believers. While he could say that if you want to be united you ought to strive to have one faith, but, instead he says: you ought to be united, because you have one faith.

Let us ponder these two things. First, that we cannot possibly interpret the words of the Apostle to mean that there has always been only one kind of manifestation of faith. While the Apostle does state that there is one God, however, we can point in the Scripture to many different manifestations of faith. Just read chapter 11 of Hebrews. You find there as many types of faith as the number of believers and their stories. Let us recall just a few here. The Apostle states that it was faith that brought down the stone walls of Jericho. What kind of faith was that? The sons of Israel had faith in the message Joshua received from God, namely, that if they marched around the town seven times, and they shouted on the seventh day, then the stone walls would fall down. In the same chapter the Apostle writes about Rahab, the unclean woman who was saved by faith. The type of faith she had is explained in Chapter 2 in the book of Joshua. Rahab had faith that God had given the land of Canaan to the sons of Israel, so she hid the spies, and her household was shown kindness. The Scripture exhorts the faith of Abraham, and the nature of his faith is explained by the Apostle in Rom. 4 (Romans 4). When God promised Abraham that he would multiply Abraham's seed, Abraham did not have weak faith, even though he knew without doubt that his body was aged - as he was close to 100 years old - and knew about the infertility of Sarah. He had no concerns, but believed with a deep faith that when God promises something God will make it happen. Next consider the woman who suffered from many years of an issue of blood. She thought she would be healed if she could only touch the garment of Christ. Her faith was in seeing Christ perform miracles, and she believed that Christ can



heal her. Then there is the centurion who said: “Lord,.... just speak the word only, and my servant shall be healed.” I could quote many other examples that would similarly illustrate from the beginning the many types of faith among the people of God. We can conclude that the purpose of the Apostle wasn’t to preach about a single type of faith, but, rather, to remind the believers of their unity, as the people he addresses share one faith.

The second thing to ponder is just how improperly and incorrectly a certain friend of ours interpreted our textus when he said that only one faith ought to exist. While, in general, his admonishment is acceptable, but it didn’t fit this verse, or this epistle of the Apostle, as I will discuss soon. If he wanted to express his thoughts, then he should have used other passages. This person demonstrated his level of knowledge, and the wisdom of his counsel. If it was not enough that he made us listen to his wise counsel, he also used a comparison saying that actions today ought to be different from the actions of our predecessors. Well now, in the days of our king, whose blessed memories we are still holding on to, there were high-ranked officials in the churches and among worldly leaders who were more knowledgeable than our friend. Our friend ought to consider their modesty.

But now let us listen to his wise counsel: “Whenever lawmakers declare and order the practice of a particular faith, those who don’t comply must be cut down to the last person, so there can only be one faith.” Now, this devout friend of ours must have never read or cannot remember the sayings and the teachings of Christ. Christ taught in Matt. 13 (Matthew 13:24 - 30) that there will be indignations and errors. In that parable Jesus explains that when a landowner’s servants asked him if they should weed out the tares from among the wheat, the landowner told them not to do it, because they might uproot the wheat along with the tares. He left that work for the reapers at the time of harvesting. Christ our Lord explains that the time of reaping is the end of the world, the time of judgement. The tares ought to remain in the field until then. However, when the lawmakers our friend mentioned would order the practice of a particular faith, then there will be only a single faith. I must point out that Calvin, with all his knowledge, did not strive to establish a single faith for the entire world. The Jews are yet to accept the true faith, as the Apostle states; nonetheless, Calvin did not convert the Jews to his religion. I am not saying that I do not wish that everyone would seek unity in faith, and agree in matters of religion, or that we ought not make an effort to counter false teachings, but Jesus stated that despite our efforts there will be thorns and weeds in the world. What I am saying is that we need to listen to the words of counselors who are better qualified than our previously mentioned friend, because our good friend doesn’t have sufficient knowledge, reasoning, and sensitivity. He even threatened us by saying that if we don’t heed his words, then in 40 years Transylvania will suffer the fate of Greece, Moldova, and Wallachia. To whom was he preaching this? I’m sure they were not 5, 6, 8 year old children, but mature, older people. Did he not notice that no one among those people are likely to live another 40 years? He must understand that he opened the door for people to commit evil deeds. Because there are many who, together with godless pagan principalities, say and think this: “έμοῦ θανόντος γαῖα μιχθήτω πυρί” (when I’m dead, be the earth consumed by fire).

