

The Heresy That the Divine Essence Does Not Beget, Is Not Begotten, and Does Not Proceed



R. J. M. I.

By

The Precious Blood of Jesus Christ;
The Grace of the God of the Holy Catholic Church;
The Mediation of the Blessed Virgin Mary,
Our Lady of Good Counsel and Crusher of Heretics;
The Protection of Saint Joseph,
Patriarch of the Holy Family and Patron of the Holy Catholic Church;
The Guidance of the Good Saint Anne,
Mother of Mary and Grandmother of God;
The Intercession of the Archangels Michael, Gabriel, and Raphael;
The Intercession of All the Other Angels and Saints;
and the Cooperation of

Richard Joseph Michael Ibranyi

To Jesus through Mary

*Júdica me, Deus, et discérne causam meam de gente non sancta:
ab hómine iníquo, et dolóso érue me*

Ad Majorem Dei Gloriam

“We believe in...the Son of God, the only begotten, born of the Father, that is of the substance [divine essence] of the Father, God of God, light of light, true God of true God, born, not made, of one substance with the Father.”
(*The Nicene Creed, 325*)

“11. If anyone does not say that the Son was begotten of the Father, that is, of the divine substance of him himself, he is a heretic.”
(Pope Damasus I, *Council of Rome, 382*)

“Accordingly, it is the right faith that we believe and confess that our Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of God, is God and man. He is God eternally begotten of the substance [divine essence] of the Father, and he is man born of the substance of his mother in time.”
(*The Athanasian Creed, 4th century*)

Original version: 2/2021; Current version: 2/2021

Mary's Little Remnant
302 East Joffre St.
Truth or Consequences, New Mexico 87901-2878, USA
Website: www.JohnTheBaptist.us
(Send for a free catalog)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

THE HERESY WAS RESURRECTED AND MADE FAMOUS IN 1150 BY THE APOSTATE PETER LOMBARD	7
THE HERESY WAS ENSHRINED IN 1215 IN THE INVALID AND HERETICAL FOURTH LATERAN COUNCIL	10
<i>The heresies that come from this heresy</i>	<i>10</i>
The heresy that there is a fourth entity in the Holy Trinity	10
<i>Aquinas' excuse backfires and has him teaching there is a fourth entity in the Holy Trinity.....</i>	<i>11</i>
The heresy of Arianism.....	12
The heresy of Modalism (Sabellianism).....	12
The heresy that God's nature is compound	13
<i>The contradictory teachings in this decree</i>	<i>13</i>
<i>The decree is infallibly worded; thus if Innocent III were a pope, papal infallibility would be heresy</i>	<i>14</i>
<i>Magisterium vs. so-called magisterium.....</i>	<i>14</i>
The solemn magisterium vs. the so-called solemn magisterium.....	15
The ordinary magisterium vs. the so-called ordinary magisterium	15
<i>Why God allowed this dilemma</i>	<i>17</i>
THE DOGMA THAT THE DIVINE ESSENCE IS UNBEGOTTEN, BEGOT, IS BEGOTTEN, AND PROCEEDS	19
<i>This dogma is above all reason but God's.....</i>	<i>19</i>
<i>The solemn magisterium teaches this dogma</i>	<i>24</i>
The Council of Nicea, 325	24
The Council of Rome, 382.....	24
The Athanasian Creed, 4th century.....	24
<i>The ordinary magisterium teaches the dogma.....</i>	<i>25</i>
St. Hilary of Poitiers.....	25
<i>On the Trinity.....</i>	<i>25</i>
St. Athanasius	25
<i>Defence of the Nicene Definition.....</i>	<i>25</i>
<i>Four Discourses against the Arians</i>	<i>26</i>
St. Ambrose	26
<i>Commentary on the Gospel of St. Luke</i>	<i>26</i>
<i>On the Christian Faith.....</i>	<i>26</i>
St. Augustine	26
<i>Letter 170, to Maximus</i>	<i>26</i>
<i>The Trinity</i>	<i>27</i>
<i>Against the Heretic Maximus</i>	<i>27</i>
St. Fulgentius of Ruspe	28
<i>To Peter on the Faith.....</i>	<i>28</i>
The Eleventh Council of Toledo, 675	28
<i>Others teach the dogma</i>	<i>29</i>
In the 15th century the invalid and heretical Council of Florence taught the dogma	29
FURTHER EXPLANATIONS.....	29
<i>The nature of God is simple and thus not compound</i>	<i>29</i>
<i>The divine essence is equal in power but not in the manner of eternal existence</i>	<i>31</i>
<i>The divine essence does not generate another divine essence in the Son and the Holy Spirit.....</i>	<i>34</i>
<i>The origin of the heresy is a quote from St. Augustine taken out of context.....</i>	<i>37</i>
THE HERESY WAS HELD BY SCHOLASTICS AND OTHERS.....	39
<i>The starting point of heretical theology is the heresy and not the dogma.....</i>	<i>40</i>
<i>The apostate Thomas Aquinas held the heresy</i>	<i>41</i>
Aquinas treats the Creator as a creature in regard to generation.....	41
<i>Hence Aquinas and those who believe like him are dumber than animals.....</i>	<i>43</i>
Aquinas contradicts himself and evades answering objections	44
Aquinas says "essence from essence" does not really mean "essence from essence"	47
<i>The apostate Dimond Brothers hold the heresy</i>	<i>48</i>

The Heresy Was Resurrected and Made Famous in 1150 by the Apostate Peter Lombard

It is a solemn magisterium dogma and an ordinary magisterium dogma that the divine essence is unbegotten in the Father, begotten in the Son by the Father, and proceeds in the Holy Spirit from the Father and the Son. Hence it is a dogma that the divine essence is unbegotten, begot, is begotten, and proceeds.

From the information I have, the apostate Peter Lombard was the first modern theologian to teach the heresy that the divine essence does not beget, is not begotten, and does not proceed. In the following quote, the apostate Peter Lombard says that Catholic authors held this heresy but he does not say who they were. He is probably referring to the Church Fathers he quotes and misinterprets when dealing with this topic. While he correctly presents the texts of the Church Fathers, he grossly misinterprets the clear and obvious meaning to defend his heresy:

Apostate Peter Lombard, *Sentences*, 1150: “1. After this there is asked, whether it must be conceded that the Father begot a divine essence or that a divine essence begot the Son, or an essence begot an essence, or whether the divine essence entirely did not beget nor has been begotten. To which consenting with Catholic authors we say, that neither did the Father beget a divine essence, nor did a divine essence beget a son, nor did a divine essence beget a divine essence. Moreover here by the name of ‘essence’ we understand the divine nature, which is common to the Three Persons and is whole in each of them... 6. Thus there also must not be said that the divine essence begot the Son.”¹

This heresy is condemned not only by the ordinary magisterium (the unanimous consensus of the Church Fathers) but also by the solemn magisterium (infallible papal decrees). What follows are three solemn magisterium decrees that condemn this heresy:

Nicene Creed, 325: “We believe in...the Son of God, the only begotten, born of the Father, that is [born] of the substance [divine essence] of the Father, God of God, light of light, true God of true God, born, not made, of one substance with the Father.”²

Pope Damasus I, *Council of Rome*, 382: “11. If anyone does not say that the Son was begotten of the Father, that is, of the divine substance of him himself, he is a heretic.”³

The Athanasian Creed, 4th century: “Accordingly, it is the right faith that we believe and confess that our Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of God, is God and man. He is God eternally begotten of the substance [divine essence] of the Father, and he is man born of the substance of his mother in time...”

Lombard never addresses these solemn magisterium teachings. But he does address some of the Church Fathers’ teachings but misinterprets the clear and obvious meaning to defend his heresy. I will give only one example, a teaching from St. Augustine.

In Book 1, Distinction 5, Chapter 1, Numbers 14-15 of his *Sentences*, Lombard quotes part of the text from St. Augustine’s work titled *Against the Heretic Maximus*. Maximus happens to hold the same heresy as Lombard. To see the full text of St. Augustine’s teaching quoted by Lombard, see in this book “Against the Heretic Maximus,” p. 27. After reading the text, you will be stupefied and shocked to see Lombard’s audacious lying when he twists to his own damnation the

¹ Translated by Giulio Silano. *Mediaeval Sources in Translation* 42. Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, Canada, 2007, second printing 2010. B. 1, dist. 5, c. 1.

² Denzinger 13, Epiphanius’ version; Denzinger 54, Hilary of Poitiers’ version.

³ D. 69.

clear and obvious meaning of St. Augustine's teaching. His comment on St. Augustine's teaching is contained in Number 17. I will tear it apart, piece by piece:

Apostate Peter Lombard, *Sentences*, 1150: "By these aforesaid words there seems to be hinted, that the divine substance begot the Son, and that the Son has been begotten from the substance of the Father, and that he is the coeternal nature from God, and that the Father begot that which he himself is. Moreover that which he himself is, is the divine essence; and thus it can be thought, that the divine essence has begotten."⁴

St. Augustine did not *hint* that the "divine substance begot the Son, and the Son has been begotten from the substance of the Father"—he shouted it out from the rooftop as clear as a trumpet blast! St. Augustine said, "For in no manner do you think that there is a true Son of God if you deny that he has been born from the substance of the Father... Therefore it is already an annoyance that you do not confess with us that the only-begotten Son of God, Jesus Christ, is from the substance of the Father." St. Augustine may as well have been speaking to Lombard!

The following statement from Lombard proves that he knows what St. Augustine is teaching, and hence Lombard is also annoyed by it, just as Maximus was:

Ibid, cont.: "These words disturb us strongly. I would prefer to hear from others how they are to be understood rather than set down my own explanation."

Why is Lombard strongly disturbed? Why is he confounded and confused? Because he knows his heresy is condemned by the clear and obvious meaning of St. Augustine's teaching. He would not have been disturbed, confounded, or confused in the least if he had held the dogma as taught by St. Augustine, "For there is no confusion to them that trust in [God]." (Dan. 3:40) Thus there is no confusion to those who trust in the faith and thus do not deny dogmas. But because Lombard denies the dogma, he is disturbed, confounded, and confused by St. Augustine's teaching. Instead of abjuring his heresy and holding the dogma, Lombard seeks (with the help of other heretics) to defend his heresy by twisting the clear and obvious meaning of St. Augustine's teaching:

Ibid, cont.: "But so that I may speak without prejudice and temerity, these words [of St. Augustine] may be taken in this sense:

" 'He is the coeternal nature from God,' that is, the Son coeternal to the Father is from the Father, in such a manner that he is the same nature with him and/or of the same nature. Which sense Augustine confirms, subjecting (himself) to the same (opinion) and as if explaining what he had said. For to the saying: 'He is the coeternal nature from God,' he added: 'The Son is not another (thing) than that from whom he is, that is, he is of one and the same substance.' "

The dogma that God the Son is of the exact same substance of God the Father is not the dogma in question, and Lombard knows it, and that is why he changed the topic. The question is how the Son eternally got the same substance from the Father, which St. Augustine explains most clearly when he says "the substance of God begets the Son from its very self." Lombard goes on to say,

Ibid, cont.: "Then more openly reveals that such an understanding of the aforesaid words shall be held, saying in the same book against Maximinus:

'This Trinity is of one and the same substance, because not from some matter and/or from nothing is the Son, but from whom he has been begotten. And likewise the Holy Spirit is not from some matter and/or from nothing, but is from that, whence he proceeds.'

⁴ b. 1, dist. 5, c. 1, n. 17.

“Certainly by these words he openly shows, that for this reason the Son is said to be from the substance of the Father, because he has been begotten from the Father in such a manner that he is of the same substance with him: and that the Holy Spirit is from the substance of the Father and the Son, because he proceeds from both, in such a manner that he is of the same substance.”

Again, St. Augustine teaches the dogma that each of the three persons of the Holy Trinity consists of the same one divine essence. The question, again, is how the Son, as well as the Holy Spirit, eternally got the divine essence, which Lombard never addresses.

Note how Lombard defended his heresy by adding the words “said to be” in the following statement: “The Son is *said to be* from the substance of the Father.” Hence he does not believe that the Son is really from the substance of the Father. He prefers the words “He [the Son] is *of* the same substance with him [the Father]” because the word “of” in this context simply means the Son has the same substance as the Father, which is true, but it does not say *how* the Son got his substance from the Father. But the word “of,” as used in the three infallible decrees listed above, leaves no doubt that the substance of the Father begot the substance of the Son.

Other words in infallible teachings also explicitly teach that the Son eternally got his substance from the substance of the Father. For example, St. Augustine, as quoted by Lombard, said the following when referring to heretics like Lombard (the heretic Maximus in this case):

St. Augustine, *Against the Heretic Maximus* (aka *Against Maximus, an Arian*), c. 428: “2. Full of carnal thoughts, you do *not* think that the substance of God begets the Son from its very self...”⁵

But Lombard would leave out the word “not”:

Lombard’s interpretation of St. Augustine’s teaching: “2. Full of carnal thoughts, you think that the substance of God begets the Son from its very self...”

And when St. Augustine said the following,

St. Augustine, *Against the Heretic Maximus*, c. 428: “For in no manner do you think that there is a true Son of God if you deny that he has been born from the substance of the Father... Therefore it is already an annoyance that you do not confess with us that the only-begotten Son of God, Jesus Christ, is from the substance of the Father.”