I wonder how many people thought listening to his preaching: “I won’t live another 40 years, and I will not see the wrath of the Lord, so I just live in any way I like.”

From where did our friend get that idea of 40 years? I believe he has taken it from no other source, but from the preaching of Jesus who foretold the destruction of Jerusalem 40 years in the future. But why would he think that such a number applies to our circumstances? Well, if he would have just opened the Scriptures he could have seen that God is very reluctant to specify deadlines, and He does not commit to act within any generalized period of time. How many years did He provide for repentance when He wanted to destroy the world the first time? That was definitely not 40 years, some would say it was 120 years. For the people of Niniveh He gave 40 days. Does our friend know how much time He gave to the people of Jerusalem when He announced through Jeremiah that if they wouldn’t fight the Chaldeans they would perish? From all these examples our friend should have learned that there is no predictable specific time for God’s punishment, because the time frame depends entirely on the will of God. Christ our Lord told the disciples that he didn’t know the timing of Judgement Day as written in Act. 1 (Acts 1:7): “the times or the seasons, which the Father hath put in his own power.” Nonetheless, our friend acts like he has just arrived from heaven, and preaches with conviction our destruction in 40 years time.

Recte dixit Thucidides (Thucydides points out): θράσος η αμάθεια (ignorance brings rashness). It is written in Judit 8 (Judith 8:11) Judith tells the Betulians they sinned greatly when they set a deadline for God, and that they ought to seek His forgiveness by crying, fasting, and supplication. My advice is no different to our friend. To that some might say: *You just encourage people to do it again*. I disagree with that, and if you want to know my thinking on that I’d say that God will not wait 40 years to destroy us; He will do it long before that if we don’t repent.

I base my thinking on the words of Apostle Paul in Rom. 11 (Romans 11:16-24). He states that the Jews are like a natural olive tree, while we, the heathens, are wild olive trees, and we were grafted onto the natural olive tree to replace the cut-off branches. Now, if God waited 40 years for the repentance of the natural olive tree, He may wait only half as much for us. Because we are wild trees, and we will be destroyed sooner, unless we repent. These teachings were not part of today’s sermon, but the words of our friend presented the occasion. I ask you brethren to forgive me, and now let us return to the teachings of the Apostle.

He reminds us that the fifth attribute of unity of Christians is the one baptism. You, my brethren, have an easier task now to understand the meaning of the words of the Apostle. He is not arguing for or against whether all baptismal practices ought to be identical, but, rather, he reminds the Ephesians that they all took part in one baptism, and so they ought to be united. It is written that way in 1 Cor. 12 (1 Corinthians 12:13): “For by one Spirit are we all baptized into one body, whether we be Jews or Gentiles, whether we be bond or free; and have been all made to drink into one Spirit.” He reminds them of unity in that verse just as he does in our textus. This is not the appropriate occasion to debate the unity of baptism. The way I taught from the

Scripture that there are many lords, and many types of faiths, I can also show that in the days of Christ our Lord, there were many types of baptisms. One type of baptism was that of the John the Baptist who baptized with water, and the other type was the baptism by Christ. John the Baptist declared in Luc. 3 (Luke 3:16) that *I baptize you with water, but One mightier than I cometh after me..... and he shall baptize with water and the Holy Ghost*. Christ himself says this to the Apostles in Acto. 1 (Acts 1:5): "For John truly baptized with water, but ye shall be baptized with the Holy Spirit not many days hence." Then there is a third type of baptism that Christ our Lord spoke about to the mother of the sons of Zebedee as it is written in Marci 10 (Mark 10:38): "can ye drink of the cup that I drink of? and be baptized with the baptism that I am baptized with?" By that time, Christ our Lord had been baptized by John and by the Holy Spirit. Yet, he says that there is another kind of baptism. By that baptism, Christ means his suffering and the shedding of his blood. Therefore, there is not just one kind of baptism. Nonetheless, the Ephesians were told that they have one baptism, as the Apostle reminds them to keep their unity in one baptism.