Lombard would interpret this to mean:

Lombard’s interpretation of St. Augustine’s teaching: “St. Augustine means for in no manner do you think that there is a true Son of God if you deny that he has been born from the Father and is of the same substance of the Father... Therefore it is already an annoyance that you do not confess with us that the only-begotten Son of God, Jesus Christ, is from the Father and of the same substance of the Father.”

By misinterpreting and twisting St. Augustine’s teachings, Lombard has enlisted St. Augustine as one of the Catholic authors (a Church Father, no less!) who held the heresy that Lombard believes is a dogma:

Lombard: “To which consenting with Catholic authors we say, that neither did the Father beget a divine essence, nor did a divine essence beget a son, nor did a divine essence beget a divine essence.”

And he did the same by misinterpreting and twisting the clear and obvious teachings of St. Fulgentius and St. Hilary of Poitiers.

⁵ PL 42:743-814.

For more of apostate Peter Lombard's heresies and his promotion and propagation of scholasticism, see my book *The Hellenization of Christianity by the Anti-Church Fathers and Scholastics*.

The Heresy Was Enshrined in 1215 in the Invalid and Heretical Fourth Lateran Council

In 1215 the invalid and heretical Fourth Lateran Council, confirmed by apostate Antipope Innocent III, enshrined the heresy that the divine essence does not beget, is not begotten, and does not proceed:

Apostate Antipope Innocent III, invalid and heretical *Fourth Lateran Council*, 1215, "On the error of Abbot Joachim": "We therefore condemn and reprove that small book or treatise which abbot Joachim published against master Peter Lombard concerning the unity or essence of the Trinity, in which he calls Peter Lombard a heretic and a madman because he said in his *Sentences*, 'For there is a certain supreme reality which is the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit, and it neither begets nor is begotten nor does it proceed.' He asserts from this that Peter Lombard ascribes to God not so much a Trinity as a quaternity, that is to say three persons and a common essence as if this were a fourth person... For there is a certain supreme reality which is the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit... This reality neither begets nor is begotten nor proceeds; the Father begets, the Son is begotten, and the Holy Spirit proceeds..."⁶

Even if Joachim Fiore may have been a heretic (as I have not had time to thoroughly study the evidence against him), he rightly condemned Lombard's heresy that the divine essence does not beget, is not begotten, and does not proceed. Hence Joachim was right for condemning Lombard as a heretic and a madman.

The heresies that come from this heresy

To teach that "there is a certain supreme reality which is the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit, and it neither begets nor is begotten nor does it proceed" implies by logical conclusion any one of the following four heresies.

The heresy that there is a fourth entity in the Holy Trinity

It implies by logical conclusion the heresy that there is a fourth entity in the Holy Trinity. The dogma is that the Father begot the Son, the Son is begotten from the Father, and the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father and the Son; hence there is no such person or entity in the Holy Trinity that has not begotten and is not begotten and does not proceed. So this other so-called reality that neither begets nor is begotten nor proceeds cannot be the Father or the Son or the Holy Spirit and thus is a fourth entity of the Holy Trinity other than the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit.

⁶ c. 2; D. 431-432.

Aquinas' excuse backfires and has him teaching there is a fourth entity in the Holy Trinity

In the following quote, the apostate Aquinas tries to prove that Peter Lombard and the Fourth Lateran Council did not imply that there is a fourth entity other than the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit:

Apostate Thomas Aquinas, *Expositio, super secundum decretalem*, 13th century :
“Since animal is not distinct from man, horse, and cow, each of which is a type of animal, for that very reason we cannot say that man, horse, cow, and animal are four things, but three only, because each one of them is an animal. Thus, because each of the three Persons is that res, namely the divine essence or nature, it cannot be said that the three Persons together with that res are four, since that res is not distinct from the three Persons.”⁷

What Aquinas has said is true regarding animals. But the question is not that a man, a horse, and a cow are animals but how animals come to be. Certainly a man, a horse, and a cow are three things and not four things even though they are all animals. The question is how animals come to be. The first humans and animals were created and the rest were born. Hence there is no such thing as an animal that was neither created nor born.

In a similar way, the question is not that the nature of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit is the divine essence they share in common, but how each has or got the divine essence. Certainly, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit are three things (persons) and thus not four things even though they have the same divine essence. The question is *how* each person has or got the divine essence. The answer is that the divine essence is either unbegotten, is begotten, or proceeds. Hence there is no such thing as a divine essence that does not beget, is not begotten, and does not proceed any more than there can be an animal that was neither created nor born.

And if one said that there could be such a thing as an animal that was not created nor born, then that would be a new thing, a new kind of animal, that was neither created nor born, which would be impossible. In the same way, if one said that there was such a thing as a divine essence that does not beget, is not begotten, and does not proceed, then that thing would be a new thing, a new divine essence, which is neither the Father whose divine essence begot the Son, nor the Son whose divine essence is begotten from the Father, nor the Holy Spirit whose divine essence proceeds from the Father and the Son, which would mean that there is a fourth entity other than the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit, which is heresy. So Aquinas' example actually backfires and thus condemns him and proves him to be illogical and more stupid than an ass.⁸

Also, Aquinas' example does not apply because even though a man, a horse, and a cow have the nature of an animal, they do not all share the exact same animal nature in each of them. For example, when a cow gives birth, the baby calf has an animal nature like his mother but it is not the exact same animal nature as his mother. The calf has a separate animal nature of its own. However, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit have not only a divine nature but they have the *exact* same divine nature. Hence when the Father begot the Son, the Son's divine nature was not *like* the Father's divine nature but it is exactly one and the *same* as the Father's divine nature. All three persons of the Blessed Trinity, the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit, all share the same divine nature.

⁷ *Opuscula Theologica* I (Rome, 1954), 1193, p. 429: “Unde etiam animal non distinguatur ab homine, equo et bove, quorum quodlibet est animal, ideo non possumus dicere quod homo et equus et bos et animal sunt quatuor, sed sunt tria tantum, quia quodlibet illorum est animal. Ita, quia quaelibet trinitatis personarum, est illa res, scilicet divina essentia vel natura, non potest dici, quod tres personae et illa res sint quatuor, quia illa res non est aliquid aliud a tribus personis.”

⁸ See in this book “The apostate Thomas Aquinas held the heresy,” p. [41](#).

The heresy of Arianism

It implies by logical conclusion the heresy of Arianism. This heresy states that God exists only as one divine person and that the person of the Son and the person of the Holy Spirit are creatures and thus not God. It states that God created the Son out of nothing and thus the Son was not begotten from the divine essence of the Father. It teaches that the Son is united to God by grace and not by nature. For if the divine essence does not beget, is not begotten, and does not proceed, then the Son and the Holy Spirit have no way of getting the divine essence and thus the Father is the only one who has the divine essence. According to this heresy, then, the only thing the Father gave the Son and the Holy Spirit is their personhood by creating them out of nothing.

According to the Arians, if the divine essence were born, then there would be two Gods, as they could not comprehend how the divine essence could be truly born in the Son and be the exact same divine substance as the Father:

History of Dogmas, by the apostate Rev. J. Tixeront, D.D., 1913: “We are well informed at least as regards the great outlines of the system of Arius... The following exposition is based exclusively on what remains of his works: There is but one God: He alone is unbegotten, eternal, without beginning, truly God. This absolute God cannot communicate his being... And because a God who had been begotten, i.e., produced through communication of substance, would imply a contradiction in terms... Hence we must reject absolutely the expressions which imply this communication or generation...”⁹

The Moslems hold this same heresy:

Nominal *Catholic Encyclopedia*, “Arianism”: “The drift of all he advanced was this: to deny that in any true sense God could have a Son; as Mohammed tersely said afterwards, ‘God neither begets, nor is he begotten’ (Koran, 112).”

The Arians and Moslems believe that if the divine essence begot, is begotten, and proceeds, then there would be three divine essences and thus three Gods:

St. Ambrose, *Exposition of the Christian*, 4th century: “10. We say, then, that there is one God, not two or three Gods, this being the error into which the impious heresy of the Arians doth run with its blasphemies. For it says that there are three Gods, in that it divides the Godhead of the Trinity; whereas the Lord, in saying, ‘Go, baptize the nations in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit,’ hath shown that the Trinity is of one power. We confess Father, Son, and Spirit, understanding in a perfect Trinity both fullness of divinity and unity of power.”¹⁰

The heresy of Modalism (Sabellianism)

It implies by logical conclusion the heresy of Modalism (also known as Sabellianism or Monarchianism or Patripassianism). This heresy states that God exists only as one divine person and pretends to be the Son and the Holy Spirit and hence the Son and the Holy Spirit do not really exist and thus are not even persons. In this way, too, it defends the heresy that the divine essence does not beget, is not begotten, and does not proceed:

St. Fulgentius of Ruspe, *Letter 8*, To Donatus, c. 520: “(XI.) 20. The Holy Trinity is one God, the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit. There is one nature of the

⁹ Translated from the Fifth French edition by H.L.B. *Nihil Obstat*: Sti. Ludovici, die 17, Nov. 1913, F. G. Holweck, *Censor Librorum*. Imprimatur: die 19, Nov. 1913, + Joannes J. Glenon, Archiepiscopus St. Ludovici. Herder Book Co., 1923. Vol. 2, c. 2, n. 1, pp. 24, 25.

¹⁰ b. 1, n. 10.

Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit but not one person. Accordingly, that, with the truth being retained, you may be able to refute or certainly repudiate falsity, if you see anyone confessing the one nature of the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit in such a way that he wants to proclaim one person, do not think him a Catholic Christian but recognize him as a Sabellian heretic. [Footnote 51]”

Footnote 51: “In the early Church, some were concerned that the worship of Christ rendered Christian monotheism suspect. They stressed the oneness of God and sought to support this by arguing that the persons of the Father and the Son were not real but only a human attempt to understand the various facets of God’s activity. Hence Sabellianism, Modalism, and Patripassianism.”

St. Augustine, *City of God*, 413: “We are not at liberty to affirm two or three gods; although, speaking of each, of the Father, or of the Son, or of the Holy Ghost, we confess that each is God: and yet we do not say, as the Sabellian heretics say, that the Father is the same as the Son, and the Holy Spirit the same as the Father and the Son; but we say that the Father is the Father of the Son, and the Son the Son of the Father, and that the Holy Spirit of the Father and the Son is neither the Father nor the Son.”¹¹

The heresy that God’s nature is compound

It implies by logical conclusion the heresy that the nature of God is compound and thus not simple. This heresy teaches that the divine persons of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit are separate from their divine essence; for if the person and not the divine essence of the Father begot the person and not the divine essence of the Son, then the divine essence of the Father and the Son are separate from their personhoods. The dogma is that the nature of God is simple and thus consists of only one thing and thus the personhood of the Father and his divine essence are one and the same thing. This is true also of the personhood and divine essence of the Son, and the personhood and divine essence of the Holy Spirit.¹²

The contradictory teachings in this decree

The Fourth Lateran Council’s decree also contains the scholastic method of contradictory teachings,¹³ which St. Paul condemns when he said,

“But God is faithful, for our preaching which was to you, was not, It is, and It is not.” (2 Cor. 1:18)

On the one hand the Fourth Lateral Council teaches the heresy that the divine substance does not beget, is not begotten, and does not proceed; but on the other hand it teaches the dogma that the Father gave his substance to the Son:

The heresy: “For there is a certain supreme reality which is the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit... This reality neither begets nor is begotten nor proceeds; the Father begets, the Son is begotten, and the Holy Spirit proceeds.”

The dogma: “For the Father, in begetting the Son from eternity, gave him his substance... It is therefore clear that in being begotten the Son received the Father’s substance.”

¹¹ b. 10, c. 24.

¹² See in this book “The nature of God is simple and thus not compound,” p. 29.

¹³ See my book *The Hellenization of Christianity by the Anti-Church Fathers and Scholastics: ...2d*) By willful ambiguity or willful contradictions.

Now for the dilemma, If the divine essence in the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit does not beget, is not begotten, and does not proceed but the Son nevertheless *got* the divine essence from the Father, then how did the Father give his divine essence (substance) to the Son? The decree does not even attempt to answer this question because whichever way it answers is yet another heresy. The only answer that is not heretical is the dogma that the Father begot his own substance in the Son. But if the decree gave this correct answer, it would condemn its own heresy that the divine essence does not beget, is not begotten, and does not proceed.

You see what a web heretics spin for themselves in which one heresy leads to others when they try to justify heresy:

“Woe to you, apostate children, saith the Lord, that you would take counsel, and not of me: and would begin a web, and not by my spirit, that you might add sin [heresy] upon sin [heresy].” (Isa. 30:1)

The decree is infallibly worded; thus if Innocent III were a pope, papal infallibility would be heresy

The Fourth Lateran Council’s decree, confirmed by apostate Antipope Innocent III, which taught the heresy that the divine essence does not beget, is not begotten, and does not proceed is infallibly worded. It condemns as a heretic anyone who believes as Joachim Fiore did; that is, that the divine essence begot, is begotten, and proceeds:

Apostate Antipope Innocent III, invalid and heretical *Fourth Lateran Council*, 1215, On the error of Abbot Joachim: “If anyone, therefore, shall presume to defend or approve the opinion or doctrine of the above mentioned Joachim [who opposed the just mentioned teachings], let him be refuted as a heretic by all.”¹⁴

From this point forward, all who held the dogma that the divine essence begot, is begotten, and proceeds, as handed down by the ordinary magisterium and the solemn magisterium, were now considered heretics.

Magisterium vs. so-called magisterium

Hence this decree in the Fourth Lateran Council condemns the Catholic Church’s ordinary magisterium and the solemn magisterium. Consequently, this modern so-called magisterium contradicts the ancient magisterium and thus (if this were possible) the magisterium cannot be infallible.¹⁵

¹⁴ c. 2; D. 432.

¹⁵ See RJMI book *The Hellenization of Christianity by the Anti-Church Fathers and Scholastics: The Theologians Replaced the Magisterium and the Bible*.

The solemn magisterium vs. the so-called solemn magisterium

All of the following papal and so-called papal decrees are infallibly worded and hence claim to be solemn magisterium dogmas—yet they contradict one another! Hence, which of the decrees are Catholics bound to believe under pain of heresy?

Popes	So-called Pope Innocent III Onward
<p>Pope Sylvester I, <i>Nicene Creed</i>, 325: “We believe in... the Son of God, the only begotten, born of the Father, <u>that is [born] of the substance [divine essence] of the Father, God of God</u>, light of light, true God of true God, born, not made, of one substance with the Father.”</p> <p>Pope Damasus I, <i>Council of Rome</i>, 382: “(11) If anyone does not say that the Son <u>was begotten</u> of the Father, that is, <u>of the divine substance of him himself</u>, he is a heretic.”</p> <p><i>The Athanasian Creed</i>, 4th century: “Accordingly, it is the right faith that we believe and confess that our Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of God, is God and man. <u>He is God eternally begotten of the substance [divine essence] of the Father</u>, and he is man born of the substance of his mother in time...”</p>	<p>So-called Pope Innocent III, 1215: “For there is a certain supreme reality which is the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit... This reality neither begets nor is begotten nor proceeds; the Father begets, the Son is begotten, and the Holy Spirit proceeds.”</p>

Hence you have infallible papal decrees contradicting a so-called infallible papal decree. And thus you have teachings of the solemn magisterium contradicting a teaching of the so-called magisterium. There are only two solutions:

1. If Innocent III were a true pope, then the solemn magisterium is not infallible and thus popes cannot teach infallibly—which is heresy.
2. If Innocent III was an apostate antipope and thus was not the pope, then his teaching was not a papal decree and thus could not be infallible. Therefore, the Fourth Lateran Council which he confirmed is invalid and thus a non-Catholic council. This upholds the dogma of papal infallibility and is based upon the dogma that non-members of the Catholic Church cannot hold offices in the Catholic Church. And thus idolaters and formal heretics cannot hold offices in the Catholic Church, which includes the papal office.¹⁶

The ordinary magisterium vs. the so-called ordinary magisterium

And the unanimous consensus of the Church Fathers contradicts the unanimous consensus of the scholastic and other modern theologians regarding this topic. Hence either all of the Church Fathers are heretics or all of the modern theologians are heretics.

And according to the heresy that the unanimous consensus of theologians in any age of the Church is infallible and thus is part of the ordinary magisterium, you have the so-called ordinary

¹⁶ See RJMI book *Non-Catholics Cannot Hold Offices in the Catholic Church*.

magisterium that consists of the scholastics and other modern theologians contradicting the true ordinary magisterium that consists of the Church Fathers. The former believes that the divine essence does not beget, is not begotten, and does not proceed; and the latter believes that the divine essence begot, is begotten, and proceeds. Hence the so-called ordinary magisterium of the scholastics and other modern theologians contradicts the ordinary magisterium of the Church Fathers. For example,

Church Fathers	Scholastic Theologians
<p>St. Hilary of Poitiers, <i>On the Trinity</i>, 4th century: “He [God the Father] begat the only-begotten from his own unbegotten substance [divine essence], bestowing through love and power his whole Divinity upon that birth.”</p> <p>St. Athanasius, <i>Defence of the Nicene Definition</i>, 350/351: “The Word is an offspring from the substance of the Father... The Son is ‘from the essence of the Father’... And on this account did the Holy Council [of Nicea] declare expressly that he was of the essence of the Father.”</p> <p>St. Ambrose, <i>On the Christian Faith</i>, 4th century: “The Son [is] begotten of the substance of the Father.”</p> <p>St. Augustine and Alypius, <i>Letter 170</i>, to Maximus, c. 428: “He [God the Father] begot the Son of his own substance [divine essence].</p> <p>St. Augustine, <i>The Trinity</i>, 5th century: “He [God the Father] has begotten his own essence [in his Son].”</p> <p>St. Fulgentius of Ruspe, <i>To Peter on the Faith</i>, 6th century: “Therefore, believe that Christ, the Son of God, i.e., one of the persons of the Trinity, is true God, so that you do not doubt that his divinity has been born of the nature [divine essence] of the Father.”</p>	<p>Apostate Peter Lombard, <i>Sentences</i>, 1150: “Neither did the Father beget a divine essence, nor did a divine essence beget a son, nor did a divine essence beget a divine essence... Thus there also must not be said that the divine essence begot the Son.”</p> <p>Apostate Thomas Aquinas, <i>Expositio, super secundum decretalem</i>, 13th century: “If therefore the divine essence begets or proceeds, it follows that just as the Father is one Person, the Son another and the Holy Spirit yet another, so too would their own essence or substance be still yet another [divine essence].”</p> <p>Apostate Thomas Aquinas, <i>Summa</i>, 13th century: “I answer that, Concerning this, the abbot Joachim erred in asserting that as we can say ‘God begot God,’ so we can say ‘Essence begot Essence.’ ” (I, q. 39, art. 5.)</p> <p>Apostate Thomas Aquinas, <i>Summa</i>, 13th century: “So the divine nature in the Son is not begotten either directly or accidentally.” (I, q. 39, art. 5, Reply to Objection 2.)</p>

Hence you have the ordinary magisterium of the Church Fathers contradicting and condemning the so-called ordinary magisterium of the scholastic and other modern theologians. There are only three solutions:

1. The ordinary magisterium is not infallible—which is heresy.
2. All the Church Fathers were heretics and thus the Catholic Church’s ordinary magisterium did not exist until the 12th century with the scholastic and other modern theologians, which would actually be a new Church and thus not the true Catholic Church—which is heresy.
3. All of the scholastic and other modern theologians are heretics. And only the unanimous teachings of the Church Fathers are infallible and thus the teachings of non-Church Father theologians could never be part of the ordinary magisterium¹⁷—which is dogma.

The third solution, then, is the correct one since it is the only one that preserves the infallibility of the ordinary magisterium. And it is the only one that has been infallibly defined by the true magisterium.

Why God allowed this dilemma

God has allowed nominal popes to deceive themselves and to deceive bishops and theologians who follow them because they are worthy of it. They are worthy of it because when they knew certain truths (certain dogmas), they denied them; or when they should have known the truth, they did not seek it. Hence they were and are cursed because of their lack of faith in one or more dogmas:

“For he [God] is found by them that tempt him not: and he sheweth himself to them that have faith in him. For perverse thoughts separate from God... For wisdom will not enter into a malicious soul, nor dwell in a body subject to sins. For the Holy Spirit of discipline will flee from the deceitful, and will withdraw himself from thoughts that are without understanding, and he shall not abide when iniquity cometh in.” (Wis. 1:2-5)

Hence God has placed them under the operation-of-error curse by which he allows Satan to utterly deceive them because they are obstinate liars:

“[Antichrist] Whose coming is according to the working of Satan, in all power, and signs, and lying wonders, and in all seduction of iniquity to them that perish; because they receive not the love of the truth, that they might be saved. Therefore God shall send them the operation of error, to believe lying, that all may be judged who have not believed the truth but have consented to iniquity.” (2 Thes. 2:9-11)

Their total and complete disdain and disrespect for the infallible traditions of the Catholic Church as handed down for the first 1000 years of the Church by the true popes and the Church Fathers has caused God to place them under this operation-of-error curse and twist them in a web and ball of confusion. Nominal infallible papal teachings are the final blow, the ultimate web, that entangled them completely and wrapped them up in a tight ball of confusion while the spider sucks all of the life out of their souls:

“Woe to you, apostate children, saith the Lord, that you would take counsel, and not of me [the infallible teachings of the Catholic Church]: and would begin a web, and not by my spirit, that you might add sin [heresy] upon sin [heresy].” (Isa. 30:1)

“Thou hast corrected man for iniquity. And thou hast made his soul to waste away like a spider.” (Ps. 38:12)

¹⁷ While non-Church Fathers can teach dogmas that belong to the ordinary magisterium, they cannot make dogmas part of the ordinary magisterium, not even when they are unanimous. See RJMI *Topic Index*: The Magisterium of the Catholic Church.

The worst thing these nominal popes, bishops, and theologians saw and denied, which put them steadfast under the operation-of-error curse and web of confusion, was the Catholic Church's infallible condemnations of the Hellenization of Christianity. Instead, they began to re-paganize the world by Hellenizing Christianity, which is the glorification of philosophy and philosophers and/or the glorification of mythology and false gods, all of which are condemned in the Bible they are supposed to read.¹⁸

By holding back his graces that enable them to be moral, God curses his chosen people who fall away from the faith and thus they fall into obstinate sins of immorality. Hence the Hellenization of Christianity opened the floodgates for a multitude of idolatries, heresies, and immoralities.¹⁹ This is known as the Romans One Curse:

“Because that when they knew God, they have not glorified him as God or given thanks; but became vain in their thoughts, and their foolish heart was darkened. For professing themselves to be wise, they became fools... And as they liked not to have God in their knowledge, God delivered them up to a reprobate sense to do those things which they ought not.” (Rom. 1:21-22, 28)

See also Osee 4:1-15; 5:1-7.

Hence the massive immorality of nominal Catholics which progressed from the 11th century onward is one sign that they are under the Romans One Curse and that the nominal popes, bishops, and theologians have obstinately denied the faith and hence are false prophets, who Jesus says are detected by their massive immorality²⁰:

“Beware of false prophets, who come to you in the clothing of sheep, but inwardly they are ravening wolves. By their fruits you shall know them. Do men gather grapes of thorns, or figs of thistles? Even so, every good tree bringeth forth good fruit, and the evil tree bringeth forth evil fruit.” (Mt. 7:15-17)

In order to promulgate their heresies to the flock, they had to hide the truth, the dogmas, handed down during the first 1000 years of the Catholic Church to the point that your average so-called Catholic was not taught these dogmas and would not have access to them—or, at least, it would take a monumental effort to find them. Until the age of the Internet, it was nearly impossible for your average so-called Catholic to find them. And this is known as the Amos Curse in which God makes it impossible or almost impossible to find the truth, to find the dogmas that were being denied by nominal popes, bishops, and theologians:

“Behold the days come, saith the Lord, and I will send forth a famine into the land: not a famine of bread, nor a thirst of water, but of hearing the word of the Lord. And they shall move from sea to sea, and from the north to the east: they shall go about seeking the word of the Lord, and shall not find it.” (Amos 8:11-12)

“Then shall they call upon me, and I will not hear: they shall rise in the morning and shall not find me.” (Prv. 1:28)

Also, see in this book “Hence Aquinas and those who believe like him are dumber than animals,” p. 43.

God would never allow such a curse unless men were worthy of it. Hence most of your so-called Catholics, laymen included, were worthy of these curses. Just see how many so-called Catholics do not really care about the faith handed down from the first 1000 years of the Church nor do they even read the Bible. Many Protestants are not as evil as nominal Catholics in this regard, as they at least read the Bible and make an effort to learn their faith, false as it is.

¹⁸ See RJMI book *The Hellenization of Christianity by the Anti-Church Fathers and Scholastics*.

¹⁹ See RJMI book *The Great Apostasy: Crimes of the Great Apostasy*. And see RJMI book *Some Dogmas and Heresies regarding Confirmation and the Holy Eucharist*.

²⁰ See RJMI book *The Great Apostasy: Crimes against Morals*.

The only way to escape these curses and thus have a hope to save your soul is to love the truth, even at the cost of your life, and thus make a sincere and consuming effort to seek and learn about the Catholic faith as taught during the first 1000 years of the Catholic Church. Even if you have not yet found it, God will protect you as long as you are making a sincere effort to find the truth:

“For God is compassionate and merciful, and will forgive sins in the day of tribulation: and he is a protector to all that seek him in truth.” (Eccus. 2:13)

If you are reading this, you have found it! Your search has ended. The only Catholic I know who is teaching the full deposit of the Catholic faith is me, Richard Joseph Michael Ibranyi. I do not say this out of pride but because I truly love all men and thus want them to be saved and to know, love, and obey the true God, the Catholic God. There is nothing more pleasing to a faithful Catholic than to give glory to God and bring other men to God so they too may see how very, very, very great, good, and wonderful he is and thus save their souls. And I do not want them to go through what I had to go through on my journey into the Catholic Church. My teachings make it easy to learn the Catholic faith and come into the true Catholic Church. My mission, in this regard, is the same during the second coming of Christ as John the Baptist’s was during the first coming of Christ:

“As it was written in the book of the sayings of Isaias the prophet: A voice of one crying in the wilderness: Prepare ye the way of the Lord, make straight his paths. Every valley shall be filled; and every mountain and hill shall be brought low; and the crooked shall be made straight; and the rough ways plain; and all flesh shall see the salvation of God.” (Lk. 3:4-6)

May God have mercy on all of you who are reading this now and grant you all the graces and other helps you need to see and embrace the truth and thus come into the true Catholic Church and thus have a hope to save your souls.