Lastly, the Apostle reminds them to be loving, to have unity in their calling as there is one God. As he says one God the Father of all. That statement is the most fundamental aspect of unity, because that one God gave one Lord and head of the church, one faith to the believers, and one baptism. He is the symbolic representative of their (the Ephesians') religion and their doctrines. All things depend on Him, and, as the Apostle states here, He is above all. He governs everything, and lives in all believers. I ask all of you believers to remain quiet and to continue to listen while I say a few words about the one God. I am not saying these words because I find pleasure in arguing, but I do have three reasons why I cannot stay quiet. The first is that we are forced to speak out. If someone is allowed to accuse us, then let us be allowed to respond. No judge is so cruel who wouldn't listen to the words of the defendant. Secondly, our leadership position demands that we speak out, as there are weaker ones among our followers who might be shocked and stunned by the accusations of our opponents. Thirdly, it is our responsibility to witness to the truth whether anyone objects to that truth or not. In addition, if there is anyone among us who are not in full understanding of what we are teaching will benefit from this, just like when one prepares for battle, spies are sent to learn the formation of the enemy, so that the army can fight more effectively. So, those of us will now know the foundations of our religion, and they can thus go into battle better prepared. I will not speak long, so bear with me for this short time.

The entire world shouts, including the prophets, the writings of Apostles, and Christ our Lord that God is one. However, our opponents glue something to that by saying: Unus et trinus (One and three). When you ask them how is it possible for God to be one and three, as a multiple of something is so different from a single of the same. They answer that He is one in His essence, but then He is three in His person. The persons are the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit. Now I have to ask whether those persons are Gods. Because if they are not Gods, why do they call them God the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy Spirit? If they are Gods, why do our opponents have the courage to call them three persons, but then they don't have the courage to say that there are three Gods? Because if we have three persons, and each of them is called a

God, wouldn't we have three Gods? For now, let us go along with their accounting and count one essence that is different from the persons. But then we have one essence plus three persons. Yet they don't say four Gods, not even three, but only one? Let's examine this a little closer. The second person who they call God the Son has dual nature. They say "duplicis naturae duas habet naturas" (having double nature means having two natures). One nature is God, and the other nature is human. They believe that this way the eternal God was not only linked to the human body, but also to the human soul. They call it heresy if one says that Christ was God-like because of his Spirit, because according to them that way Christ could bring salvation only to the soul, the half of the believer. So they have to link the body and soul together as human nature in order that both soul and body can be saved. Now, let us ask how many parts we see in that second person. First is the essence, the second is the person, the third is the human soul, and the fourth is the body. How many parts are there to a soul? The great thinkers say there are three. Vegetativa, sensitiva, and rationalis. How many parts are there in the vegetativa? Nutrire, augere, and generare. The sensitiva has eight parts to it. Quinque sensus exterioris, tres interioris (five external senses and three internal senses). The rationalis has the parts called intellectus agens et patiens, contemplativa et practica (active and patient intellect and the contemplative and practical). How many parts are there already? And then if we examine the body how many parts will we find? How many elements, how many humors? How many muscles, how many veins, how many nerves are there in the human body? Under the concept Trinity, we have to count them all, because the Godhead is so inseparably connected to human nature. Christ had as many bones and organs as any of us has. Because the Scripture states that he, while sinless, was similar to us muscle by muscle, bone by bone. He himself states that he has flesh and bones, not only Spirit. Now you have to decide if we could call it a Trinity when we see that many parts, or if we could call it the one God who has countless parts. Nam quo jure dicitur trinitas, ab tres personas, eodem jure propter ut partes dici potest triachas, decas, century (If one calls three persons trinity, then it might as well be named after thirty or hundred). If you maintain that even with this many parts God could still be a single entity, you are unavoidably proposing that God is a composite entity. Now, where there is a composite entity, ibi sunt ubi partes, ibi aliquid prius et posterius (once there are parts, some of them will be primary and others will be secondary). Nam partes toto sunt priores, si non tempore, tamen ratione (For some parts will be before over others if not in a temporal sense, but in their significance). Thus, while the Trinitarians would prefer to stay clear of this conflict with their statement that in Trinitate nihil est prius, neque posterius (in the Trinity nothing is before or after), they can never avoid this issue.

I will not detail here the many other absurd points of view that come from that religion. Without a doubt the concept of the Trinity is an overstatement, because during the passage of time, the elements of a Trinity could not have remained unified, as in tempore accepit illi incarnatio (the incarnation took place at a defined point in time). As I promised I will not speak about those topics, because our opponents deny all our arguments anyway. They evade discussions of these points. Whenever they can, they find an excuse to change the conversation. For instance, they declare that when we argue based on human knowledge that makes the Trinity seemingly impossible, and