The Dogma That the Divine Essence Is Unbegotten, Begot, Is Begotten, and Proceeds

This dogma is above all reason but God’s

It is a Catholic dogma that the divine essence is unbegotten, begot, is begotten, and proceeds. One may ask, How can the divine essence be unbegotten and begotten? And how can the divine essence have begotten and be begotten? I answer by saying, This is among the deepest mysteries of the faith that contradict human science, but not the divine science, and thus can only be believed by faith alone and hence not reasonably understood by any creature. It ranks in the same category as the following dogmas that must be believed by faith alone because they cannot be understood by human reason:

- How could God have always existed?
- How could God create things out of nothing?
- How could God the Father be God, and God the Son be God, and God the Holy Spirit be God, and yet there is only one God?
- How could someone be born and yet always have existed? How could Jesus Christ be born from the Father and yet always have existed?
- How could the Son be born of God the Father and yet be God?
- How could the Holy Eucharist be Christ’s body and blood when it looks, acts, and tastes like bread and wine?

Regarding dogmas that are above human reason (that is, supernatural mysteries), St. Jesus, Son of Sirach, and St. Paul say,

“In unnecessary matters be not over curious, and in many of his works thou shalt not be inquisitive. For many things are shewn to thee above the understanding of men. And the suspicion of them hath deceived many, and hath detained their minds in vanity.” (Eccus. 3:24-26)

“Now faith is the substance of things to be hoped for, the evidence of things that appear not. (Heb. 11:1) For we walk by faith, and not by sight. (2 Cor. 5:7)”

And regarding the supernatural mystery of the divine generation of God the Son, St. Ambrose says,

St. Ambrose, *Commentary on the Gospel of St. Luke*, c. 389: “Divine generation is a thing the full nature of which the human mind is incapable of understanding by any investigative process; by faith, however, it is grasped in its fullness. For even if I am not permitted to know how he [Jesus] was born, neither am I permitted to be ignorant of the fact that he was born.”²¹

St. Ambrose, *Exposition of the Christian*, 4th century: “Dost thou ask me how he is a Son, if he have not a Father existing before him? I ask of thee, in turn, when, or how, thinkest thou that the Son was begotten. For me the knowledge of the mystery of his generation is more than I can attain to—the mind fails, the voice is dumb—ay, and not mine alone, but the angels’ also. It is above Powers, above Angels, above Cherubim, Seraphim, and all that has feeling and thought, for it is written: ‘The peace of Christ, which passeth all understanding.’ If the peace of Christ passes all understanding, how can so wondrous a generation but be above all understanding?²² ... The unbelievers are in uttermost need of arguments, the faithful have enough and to spare. Indeed, Peter’s single confession was abundant to warrant faith in Christ: ‘Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God’; for it is enough to know his Divine Generation, without division or diminution, being neither derivation nor creation.”²³

Even though Gregory of Nazianzus was an apostate, he teaches the truth in this regard:

Apostate Gregory of Nazianzus, *Orations*, Oration 29 (The Third Theological Oration, on the Son), 4th century: “VIII. How then was he begotten? This generation would have been no great thing, if you could have comprehended it who have no real knowledge even of your own generation, or at least who comprehend very little of it, and of that little you are ashamed to speak; and then do you think you know the whole? You will have to undergo much labour before you discover

²¹ b. 4, n. 71.

²² b. 1, n. 64.

²³ b. 2, n. 129.

the laws of composition, formation, manifestation, and the bond whereby soul is united to body, mind to soul, and reason to mind; and movement, increase, assimilation of food, sense, memory, recollection, and all the rest of the parts of which you are compounded; and which of them belongs to the soul and body together, and which to each independently of the other, and which is received from each other. For those parts whose maturity comes later, yet received their laws at the time of conception. Tell me what these laws are? And do not even then venture to speculate on the generation of God; for that would be unsafe. For even if you knew all about your own, yet you do not by any means know about God's. And if you do not understand your own, how can you know about God's? For in proportion as God is harder to trace out than man, so is the heavenly Generation harder to comprehend than your own. But if you assert that because you cannot comprehend it, therefore he cannot have been begotten, it will be time for you to strike out many existing things which you cannot comprehend; and first of all God himself. For you cannot say what he is, even if you are very reckless, and excessively proud of your intelligence. First, cast away your notions of flow and divisions and sections, and your conceptions of immaterial as if it were material birth, and then you may perhaps worthily conceive of the divine generation. How was he begotten? –I repeat the question in indignation. The begetting of God must be honoured by silence. It is a great thing for you to learn that he was begotten. But the manner of his generation we will not admit that even angels can conceive, much less you. Shall I tell you how it was? It was in a manner known to the Father who begat, and to the Son who was begotten. Anything more than this is hidden by a cloud and escapes your dim sight.”

I will now ask you to put away your human reason for a moment and come and see with the eyes of faith what I am going to show you, now and in eternity, and you will see how the divine essence is unbegotten, begot, is begotten, and proceeds.

- Come and see God the Father, whose divine essence is unbegotten and begot the divine essence of God the Son.



- Come and see God the Son, whose divine essence is begotten from the divine essence of God the Father.



- Come and see God the Holy Spirit, whose divine essence proceeds from the divine essence of God the Father and from the divine essence of God the Son.



- And then come and see the Holy Trinity, all three divine persons together and the one divine essence they have in common, and you will see how the one divine essence is unbegotten, begot, is begotten, and proceeds.



Therefore:

1. The part (person) of the one divine essence that consists of the Father is unbegotten and begot the Son. I say begot and not beget because the Son is already eternally born. It is not accurate to say that he is eternally being born or else the Son would eternally be in the process of being born and thus would never actually be born. And it is not as accurate to say that the Son *was* eternally born, which could be taken in the heretical sense to mean that there was a time when the Son was not born. The more accurate way to say it is that “The Son *is* eternally born.”
2. The part (person) of the one divine essence that consists of the Son is begotten from the one divine essence of the Father.
3. The part (person) of the one divine essence that consists of the Holy Spirit proceeds from the one divine essence that consists of the Father and from the one divine essence that consists of the Son.

4. Yet even though the divine essence is unbegotten, begot, is begotten, and proceeds, it is the exact same one divine essence that all three divine persons share in common, just as each person is God but there is only one God. What differs is the manner of eternal existence, the manner of how each person has or got the divine essence, not the quality of the divine essence.

And these things have been infallibly defined by the Catholic Church's solemn magisterium and ordinary magisterium. Consequently, the belief that the one divine essence does not beget, is not begotten, and does not proceed is heretical.

The solemn magisterium teaches this dogma

Firstly, and most importantly, the infallible solemn magisterium teaches the dogma that the Son is begotten from the substance (the divine essence) of the Father and thus the Father's substance (divine essence) begot the Son and hence the Son's divine essence is begotten.

The Council of Nicea, 325

Nicene Creed, 325: "We believe in... the Son of God, the only begotten, born of the Father, that is of the substance [divine essence] of the Father, God of God, light of light, true God of true God, born, not made, of one substance with the Father."²⁴

The Council of Rome, 382

Pope Damasus I, *Council of Rome*, 382: "11. If anyone does not say that the Son was begotten of the Father, that is, of the divine substance of him himself, he is a heretic."²⁵

The Athanasian Creed, 4th century

The Athanasian Creed, 4th century: "Accordingly, it is the right faith that we believe and confess that our Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of God, is God and man. He is God eternally begotten of the substance [divine essence] of the Father, and he is man born of the substance of his mother in time..."

Hence God the Son's substance (divine essence) is eternally begotten from the substance (the divine essence) of God the Father not simply from the person of God the Father. The Creed does not say, "He is God eternally begotten of the person of the Father," which is true if taken in correct context to mean the person of God the Father which consists of his divine essence. Instead, it says, "He is eternally begotten of the substance of the Father," to leave no doubt that the divine essence of the Father begot the divine essence of the Son. Hence the divine essence of the Son is eternally born from the divine essence of the Father. This alone condemns the heresy that the divine essence does not beget, is not begotten, and does not proceed.

²⁴ Denzinger 13, Epiphanius' version; Denzinger 54, Hilary of Poitiers' version.

²⁵ D. 69.

The ordinary magisterium teaches the dogma

No Church Father ever taught that the divine essence does not beget, is not begotten, and does not proceed. Instead, they taught the opposite, that the divine essence is unbegotten, begot, is begotten, and proceeds. And hence this is an ordinary magisterium dogma. What follows are only a few examples of many:

St. Hilary of Poitiers

On the Trinity

St. Hilary of Poitiers, *On the Trinity*, 4th century: “Yet in what sense is God a Father (as he is), if he have not begotten in his Son that same substance and nature which is his own?...²⁶ He, therefore, the unbegotten before time has begot a Son from himself; not from any pre-existent matter, for all things are through the Son; not from nothing, for the Son is from the Father’s self... as the Apostle says, in Christ dwelleth all the fullness of the Godhead bodily. Incomprehensibly, ineffably, before time or worlds, he begat the only-begotten from his own unbegotten substance [divine essence], bestowing through love and power his whole divinity upon that birth...²⁷ He is God from God, subsisting through a true birth; God’s own Son, born from the Father, indistinguishable from him in nature, and therefore inseparable.²⁸”

St. Athanasius

Defence of the Nicene Definition

St. Athanasius, *Defence of the Nicene Definition*, 350/351: “3. ...The Word is an offspring from the substance of the Father...

“19. The Council [of Nicea] wishing to do away with the irreligious phrases of the Arians...were forced to express more distinctly the sense of the words ‘from God.’ Accordingly, they wrote ‘from the essence of God’... For he is Lord and framer of all; and on this account did the Holy Council declare expressly that he was of the essence of the Father, that we might believe the Word to be other than the nature of things originate, being alone truly from God; and that no subterfuge should be left open to the irreligious. This then was the reason why the Council wrote ‘of the essence.’...But as to the Word, since he is not a creature, he alone is both called and is ‘from the Father’; and it is significant of this sense to say that the Son is ‘from the essence of the Father’...And on this account did the Holy Council [of Nicea] declare expressly that he was of the essence of the Father...

“22. Therefore let no one be startled on hearing that the Son of God is from the essence of the Father; but rather let him accept the explanation of the Fathers, who in more explicit but equivalent language have for ‘from God’ written of the essence.’ For they considered it the same thing to say that the Word was ‘of God’ and ‘of the essence of God,’ since the word ‘God,’ as I have already said, signifies nothing but the essence of him who is. If then the Word is not in such sense from God, as a son, genuine and natural, from a father, but only as creatures because they are framed, and as ‘all things are from God,’ then neither is he from the essence of

²⁶ b. 2, n. 3.

²⁷ b. 3, n. 3.

²⁸ b. 7, n. 11.

the Father, nor is the Son again Son according to essence, but in consequence of virtue, as we who are called sons by grace. But if he only is from God, as a genuine Son, as he is, then the Son may reasonably be called from the essence of God.”

Four Discourses against the Arians

St. Athanasius, *Four Discourses against the Arians*, 356-360: “And beholding the Son we see the Father; for the thought and comprehension of the Son is knowledge concerning the Father, because he is his proper offspring from his essence... Hence it is not incredible that God should have a Son, the offspring of his own essence; nor do we imply affection or division of God’s essence when we speak of ‘Son’ and ‘offspring’; but rather, as acknowledging the genuine, and true, and only-begotten of God, so we believe.”²⁹

St. Ambrose

Commentary on the Gospel of St. Luke

St. Ambrose, *Commentary on the Gospel of St. Luke*, c. 389: “Divine generation is a thing the full nature of which the human mind is incapable of understanding by any investigative process; by faith, however, it is grasped in its fullness. For even if I am not permitted to know how he [Jesus] was born, neither am I permitted to be ignorant of the fact that he was born.”³⁰

On the Christian Faith

St. Ambrose, *On the Christian Faith* (aka *On the Mysteries*, 380: “How then, let them tell us, would they have these things to be?—a true generation, the true Son begotten of God the Father, that is, of the substance of the Father or of another substance? If they say ‘begotten of the Father, that is, of the substance of God,’ well and good, for then they acknowledge the Son as begotten of the substance of the Father. If, then, they are of one substance, surely they are also of one sovereign power.”³¹

St. Augustine

Letter 170, to Maximus

St. Augustine and Alypius, *Letter 170, to Maximus*, 415: “But the only-begotten Son does not come of God the Father as the whole of creation came from him, which he created from nothing. He begot the Son of his own substance [divine essence], he did not make him out of nothing; he did not beget him in time, through whom he instituted all time, for, as the flame is not antecedent to the brightness which it produces, so the Father has never been without the Son... And the Father did not diminish himself in order to have a Son of himself, but he begot him as

²⁹ disc. 1, c. 5, n. 16.

³⁰ b. 4, n. 71.

³¹ b. 4, c. 9, n. 94.

another self so as to remain whole in himself, and to be as great in the Son as he is alone... We do not say that Abel and Adam were not of the same nature and substance because the former had had human nature from the latter, but the latter had his from no man. If, then, we consider the nature of both, Abel was a man, Adam was a man; but, if we consider their origin, Abel descended from the first man, Adam from no man. Thus, in God the Father and God the Son, if we consider the nature of both, each one is God, but one is not more God than the other; if we consider their origin, the Father is God from whom the Son is God, but there is no god previous to God the Father.”

The Trinity

St. Augustine, *The Trinity*, 400-416: “Therefore, except that he is the Father, the Father is not anything unless because he has a Son, so that not only that which is meant by Father it is obvious that he is not so called in respect to himself, but in relation to his Son and, therefore, is the Father because he has a Son but that which he is in respect to his own substance is so called because he has begotten his own essence [in his Son]...³² The Word, therefore, the only-begotten Son of God the Father, like and equal in all things to the Father, God of God, light of light, wisdom of wisdom, essence of essence.³³”

Against the Heretic Maximus

In the days of St. Augustine, the heretic Maximus held the same heresy as the apostates Lombard, Aquinas, the invalid and heretical Fourth Lateran Council, the Dimond Brothers, and others; that is, the heresy that the divine essence does not beget, is not begotten, and does not proceed. Hence by condemning Maximus as a heretic, St. Augustine also condemns them as heretics and carnal:

St. Augustine, *Against the Heretic Maximus*, c. 428: “2. Full of carnal thoughts, you do not think that the substance of God begets the Son from its very self, unless by this it suffers what a substance of flesh suffers when it begets. *You err not knowing the Scriptures nor the virtue of God.* (Mt. 22:29) For in no manner do you think (that there is) a true Son of God if you deny that he has been born from the substance of the Father. For there was not already a Son of man and by God granting he became Son of God born out of God by grace, not by nature. Or, even if there was not a son of man, nevertheless was there by chance some whatever kind of creature and, with God changing (it), it was converted into the Son of God? But neither of these exists: therefore either from nothing or from some substance has he been born. But lest we would believe that you think that the Son of God is from nothing, you have affirmed, that you do not say that the Son of God is from nothing. Therefore he is from some substance; and if not from the substance of the Father, say, which he is from; but you shall not find (one). Therefore it is already an annoyance that you do not confess with us that the only-begotten Son of God, Jesus Christ, is from the substance of the Father...

“We both read, *that we may be in his true Son*, Jesus Christ. Therefore tell us, whether that true Son of God, different in a certain property from those who are sons by grace, is from no substance or whether (he is) from some (substance)? I do not say, you say, ‘from no (substance),’ nor do I say ‘from nothing’: therefore he is from some substance. I ask, ‘From which?’ If he is not from the substance of the Father, I seek another. If you do not find another, acknowledge the substance of the Father, and confess that the Son is consubstantial with the Father...

³² b. 7, c. 1, n. 1.

³³ b. 15, c. 14, n. 23.

“I confess, that God the Father in an entirely incorruptible manner has begotten, but that he has begotten what he himself is. Likewise I say that there must be often said: ‘the Son of God either has been born from some substance or from none’; if from none: therefore from nothing; which you do not now say; however, if (he is) from some (substance), and not, however, from the substance of the Father, he is not the true Son; however, if from the substance of the Father, of one and the same substance are the Father and the Son. Moreover, neither do you want a Son begotten from the substance of the Father; and nevertheless you concede that he is neither out of nothing nor out of some matter but rather out of the Father; nor do you see how necessary it is that he who is not out of nothing nor out of some other thing, but out of God, cannot be except from the substance of the Father, and that this is what God is, from what he is, that is God born from God.”³⁴

St. Fulgentius of Ruspe

To Peter on the Faith

St. Fulgentius of Ruspe, *To Peter on the Faith*, 6th century: “10. Therefore, God the Father, begotten by no God, once from his own nature, without a beginning, begot God the Son, equal to himself and co-eternal in divinity by that same nature by which he himself is eternal. But the very same God the Son since he is God eternal and true and with the Father by nature one God in his divinity... 15. ...Therefore, believe that Christ, the Son of God, i.e., one of the persons of the Trinity, is true God, so that you do not doubt that his divinity has been born of the nature [divine essence] of the Father.”³⁵

The Eleventh Council of Toledo, 675

The Council of Toledo XI, Creed of Faith, 675: “[The Trinity] We confess and believe the holy and ineffable Trinity, the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Spirit, one God naturally, to be of one substance, one nature, and also of one majesty and power. And we profess that the Father, indeed, is not begotten, not created but unbegotten. For he from whom both the Son received his nativity and the Holy Spirit his procession takes his origin from no one. Therefore, he [God the Father] is the source and origin of all Godhead; also is the Father himself of his own essence, he who ineffably begot the Son from an ineffable substance [divine essence]; nor did he, however, beget other than what he himself is: God from God, light from light, from him, therefore, is *all paternity in heaven and on earth* (Eph. 3:15) We confess also that the Son was born, but not made, from the substance of the Father without beginning before all ages... For neither from nothing nor from any other substance, but from the womb of the Father, that is, from his substance [divine essence], we must believe that the Son was begotten or born. Therefore, the Father is eternal, and the Son is eternal. But if he always was Father, he always had a Son to whom he was Father; and by reason of this we confess that the Son was born of the Father without beginning... For the Father has eternity without nativity, the Son eternity with nativity, and the Holy Spirit eternity with procession but without nativity.”³⁶

³⁴ PL 42:743-814. B. 2, c. 14, nn. 2-4.

³⁵ c. 2.

³⁶ D. 275-276, 281.

Others teach the dogma

In the 15th century the invalid and heretical Council of Florence taught the dogma

Even though the Council of Florence was heretical and invalid, it teaches the dogma in this regard and condemns the heresy that the divine essence does not beget, is not begotten, and does not proceed:

Invalid and heretical *Council of Florence*, “Cantate Domino,” 1442: “...Whatever the Father is or has, he does not have from another but from himself; and he is the principle without principle. Whatever the Son is or has, he has from the Father and is the principle from a principle. Whatever the Holy Spirit is or has, he has simultaneously from the Father and the Son. But the Father and the Son are not two principles of the Holy Spirit, but one principle, just as the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit are not three principles of the creature, but one principle.” (D. 704)

In context, “Whatever the Son is or has, he has from the Father” means that everything of the Son’s Godhead that he is and has, he has from the Father. It does not refer to the Son’s human nature which he got from the Blessed Virgin Mary. Hence the Son got not only his personhood from the Father but also his divine essence. That is beside the fact (the dogma) that the nature of God is simple and thus not in compound parts and hence the nature of each divine person consists solely of the divine essence.³⁷ Therefore the Father truly begot the divine essence of the Son, and the Son’s divine essence is truly begotten. Hence the divine essence begot and is begotten. And how else could the Son get the divine essence if it were not begotten from the divine essence of the Father!

Further Explanations

The nature of God is simple and thus not compound

It is a dogma that the nature of God is simple and thus not compound; that is, the nature of God consists of one thing and not multiple things. Hence the divine nature of God the Father, as well as God the Son and God the Holy Spirit, consists wholly and only of the divine essence. Hence the divine nature of God the Father, as well as God the Son and God the Holy Spirit, does not consist of a part that is person and a part that is divine essence. The very nature of each divine person is the divine essence they share in common:

St. Hilary of Poitiers, *On the Trinity*, 4th century: “God, however, has no body, but simple essence: no parts, but an all-embracing whole: nothing quickened, but everything living. God is therefore all life, and all one, not compounded of parts, but perfect in his simplicity...³⁸ As to such phrases as from him, and from the womb, and I went out from the Father and am come, if they be understood to denote that the Father extends a part and, as it were, a development of that one substance, then the Father will be of a compound nature and divisible and changeable and corporeal, according to them; and thus, as far as their words go, the incorporeal God will be subjected to the properties of matter. Such is their error, such their pestilent teaching; to suppose it they borrow the words of Scripture, perverting its meaning

³⁷ See in this book “The nature of God is simple and thus not compound,” p. 296.

³⁸ b. 9, n. 61.

and using the ignorance of men as their opportunity of gaining credence for their lies.³⁹”

St. Athanasius, *Defence of the Nicene Definition*, 350/351: “22. If then any man conceives God to be compound, as accident is in essence, or to have any external envelopment, and to be encompassed, or as if there is aught about him which completes the essence, so that when we say ‘God,’ or name ‘Father,’ we do not signify the invisible and incomprehensible essence, but something about it, then let them complain of the Council’s [Nicea’s] stating that the Son was from the essence of God; but let them reflect, that in thus considering they utter two blasphemies; for they make God corporeal, and they falsely say that the Lord is not Son of the very Father, but of what is about him. But if God be simple, as he is, it follows that in saying ‘God’ and naming ‘Father,’ we name nothing as if about him, but signify his essence itself. For though to comprehend what the essence of God is be impossible, yet if we only understand that God is, and if Scripture indicates him by means of these titles, we, with the intention of indicating him and none else, call him God and Father and Lord. When then he says ‘I am that I am,’ and ‘I am the Lord God,’ or when Scripture says ‘God,’ we understand nothing else by it but the intimation of his incomprehensible essence itself, and that he is, who is spoken of. Therefore let no one be startled on hearing that the Son of God is from the essence of the Father; but rather let him accept the explanation of the Fathers, who in more explicit but equivalent language have for ‘from God’ written ‘of the essence.’ For they considered it the same thing to say that the Word was ‘of God’ and ‘of the essence of God,’ since the word ‘God,’ as I have already said, signifies nothing but the essence of him who is. If then the Word is not in such sense from God, as a son, genuine and natural, from a father, but only as creatures because they are framed, and as ‘all things are from God,’ then neither is he from the essence of the Father, nor is the Son again Son according to essence, but in consequence of virtue, as we who are called sons by grace. But if he only is from God, as a genuine Son, as he is, then the Son may reasonably be called from the essence of God.”

St. Athanasius, *Four Discourses against the Arians*, 356-360: “As we said above, so now we repeat, that the divine generation must not be compared to the nature of men, nor the Son considered to be part of God, nor the generation to imply any passion whatever; God is not as man; for men beget passibly, having a transitive nature, which waits for periods by reason of its weakness. But with God this cannot be; for he is not composed of parts, but being impassible and simple, he is impassibly and indivisibly Father of the Son... Scripture speaks of ‘Son,’ in order to herald the natural and true offspring of his essence.”⁴⁰

St. Athanasius, *On the Councils of Ariminum and Seleucia*, 4th century: “34. ... Tell us yourselves, why is it you are not pleased with the phrase ‘of the essence’ (this must first be enquired about), when you yourselves have written that the Son is generated from the Father? If when you name the Father, or use the word ‘God,’ you do not signify essence, or understand him according to essence, who is that he is, but signify something else about him, not to say inferior, then you should not have written that the Son was from the Father, but from what is about him or in him; and so, shrinking from saying that God is truly Father, and making him compound who is simple, in a material way, you will be authors of a newer blasphemy. And, with such ideas, you must needs consider the Word, and the title ‘Son,’ not as an essence but as a name only, and in consequence hold your own views as far as names only...”

“35. But this is more like the crime of the Sadducees, and of those among the Greeks who had the name of Atheists. It follows that you will deny that even creation is the handy-work of God himself that is; at least, if ‘Father’ and ‘God’ do

³⁹ b. 4, nn. 13-14.

⁴⁰ disc. 1, c. 8, n. 28.

not signify the very essence of him that is, but something else, which you imagine: which is irreligious, and most shocking even to think of. But if, when we hear it said, ‘I am that I am,’ and ‘In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth,’ and ‘Hear, O Israel, the Lord our God is one Lord,’ and ‘Thus saith the Lord Almighty’ (Ex. 3:14; Gen. 1:1; Deut. 6:4), we understand nothing else than the very simple and blessed and incomprehensible essence itself of him that is, (for though we be unable to master what he is, yet hearing ‘Father,’ and ‘God,’ and ‘Almighty,’ we understand nothing else to be meant than the very essence of him that is; and if ye too have said that the Son is from God, it follows that you have said that he is from the ‘essence’ of the Father. And since the Scriptures precede you which say, that the Lord is Son of the Father, and the Father himself precedes them, who says, ‘This is my beloved Son’ (Mt. 3:17), and a son is no other than the offspring from his father, is it not evident that the Fathers have suitably said that the Son is from the Father’s essence?”⁴¹

Therefore it is heresy to believe or imply that the person of God the Father is a separate thing from the divine essence of God the Father. The very nature of each divine person is the one divine essence they share in common. It is heresy to teach that God the Father or God the Son or God the Holy Spirit consists of two things, a person and a divine essence, as if the person is a separate thing from the divine essence but united to it. The very essence of each divine person is the one divine essence they share and have in common. In a similar way, it is heresy to believe that a human person can exist without a soul. The very essence of a human person is his soul, even though a human is a compound being.

Hence, this dogma alone, that the nature of God is simple and not compound, condemns the heresy that the divine essence does not beget, is not begotten, and does not proceed. For if this heresy were true, then God is compound because the Father begot something of himself in the Son that is not his divine essence.

Hence the dogma that the Son is born of the Father refers to the Son’s divine essence; if not, then what does it refer to—“the person of the Son without the divine essence”? Which if this were true, then the Son is not divine but simply a person without a divine essence; and this is what the Arian heretics believe. And if the divine essence is not begotten, then how did the Son get the divine essence? If only God the Father’s personhood and not his divine essence begot God the Son, then God the Son would be only a person without a divine essence; actually, he would be nothing, a person without a nature, without a spirit, without life. To see how St. Augustine puts it, see in this book “Against the Heretic Maximus,” p. 27.