instead of us arguing we ought to have faith and just believe it. Among other evidence they mention the writings of Augustine we heard through Georgie Caroli, pastore Eniediense historiam sive fabulam (the priest from Nagyenyed who told teachings and tales). From those teachings they explain that human knowledge can not comprehend all the biblical mysteries, and we agree with them on that statement. However, think this through. Just how could anyone comprehend what “white” is when you teach them about what is “black”, so they can grasp the meaning of “white”? In a similar fashion they instruct us to learn about the three persons if we want to comprehend the one God. This is like when wanting to comprehend what “warmth” is, and being instructed to hold a piece of ice in your hand; warmth and ice are as different as the “one” and the “many”. No wonder that human understanding is baffled by how, as they state, one could be three. My answer is this: Christ our Lord says in Jo. 17 (John 17:3): “this is life eternal, that they might know thee the only true God.” Let us recognize here that the true God linked eternal life to knowing Him. If no one can comprehend the Trinity declared by our opponents, then the Trinity is neither linked to eternal life nor is it a true God. After that I don’t know why anyone would argue and fight for the Trinity; we ought to let it rest with those who invented it.

It is not sufficient for us to declare that God is one, but we also need to understand who He is. I should ask our opponents what the name of their God is, because *vocabula sunt lumina rerum et notionis* (words are the light of things and of knowledge). If we want to understand God then we must have a name for Him. Thus, our opponents must name their God. If they say that His name is Trinity, then let them show us that name in the Scripture. As, it is not enough to discuss a topic, but there needs to be evidence behind it as well. However, even they admit that there is no such word in the entire Bible. They state that even though that word is not in the Scripture, the notion of it is there. They declare that the Scripture assigns attributes to the Father in some verses, and in other verses it assigns identical attributes to Christ, and yet in other verses assigns identical attributes to the Holy Spirit. It follows from all this that the Trinity came about through fabrication. Therefore, the foundation of their religion is built on deduction, syllogism. Tell me: What will happen to people who don’t understand deduction, who can’t read the Scripture, who can’t memorize several passages of the Scripture? All those will remain unsaved, and lost, based on the Athanasian Creed. Moses spoke differently about our knowledge of God in Deut. 30 (Deuteronomy 30:12 -13). He says that the Word is neither in heaven or beyond the sea, so we don’t need to wonder who will bring it to us, but, rather, the Word is close to us, in our mouths, and in our hearts. Similarly, Apostle Paul declares this in Rom. 10. (Romans 10) in the New Testament. Therefore, we shouldn’t need any kind of deduction to understand who God is. While their deduction seems like a powerful argument at first, however, when you examine that argument and test it from all sides, their deduction doesn’t amount to all they want you to believe; all they have is speculative reasoning. Therefore, the Trinity doesn’t appear in the Scripture, neither as a name nor as a notion. What our opponents are incapable of showing, we, on the other hand, can readily accomplish: we can point out the name of God by the letter of the Scripture, without the need for deduction. Let us consult Apostle Paul, the teacher of the Gentiles. He declares: *Pater omnium* (Father of all). Written in 1 Cor. 8 (1 Corinthians 8:4): “there is none other God, but one.” How could

there be any greater clarity about this? Despite that there are entities in heaven and on earth who are called gods. Apostle Paul explains immediately who is the one God. It is the Father. Furthermore, that is the name of the true God not only in the New Testament, but in the Old Testament as well, as it is written in Malach. 2 (Malachi 2:10): "Have we not all one father? Hath not one God created us?" In the Old Testament He is called the God of Israel in Deut. 6 (Deuteronomy 6:4): "Audi Israel (Hear oh Israel)". He is also called the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob in Exod. 3. And other verses as well. God is called the father of our Lord, Jesus Christ, in the New Testament as written in Jo. 17 (John 17:3). *Haec est vita eterna (this is life eternal). You might say: Right there is Christ as well!* First, while Jesus is mentioned in that passage, only the Father is named as the one God. Jesus is mentioned in that passage to emphasize that we ought to know Jesus if we intend to gain eternal life, because nobody goes to the Father, but through Jesus. He is the way; he is the door. The better qualified experts among Trinitarians read this passage like we do. They also call Jesus the Christ, as we do. Because Trinitarians enjoy deductive reasoning, I will present an example so they might see that I understand them. The only true God is whom Moses mentioned when he said: "Hear oh Israel." That God is the Father of Jesus Christ, as it is written in Jo. 8 (John 8:54) where Christ told the Jews, the sons of Israel, that the one you call God is my Father. Therefore, the Father of Jesus Christ is the one eternal God. This is our religion, and the world condemns us for it, calls us heretics, and curses us. But the time will come when our opponents will comprehend - quem transfixerunt (whom did they pierce). Amen.