Those, then, who hold the heresy that the divine essence does not beget, is not begotten, and does not proceed also hold the heresy by logical conclusion that the nature of God is compound, consisting of the divine essence and a personhood, each a separate part in each person. For if the divine essence of God the Father did not beget the Son, then only his person did, which separates his divine essence from his person. And this heresy that God’s nature is compound and not simple can be used to defend Arianism, Modalism, or a fourth entity in the Holy Trinity.⁴²

The divine essence is equal in power but not in the manner of eternal existence

Among all three divine persons, the quality of the one divine essence is exactly the same, thus in power, knowledge, and will—one in power, knowledge, and will. The difference is the manner in which the one divine essence in the three divine persons eternally exists:

⁴¹ pt. 3.

⁴² See in this book “The heresies that come from this heresy,” p. 10.

The Council of Toledo XI, Creed of Faith, 675: “For the Father has eternity without nativity, the Son eternity with nativity, and the Holy Spirit eternity with procession but without nativity.”⁴³

The eternal existence of the Father comes from no one and thus the one divine essence of the Father came from no one. However, the eternal existence of the Son eternally comes from the Father (as the Son is eternally born from the Father) and thus the one divine essence the Son shares with the Father came from the Father. And the eternal existence of the Holy Spirit eternally comes from the Father and the Son (because the Holy Spirit eternally proceeds from the Father and the Son) and thus the one divine essence the Holy Spirit shares with the Father and the Son proceeds from the Father and the Son. Even though the Council of Florence was heretical and invalid, it teaches the truth in this regard and condemns the heresy that the divine essence does not beget, is not begotten, and does not proceed:

Invalid and heretical *Council of Florence*, Cantate Domino, 1442: “...Whatever the Father is or has, he does not have from another but from himself; and he is the principle without principle. Whatever the Son is or has, he has from the Father and is the principle from a principle. Whatever the Holy Spirit is or has, he has simultaneously from the Father and the Son. But the Father and the Son are not two principles of the Holy Spirit, but one principle, just as the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit are not three principles of the creature, but one principle.” (D. 704)

In context, “Whatever the Son is or has, he has from the Father” means that everything of the Son’s Godhead that he is and has, he has from the Father. It does not refer to the Son’s human nature which he got from the Blessed Virgin Mary. Hence the Son got not only his personhood from the Father but also his divine essence. And, as stated in the last section, if the Father gave the Son personhood only, then the Father would be a compound being because his personhood would be separate from his divine essence, which is another heresy. Therefore the divine essence of the Father truly begot the divine essence of the Son and thus the Son’s divine essence is truly begotten. Hence the divine essence begot and is begotten. And how else could the Son get the divine essence if it were not begotten from the divine essence of the Father!

A similar but not exact example is as follows: The human body of Adam was created from slime and thus not born. But the human body of Abel was born from Adam and thus not created. But the human bodies of Adam and Abel have the exact same faculties. The difference is how their human bodies came to be. Adam’s body was created, and Abel’s body was born from Adam. The human body of Adam was unborn whereas the human body of Abel was born, but the faculties of their human bodies were the same. Hence the human body was first created, and then all other human bodies are born. But all of them are human bodies. But it would be absurd, illogical, and heretical to say that the human body is neither created nor born. In the following quote, St. Augustine teaches this example and condemns the heresy that the divine essence (the divine substance) does not beget, is not begotten, and does not proceed:

St. Augustine and Alypius, *Letter 170*, to Maximus, 415: “But the only-begotten Son does not come of God the Father as the whole of creation came from him [through God the Son], which he created from nothing. He begot the Son of his own substance [divine essence], he did not make him out of nothing; he did not beget him in time, through whom he instituted all time, for, as the flame is not antecedent to the brightness which it produces, so the Father has never been without the Son... And the Father did not diminish himself in order to have a Son of himself, but he begot him as another self so as to remain whole in himself, and to be as great in the Son as he is alone... We do not say that Abel and Adam were not of the same nature and substance because the former had had human nature from the latter, but the latter had his from no man. If, then, we consider the nature of both, Abel was a man,

⁴³ D. 281.

Adam was a man; but, if we consider their origin, Abel descended from the first man, Adam from no man. Thus, in God the Father and God the Son, if we consider the nature of both, each one is God, but one is not more God than the other; if we consider their origin, the Father is God from whom the Son is God, but there is no God previous to God the Father.”

And the Eleventh Council of Toledo in 675 teaches the following:

The Council of Toledo XI, Creed of Faith, 675: “[The Trinity] We confess and believe the holy and ineffable Trinity, the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Spirit, one God naturally, to be of one substance, one nature, and also of one majesty and power. And we profess that the Father, indeed, is not begotten, not created but unbegotten. For he from whom both the Son received his nativity and the Holy Spirit his procession takes his origin from no one. Therefore, he [God the Father] is the source and origin of all Godhead; also is the Father himself of his own essence, he who ineffably begot the Son from an ineffable substance [divine essence]; nor did he, however, beget other than what he himself is: God from God, light from light, from him, therefore, is *all paternity in heaven and on earth* (Eph. 3:15). We confess also that the Son was born, but not made, from the substance of the Father without beginning before all ages... For, neither from nothing nor from any other substance, but from the womb of the Father, that is, from his substance [divine essence], we must believe that the Son was begotten or born. Therefore, the Father is eternal, and the Son is eternal. But if he always was Father, he always had a Son to whom he was Father; and by reason of this we confess that the Son was born of the Father without beginning... For the Father has eternity without nativity, the Son eternity with nativity, and the Holy Spirit eternity with procession but without nativity.”⁴⁴

It is not only the manner of each divine person’s eternal existence that differs, as the eternal existence of the Father is unbegotten, the Son begotten, and the Holy Spirit proceeding. The dogma that the one divine essence is partitioned into three distinct persons also makes them different, which is caused by the manner in which they eternally exist. One proof of this is that each person can act separately from the other even though they share the same one divine essence.

For example, the person of God the Son, but not the person of God the Father or the person of God the Holy Spirit, was born of a virgin. Hence the part (person) of the one divine essence that consists of the person of the Son took on a human nature from Mary. But the part (person) of the one divine essence that consists of the person of God the Father was not born of a virgin or else Mary would also be the Mother of the person of God the Father.

The Council of Toledo XI, Creed of Faith, 675: “[The Incarnation] Of these three persons we believe that for the liberation of the human race, only the person of the Son became true man.”⁴⁵

Apostate Antipope Innocent III, *Fitts Exemplo* (Profession of Faith Prescribed for Durand of Osca and His Waldensian Companions), 1208: “By the heart we believe and by the mouth we confess that the Incarnation of the divinity took place neither in the Father, nor in the Holy Spirit, but in the Son only...”⁴⁶

And the person of God the Son, but not the person of God the Father or the person of God the Holy Spirit, died on the Cross for our sins.

⁴⁴ D. 275-276, 281.

⁴⁵ D. 282.

⁴⁶ D. 422.

The divine essence does not generate another divine essence in the Son and the Holy Spirit

The heretics who held the heresy that the divine essence does not beget, is not begotten, and does not proceed, believed that if the divine essence begets, is begotten, and proceeds then the divine essence would generate another divine essence in the Son and the Holy Spirit and thus there would be three divine essences and thus three Gods. For example, the apostate Thomas Aquinas believed this:

Apostate Thomas Aquinas, *Expositio, super secundum decretalem*, 13th century: “If therefore the divine essence begets or proceeds, it follows that just as the Father is one Person, the Son another, and the Holy Spirit yet another, so too would their own essence or substance be still yet another [divine essence].”⁴⁷

Fiona Robb’s book *Intellectual Tradition and Misunderstanding: The Development of Academic Theology on the Trinity in the Twelfth and Thirteenth Centuries* contains a list of seven heretical theologians who believed that if the divine essence begets, is begotten, or proceeds then the consequence is that there would be three divine essences and thus three Gods:

“The seven, named at the beginning of the *Littera*,⁴⁸ affirmed

“(1) ‘that the divine essence is one in three *supposita* [persons], in no way divided into three parts, or repeated, unfolded, repeatedly posited, or multiplied; and we state and affirm the opposite view to be incorrect;

“and (2) ‘that in the divinity there is no place for a producing and a produced essence; and the opposite view is incorrect.’ ”⁴⁹

If the divine essence cannot produce (generate) the divine essence, then neither can God produce God, and thus the dogma that God begets God, God from God, as stated in the Nicene Creed, is heretical. But because it is a dogma that God begets God while not producing another God, then it is likewise a dogma that the divine essence begets the divine essence while not producing another divine essence. For after all, the very nature of God is simple and thus not compound and hence the very nature of God is his divine essence only, and consequently the only thing that God the Father has to beget is his divine essence, and this is what makes him God and the one born of him God. Hence St. Augustine teaches that to say “God of God” is the same as saying “essence of essence”:

St. Augustine, *The Trinity*, 400-416: “The Word, therefore, the only-begotten Son of God the Father, like and equal in all things to the Father, God of God, light of light, wisdom of wisdom, essence of essence.⁵⁰”

The Council of Toledo XI, Creed of Faith, 675: “For: neither from nothing nor from any other substance, but from the womb of the Father, that is, from his substance [divine essence], we must believe that the Son was begotten or born... Neither do we call the same Son of God a part of a divided nature because of the fact that he is begotten of the Father; but we assert that the perfect Father begets the perfect Son without diminution or division, because it is a characteristic of Divinity alone not to have an unequal Son... And just as it is Catholic to say: God from God, light from

⁴⁷ *Opuscula Theologica* I (Rome, 1954), pp. 428-31. “Si ergo essential divina generat vel procedit, consequens est quod sicut est alia persona Patris, alia Filii, alia Spiritus sancti, ita etiam sit earum alia et alia substantia vel essential.”

⁴⁸ Footnote 109: “Droco, minister of France-, John of Wales; Simon of Lens; Arlotto of Prato; Richard of Middleton (d. c. 1295); Giles of Bensa; John of Murrovalle, later Minister General during the next major prosecution of Olivi’s teachings in 1309-11. On Richard of Middleton, see E. Hocedez, *Richard de Middleton. Sa vie, ses oeuvres, sa doctrine*, SSL 7 (Louvain, 1925), in whose writings, according to Hocedez, there is no personal reference to Olivi (p. 443).”

⁴⁹ Published by University College, University of London, December 1993. Chap. 7, sec. 3, p. 263.

⁵⁰ b. 15, c. 14, n. 23.

light, life from life, so it is a proved assertion of true faith to say the will from the will; just as wisdom from wisdom, essence from essence.”⁵¹

The heretics would have us believe that “essence of essence” or “essence from essence” is heresy. They would have us believe that God begot God means that a person begot another person (person of person) but not the divine essence (essence of essence).

The dogma is that when God the Father eternally begot the Son, he begot another person but begot the same divine essence and hence there is only one divine essence. Therefore when God the Father eternally begot the Son, he begot another person but begot the same God and hence there is only one God. Hence even though God the Father begot God the Son, there is only one God and thus not two Gods. Likewise, even though the divine essence of God the Father begot the divine essence of God the Son, there is only one divine essence and not two divine essences.

St. Hilary of Poitiers, St. Athanasius, and St. Augustine also teach that even though the divine essence of the Father begot the divine essence of the Son, there is only one divine essence and thus not two divine essences:

St. Hilary of Poitiers, *On the Trinity*, 4th century: “God from God, not by division or extension or emanation, but by the operation of a nature which brings into existence, by means of birth, a nature one with itself... The nature with which God [the Son] is born is necessarily the same as that of his source. He cannot come into existence as other than God, since his origin is from none other than God. His nature is the same, not in the sense that the begetter also was begotten—for then the unbegotten, having been begotten, would not be himself—but that the substance of the begotten consists in all those elements which are summed up in the substance of the begetter, who is his only origin... Hence, in the generation of the Son, the incorporeal and unchangeable God begets, in accordance with his own nature, God incorporeal and unchangeable; and this perfect birth of incorporeal and unchangeable God from incorporeal and unchangeable God involves, as we see in the light of the revelation of God from God, no diminution of the begetter’s substance. And so God the only-begotten bears witness through the holy Moses; ‘See, see that I am God, and there is no God beside me.’ For there is no second divine nature...”⁵²

St. Athanasius, *Four Discourses against the Arians*, 356-360: “And beholding the Son, we see the Father; for the thought and comprehension of the Son, is knowledge concerning the Father, because he is his proper offspring from his essence... Hence it is not incredible that God should have a Son, the offspring of his own essence; nor do we imply affection or division of God’s essence when we speak of ‘Son’ and ‘offspring’; but rather, as acknowledging the genuine, and true, and only-begotten of God, so we believe.”⁵³

St. Athanasius, *Defence of the Nicene Definition*, 350/351: “19 ...But as to the Word, since he is not a creature, he alone is both called and is ‘from the Father’; and it is significant of this sense to say that the Son is ‘from the essence of the Father’... And on this account did the Holy Council [of Nicea] declare expressly that he was of the essence of the Father...

“23. ...For how can these be his, unless he [the Son] be proper offspring of the Father’s essence? ...Indeed, if we say that the Word is from the essence of God (for after what has been said this must be a phrase admitted by them), what does this mean but the truth and eternity of the essence from which he is begotten? For it is not different in kind, lest it be combined with the essence of God as something foreign and unlike it. Nor is he like only outwardly, lest he seem in some respect or wholly to be other in essence, as brass shines like gold and silver like tin. For these

⁵¹ Profession of Faith Concerning the Trinity. D. 296.

⁵² b, 5, n. 37.

⁵³ disc. 1, c. 5, n. 16.

are foreign and of other nature, are separated off from each other in nature and virtues, nor is brass proper to gold, nor is the pigeon born from the doves; but though they are considered like, yet they differ in essence. If then it be thus with the Son, let him be a creature as we are, and not one in essence; but if the Son is Word, wisdom, image of the Father, radiance, he must in all reason be one in essence. For unless it be proved that he is not from God, but an instrument different in nature and different in essence, surely the Council was sound in its doctrine and correct in its decree.”

St. Augustine, *The Trinity*, 400-416: “Whence the Father and Son together are one wisdom, because one essence, and singly wisdom of wisdom, as essence of essence. And hence they are not therefore not one essence, because the Father is not the Son, and the Son is not the Father, or because the Father is un-begotten, but the Son is begotten: since by these names only their *relative* attributes are expressed. But both together are one wisdom and one essence; in which to be, is the same as to be wise. And both together are not the Word or the Son, since to be is not the same as to be the Word or the Son, as we have already sufficiently shown that these terms are spoken relatively.”⁵⁴

In the late 13th century Peter Olivi (d. 1298) taught this dogma and was denounced as a heretic for it:

Fiona Robb: “Olivi even reproduces the very argument which scholastic commentators had attributed to Joachim, namely that if it is objected ‘essence begot essence, therefore another essence,’ it should similarly apply that for ‘God begot God it follows there is another God.’^{55,56}

Even though Peter Olivi may have been a heretic in other regards (as I have not had time to study his other teachings), he held the dogma in this regard; that the divine essence begot, is begotten, and proceeds. And he believed the dogma that there is only one divine essence and thus all three persons in the Holy Trinity share the same one divine essence. Hence when he said that the divine essence repeats itself in the Son and the Holy Spirit, he did not mean by way of creating another essence but by way of the same one essence generating itself in the Son (by way of begetting) and the Holy Spirit (by way of proceeding from the Father and the Son) and thus he did not believe that there are three divine essences. But the heretics, nevertheless, denounced him as a heretical polytheist for holding the dogma:

Fiona Robb: “According to Ubertino of Casale (d. c. 1329-41), one of Olivi’s supporters writing in 1311 during the second wave of attacks on Olivi’s teachings, ... At the same time, it was singled out by critics such as Augustinus Triumphus (d. 1328), one of the theologians commissioned by Pope Clement V in 1310 to examine Olivi’s doctrines yet again. Of the twelve errors which he attributes to Olivi, the first two concerned the triplication and generation of the divine essence...

“Thus, says Olivi, he stands accused of asserting that the essence is repeated in the three *supposita* [persons], rather than saying that the essence is one in three *supposita*. Olivi counters that he has not spoken of the divine essence as repeated in any straightforward way (*simpliciter*) but according to a certain definition whereby it is legitimate to say that it is repeated in several *supposita*. For any repetition

⁵⁴ b. 7, v. 2, n. 3.

⁵⁵ Footnote 161: “*Ainplior declaratio*, p. 373.3-5: ‘si essentia genuit essentiam, ergo aliam essentiam, dicendum quod si haec consequentia bona est, tunc eadem ratione sequitur: Deus generat Deum, ergo alium Deum’; similarly, *ibid.*, p. 380.32-7: ‘Et certe sicut nulla est contradictio dicere quod est Deus generans et Deus genitus et Deus Trinitas. quamvis in primis duabus li Deus sumatur singulariter, scilicet in prima pro solo Patre et in secunda pro solo Filio, in tertia vero sumatur communiter, sic nec oportet quod huius praedicta respectu essentiae sibi invicem contradicant.’ Olivi also contravenes another axiom of grammatical theology, that ‘essence’ never stands for Person. *ibid.*, p. 378.28-36: ‘essentia stat aliquando pro tribus personis simul [...] Aliquando stat pro duabus tantum Aliquando stat pro una sola persona, ut cum dicitur essentia de essential.’ ”

⁵⁶ *Intellectual Tradition and Misunderstanding: The Development of Academic Theology on the Trinity in the Twelfth and Thirteenth Centuries*, 1993. Chap. 7, sec. 3, p. 273.

concerns the mode of personal existence only. And if his opponents charge that such words as *replicata* and *geminata* are improper and should under no circumstances be attributed to the essence, then they are in the same breath also condemning the many *sancti* who used similar expressions. Olivi cites a number of authorities in his favour, including [RJMI: apostate] Boethius, Hilary of Poitiers and Saint [RJMI: apostate] Anselm. From this he concludes:

‘It is clear that the aforementioned saints and doctors have stated that the essence is *repetita*, *replicata*, and *geminata* [...] for it is certain that those words, understood according to the aforementioned definitions, do not signify any essential diversification, numeration or mutation in the divine essence, but only its personal production or communication or its acceptance of the diverse modes of existence of the persons.’^{57,58}

In spite of Olivi’s good defence of the dogma, he was denounced as a heretic by those who denied the dogma.

The origin of the heresy is a quote from St. Augustine taken out of context

The heretics take St. Augustine’s teaching that “there is nothing whatsoever that begets itself that it may exist” out of context to defend their heresy that the divine essence does not beget, is not begotten, and does not proceed:

Apostate Peter Lombard, *Sentences*, 1150: “For as Augustine says in the first book On the Trinity: ⁵⁹ ‘There is no thing, which begets itself, to be.’⁶⁰ ... Thus there also must not be said, that the divine essence begot the Son, because since the Son is the divine essence, the Son would already be the thing, by which he is generated: and thus the same thing would generate its very self.”⁶¹

Apostate Thomas Aquinas, *Summa*, **On the contrary**, Augustine says (De Trin. i, 1): ‘Nothing begets itself.’ But if the essence begets the essence, it begets itself only, since nothing exists in God as distinguished from the divine essence. Therefore the essence does not beget essence.”⁶²

Fiona Robb: “The very first question with which he [Lombard] deals is the proposition that ‘God begot God’ implies ‘God begot himself or another God.’ Immediately, therefore, we enter the semantic discussion about the term ‘God.’ This is crucially important in subsequent writings, including thirteenth-century interpretations of the Lateran decree. In his account of the position of Alberic of Reims, the Lombard, like Abelard and the anonymous *Summa Sententiarum*, identifies the root of the problem in the expression from the Nicene Creed ‘God from God.’ The Lombard’s version of Alberic’s argument is almost identical with Abelard’s. The basic apparatus, including the important Augustinian *dictum* that ‘no thing begets itself,’⁶³ was to become a permanent feature of twelfth- and thirteenth-century discussion.”⁶⁴ ...⁶⁵

⁵⁷ Footnote 132: “*Responsio II*, p. 146.26-38: ‘Tatet igitur sanctose et doctores praedictos dixisse essentiam in personis repetitam, iteratam, geminatam [...] certum est enim quod verba, sub praedictis determinationibus sumpta, nullam essentialem diversificationem, aut numerationem aut mutationem significant in essentia divina, sed solum personalem eius productionem, vel communicationem sive acceptionem diversorum modorum existendi personalium.’”

⁵⁸ *Intellectual Tradition and Misunderstanding: The Development of Academic Theology on the Trinity in the Twelfth and Thirteenth Centuries*, 1993. Chap. 7, sec. 3, pp. 264, 266-267.

⁵⁹ Footnote: “Augustine, *De Trinitate*, b. 1, c. 1, n. 1.”

⁶⁰ b. 1, dist. 4, c. 1, n. 1.

⁶¹ b. 1, dist. 5, c. 1, n. 6.

⁶² I, q. 39, art. 5.

⁶³ Footnote 81: “Augustine. *De trin.* l.1. CCSL 50, p.28.33-6. PL 42.820.”

⁶⁴ Footnote 82: “For subsequent treatments of the same question in unpublished manuscripts, citing the Augustinian passage: *Glossa*, BM Royal 7F XIII. fol. 7va; *Sententie Udonis*. Munich Clm. 7622, fol. 4ra; Hubertus, *Summa*. Munich Clm. 28799. fol.3ra; *Summa*.

“The proposition ‘God begot another God’ is totally inadmissible, since there is no doubt that there is only one God. The remaining proposition, that ‘God begot himself,’ is equally absurd, since as Augustine states, ‘no thing begets itself’...⁶⁶

“Aquinas’...argument repeats the Augustinian principle, which had come to occupy such a central place in the *Sentences*, that the essence cannot conceivably beget since no thing begets itself.^{67,68}

What follows is St. Augustine’s teaching:

St. Augustine, *The Trinity*, 400-416: “On the other hand, he who believes that the power of God is such that he himself has begotten himself errs all the more, since, not only does God not exist in such a way, but neither does a spiritual nor a corporeal creature so exist, for there is nothing whatsoever that begets itself that it may exist.”⁶⁹

St. Augustine is speaking of the very existence of God himself and thus of the origin of the Holy Trinity, of God the Father, also known as the anchor of the Holy Trinity. He is proving the dogma that God the Father is unbegotten. The question is, How could God beget himself into existence if he did not exist before he was begotten into existence? If God the Father was begotten, then the thing that begot him had to be God and thus God the Father would be God the Son and the person that begot him would be God the Father. And the same problem would exist with this God the Father—How did he come to be! It has to stop with a God that is unbegotten:

St. Augustine and Alypius, *Letter 170*, to Maximus, 415: “If we consider their origin, the Father is God from whom the Son is God, but there is no god previous to God the Father.”

And if one were to say that the thing that begot God the Father was not God, then how can something that is not God beget God? And who created that thing that begot God the Father? The only solution is the dogma that God the Father is unbegotten and thus God did not beget himself into existence. That is what St. Augustine means when he says,

“He who thinks that God is of such power as to have generated himself, is so much the more in error... for there is nothing whatsoever that begets itself that it may exist.”

And St. Fulgentius confirms it:

St. Fulgentius of Ruspe, *To Peter on the Faith*, 6th century: “10. Therefore, God the Father, begotten by no God, once from his own nature, without a beginning, begot God the Son, equal to himself and co-eternal in divinity by that same nature by which he himself is eternal. But the very same God the Son since he is God eternal and true and with the Father by nature one God in his divinity... 15. ...Therefore, believe that Christ, the Son of God, i.e., one of the persons of the Trinity, is true God, so that you do not doubt that his divinity has been born of the nature of the Father.”⁷⁰

Hence when God the Son was begotten from God the Father, God already existed in God the Father. And God the Father did not beget himself into existence. Now all this happens in eternity.

BM Royal 9E XII, fol. 151va. Not citing Augustine: *Quaestiones*, BM Harley 3855, fol. 12ra and Paris Maz. 1708. fol. 249ra; Peter of Captia, Suinina, Munich Clm. 14508, fol. 2ra; *Quaestiones*. BM Royal 9E XII fol. 233ra, *Commentariuin in Petri Lombardi Sententiaruin prologum*, BN lat. 3804A, fol. 185va. Authors citing the Augustinian passage tend both to cite more authorities in general and to rely more on the *Sentences*, from where they take these authorities, than their counterparts.”

⁶⁵ c. 4, sec. 2, p. 89.

⁶⁶ c. 5, sec. 5, p. 158.

⁶⁷ c. 7, sec. 1, p. 252.

⁶⁸ *Intellectual Tradition and Misunderstanding: The Development of Academic Theology on the Trinity in the Twelfth and Thirteenth Centuries*, 1993.

⁶⁹ b. 1, 1.

⁷⁰ c. 2.

Hence when God the Father eternally begot God the Son, God the Father already eternally existed. Of course he had to, or else how could he have eternally begotten the Son if he himself did not eternally exist. And thus the divine essence of God the Father truly begot the divine essence in God the Son but the divine essence already existed in God the Father.

St. Augustine also correctly teaches that no spiritual or bodily creature generates itself into existence, when he said the following:

“But he who thinks that God is of such power as to have generated himself, is so much the more in error, because not only does God not so exist, but neither does the spiritual nor the bodily creature.”

All human souls are created by God and thus a human does not generate his own soul. And no human can generate his own body. The body of Adam was created by God out of the slime of the earth, and other human bodies are born from their parents. In the same way, God could not have generated himself into existence because he would not have existed before he generated himself into existence. Hence the dogma that God the Father is unbegotten. In fact, one of God the Father’s names is the “Unbegotten.”

What makes the heretics all the more culpable who take St. Augustine’s teachings out of context to defend their heresy that the divine essence does not beget, is not begotten, and does not proceed, is that they ignore or despise a multitude of St. Augustine’s teachings in which he clearly and explicitly teaches that the divine essence (divine substance) begot, is begotten, and proceeds. For example,⁷¹

St. Augustine and Alypius, *Letter 170*, to Maximus, 415: “But the only-begotten Son does not come of God the Father as the whole of creation came from him, which he created from nothing. He begot the Son of his own substance [divine essence], he did not make him out of nothing...”

St. Augustine, *The Trinity*, 400-416: “He [the Father] has begotten his own essence [in his Son].”⁷²

The Heresy Was Held by Scholastics and Others

From the time the apostate Lombard’s *Sentences* was promulgated in 1150, most of the following scholastics held the heresy that the divine essence does not beget, is not begotten, and does not proceed. And from the time of the invalid and heretical Fourth Lateran Council in 1215, they had to hold this heresy or else they were condemned and cast out from among “acceptable” theologians:

Fiona Robb: “The *Sentences* represent a landmark in twelfth-century theology... I hope to show how and to what extent the *Sentences* served as a mediator of earlier debates and a constant point of reference for theologians in the later period. The presence of the *Sentences* as a common denominator in the study of theology was one factor in the development of a distinct method, which may broadly be defined as a consensus, in trinitarian theology in the later twelfth century... This consensus was one of the preconditions for the statement on the Trinity issued by the Fourth Lateran Council...”⁷³

“The heated debates and personal exchanges which characterised the first half of the twelfth century tailed off during the second. This change in tone and intensity was partly a consequence of the replacement of one generation of theologians by

⁷¹ For more examples, see in this book “The ordinary magisterium teaches the dogma: St. Augustine,” p. 26.

⁷² b. 7, c. 1, n. 1.

⁷³ c. 1 (Introduction), pp. 13, 15.

another, the early pioneers by their successors. Another factor in the shift to a more structured and impersonal approach was the institutionalisation of study itself, particularly the increasing authority of the master and pivotal role of the *quaestio* technique. In this chapter I wish to consider a further aspect, strongly interrelated to these two: the role of Peter Lombard's *Sentences* as a common source in the academic study of theology and as a text which informs the structure of virtually all subsequent scholastic theological writings, irrespective of any notional allegiance of the authors to a particular master or school.

“The *Sentences* both reflected this tendency towards greater convergence in method and doctrine among theologians and at the same time were an agent in this process. There is no denying the work's central role, intellectually and chronologically, in opening the way to the doctrinal consensus of the later twelfth century. Its universal adoption as a theological reference work was a necessary precondition for the emergence of this consensus before 1215. In particular, the Lombard's concept of the essence as a *quaedam summa res*, and his related position that the essence does not beget, were at the centre of the Fourth Lateran Council's clarification of the doctrine. For the Lombard, as for Abelard, there is an implicit link between the doctrines of divine unity (of essence) and divine generation (not of essence) which is reflected in the Lateran decree itself. His position that unity of essence (*quaedam summa res*) precludes the generation of the essence is cited in the decree.^{74,75}

The starting point of heretical theology is the heresy and not the dogma

The theology of heretics defending their heresy is endlessly bound to be contradictory, twisted, and confused and thus with no true solution because it set out to defend a heresy and not a dogma. Their starting point is the heresy and not the dogma. If the dogma were their starting point, there would be a solution and hence their theology would eventually be correct. Thus the heresy that the divine essence does not beget, is not begotten, and does not proceed is the starting point for the heretics' theology. Consequently, their theology is endlessly bound to be contradictory, twisted, and confused and thus with no solution.

After the invalid and heretical Fourth Lateran Council, all of the theologians had to believe in this heresy or else they would be condemned as heretics and forbidden to teach the faith. Some of those who did not hold the heresy defended the dogma in their private writings; and some of their teachings were brought before councils and condemned, such as Peter Olivi's.

However, the apostate antipopes and theologians were never bold enough to teach this heresy to laymen and your average bishop and priest because they knew that they would reject it by the very sound of it, by the very hearing of the words “The Divine Essence (and thus God) does not beget, is not begotten, and does not proceed,” because these words are contrary to the very Nicene Creed they profess during Mass⁷⁶ and the Athanasian Creed they profess during the Divine Office.

In this chapter, I will refute the most influential scholastic, the apostate Thomas Aquinas, who is a representative of all the scholastics who held the heresy before and after him. I will then refute two modern-day scholastics who hold the heresy, the apostate Dimond Brothers.

⁷⁴ c. 4, p. 74.

⁷⁵ *Intellectual Tradition and Misunderstanding: The Development of Academic Theology on the Trinity in the Twelfth and Thirteenth Centuries*, 1993.

⁷⁶ The creed that is said during Mass is incorrectly called the Nicene Creed. It is actually the amended Constantinople Creed.

The apostate Thomas Aquinas held the heresy

Aquinas treats the Creator as a creature in regard to generation

In order to justify his heresy that the divine essence does not beget, is not begotten, and does not proceed, the apostate Thomas Aquinas puts reason over faith and treats God as a creature and not as the Creator:

Apostate Thomas Aquinas, *Expositio, super secundum decretalem*, 13th century: “If therefore the divine essence begets or proceeds, it follows that just as the Father is one Person, the Son another, and the Holy Spirit yet another, so too would their own essence or substance be still yet another [divine essence].”⁷⁷

His statement would be true if he were referring to a human creature, but it is heresy because he is referring to God. While the generating of humans is similar in some ways to the generating of God, it is not exactly the same but differs in some very important points. God is eternal and humans are not.

Aquinas treats the Creator as a creature because he believes that they are not only alike in some ways regarding begetting (which is true) but that they are *exactly* alike (which is heresy). For example, a human being begets another human being, another person other than himself, and gives him a body like his own but not his own body. Hence Aquinas also believes that God’s way of begetting is exactly the same. Therefore he believes that if God (and thus his divine essence) begets God (a divine essence), then that divine essence would not only be another person (which is true) but would also be another divine essence like unto his divine essence but not exactly the same (which is heresy). Thus when Aquinas treats the Creator as a creature by putting human reason over faith, he fails to see that a human being begetting a human being differs from God begetting God.

The dogma is as follows: While human nature begets another person and another human nature, the divine nature (divine essence) begot another person but did not beget another divine nature but begot the very same divine nature. Hence the divine essence of the Father begot another person in the Son but begot the same divine nature in the Son and thus did not beget another divine nature in the Son.

Each divine person consists of the one divine essence they share in common. Hence the divine person of the Father is not separate from his divine essence. It is one and the same thing because the nature of God is simple and not compound; that is, the nature of God consists of only one thing and thus not many things. It consists of his divine essence and nothing more. The difference between the divine persons is their manner of eternal existence, the manner in which each has or got the one divine essence they share in common.⁷⁸

Hence when the Father begot the person of the Son, at that same instant he begot the divine essence of the Son. While the person of the Son is another person other than the Father, the divine essence of the Son is the same divine essence as the Father and thus not another essence. You may ask, How is this possible? Well, this is a supernatural mystery and thus no creature will ever be able to reasonably understand how this is possible any more than they can reasonably understand how God the Son was truly born from the Father and yet be God but not another God but the same God as God the Father and thus the Father and the Son are one God and not two Gods. Likewise, even though the divine essence of the Father begot the divine essence of the Son, that does not make two divine essences but only one divine essence. And that is why Catholics

⁷⁷ *Opuscula Theologica* I (Rome, 1954), pp. 428-31. “Si ergo essential divina generat vel procedit, consequens est quod sicut est alia persona Patris, alia Filii, alia Spiritus sancti, ita etiam sit earum alia et alia substantia vel essential.”

⁷⁸ See in this book “The nature of God is simple and thus not compound,” p. [29](#).

accept these dogmas by faith alone even though they cannot reasonably understand them because these dogmas contradict human reason.

In the following quote Aquinas, again, treats the Creator as a creature in regard to the manner of generation. Objection 2 teaches the dogma, and Aquinas' reply teaches the heresy:

“Apostate Thomas Aquinas, *Summa*, I, q. 39, art. 5:

“**Objection 2.** Further, generation or corruption in ourselves implies generation or corruption of what is within us. But the Son is generated. Therefore since the divine essence is in the Son, it seems that the divine essence is generated.

“**Reply to Objection 2.** In creatures the one generated has not the same nature numerically as the generator, but another nature, numerically distinct, which commences to exist in it anew by generation, and ceases to exist by corruption, and so it is generated and corrupted accidentally; whereas God begotten has the same nature numerically as the begetter. So the divine nature in the Son is not begotten either directly or accidentally.”

Indeed, a human being generates another person and another human nature. However, when the divine essence of the Father generated the Son, he did not generate another divine essence but generated the exact same one divine essence as his own, even though he generated another person. That is one of the big differences between the creature and the Creator (the Eternal). And because this contradicts human reason and the human way of begetting, Aquinas rejects it because he puts reason over faith; in this case, he refused to believe by faith alone the supernatural mystery that while the divine essence begot, is begotten, and proceeds, it is the exact same divine essence in all three divine persons.

The following Church Fathers condemn Aquinas' heresy and Aquinas for treating the Creator and creature as equal in regard to begetting:

St. Cyril of Jerusalem, *Catechetical Lectures*, Lecture 4, 4th century: “7. Believe also in the Son of God, one and only, our Lord Jesus Christ, who was begotten God of God, begotten Life of Life, begotten Light of Light, who is in all things like to him that begat, who received not his being in time [like human beings], but was before all ages eternally and incomprehensibly begotten of the Father.”

St. Athanasius, *Four Discourses against the Arians*, 358-362: “He [God] begets not as men beget but as God begets.”⁷⁹

St. Athanasius, *Defence of the Nicene Definition*, 350/351: “3. ...The Word is an offspring from the substance of the Father...”

“24. Further, let every corporeal reference be banished on this subject [by comparing divine generation to human generation]; and transcending every imagination of sense, let us, with pure understanding and with mind alone, apprehend the genuine relation of son to father, and the Word's proper relation towards God, and the unvarying likeness of the radiance towards the light: for as the words ‘Offspring’ and ‘Son’ bear, and are meant to bear, no human sense [as to human generation], but one suitable to God, in like manner when we hear the phrase ‘one in essence,’ let us not fall upon human senses, and imagine partitions and divisions of the Godhead, but as having our thoughts directed to things immaterial, let us preserve undivided the oneness of nature...”

“19. ...But as to the Word, since he is not a creature [such as a human being], he alone is both called and is ‘from the Father’; and it is significant of this sense to say that the Son is ‘from the essence of the Father’... And on this account did the Holy Council [of Nicea] declare expressly that he was of the essence of the Father...”

“20. ...The generation of the Son from the Father is not according to the nature of men, and not only like, but also inseparable from the essence of the Father...”

⁷⁹ disc. 1, n. 23.

“22. ...Therefore let no one be startled on hearing that the Son of God is from the essence of the Father; ... If then the Word is not in such sense from God, as a son, genuine and natural, from a father, but only as creatures because they are framed, and as ‘all things are from God,’ then neither is he from the essence of the Father, nor is the Son again Son according to essence, but in consequence of virtue, as we who are called sons by grace. But if he only is from God, as a genuine Son, as he is, then the Son may reasonably be called from the essence of God.”

St. Athanasius, *Four Discourses against the Arians*, 356-360: “As we said above, so now we repeat, that the divine generation must not be compared to the nature of men, nor the Son considered to be part of God, nor the generation to imply any passion whatever; God is not as man; for men beget passably, having a transitive nature, which waits for periods by reason of its weakness. But with God this cannot be; for he is not composed of parts, but being impassible and simple, he is impassibly and indivisibly Father of the Son.”⁸⁰

St. Hilary of Poitiers, *On the Trinity*, 4th century: “He therefore, the Unbegotten, before time has begot a Son from himself; not from any pre-existent matter [as human generation], for all things are through the Son; not from nothing, for the Son is from the Father’s self; not by way of childbirth [as humans], for in God there is neither change nor void; not as a piece of himself cut or torn off or stretched out... He begat the only-begotten from his own unbegotten substance...”⁸¹

“The nature with which God is born is necessarily the same as that of his source [God and not human]. He cannot come into existence as other than God, since his origin is from none other than God... Hence, in the generation of the Son, the incorporeal and unchangeable God [not corporal and changeable humans] begets, in accordance with his own nature, God incorporeal and unchangeable; and this perfect birth of incorporeal and unchangeable God from incorporeal and unchangeable God involves, as we see in the light of the revelation of God from God, no diminution of the begetter’s substance.”⁸²

Also, see in this book the quote from Apostate Gregory Nazianzus, p. [20](#).

Hence when God the Father and thus his divine essence begot God the Son and his divine essence, he begot another person but did not beget another divine essence but begot in the Son the exact same divine essence as his own. And he did not lose any of his own divine essence. Therefore, the divine essence of the Father and the Son is the exact same one divine essence. Here is where faith in the dogma comes in because men can never understand how this is possible since it contradicts human reason, just as men can never reasonably understand how God the Son is truly born and yet always existed or how God always existed. However, these supernatural mysteries do not contradict divine reason and the divine science, which can only be reasonably understood by God.

Hence Aquinas and those who believe like him are dumber than animals

As a result of Aquinas’ putting reason over faith, in this regard, by treating the creature as equal to the Creator, he proves himself, yet again, to be illogical and more stupid than an ass. And this applies to all who hold the heresy that the divine essence does not beget, is not begotten, and does not proceed. They are all illogical and dumber than an ass. After all, this is the curse that falls upon all those who fall away from the faith, who do not like to have the knowledge of the faith that was handed down during the first 1000 years of the Catholic Church. St. Paul put it this way:

⁸⁰ disc. 1, c. 8, n. 28.

⁸¹ b. 3, n. 3.

⁸² b. 5, n. 37.

“For professing themselves to be wise, they became fools... Who changed the truth of God into a lie; and worshipped and served the creature rather than the Creator, who is blessed for ever... And as they liked not to have God in their knowledge, God delivered them up to a reprobate sense, to do those things which they ought not.” (Rom. 1:22, 25, 28)

And the holy Prophet Isaias says that those who fall away (such as the apostate Aquinas) are lower and more stupid than senseless animals:

“Hear, O ye heavens, and give ear, O earth, for the Lord hath spoken. I have brought up children, and exalted them: but they have despised me [in the dogmas of the Catholic Church]. The ox knoweth his owner, and the ass his master’s crib: but Israel hath not known me, and my people hath not understood. Woe to the sinful nation, a people laden with iniquity, a wicked seed, ungracious children: they have forsaken the Lord, they have blasphemed the Holy One of Israel, they are gone away backwards.” (Isa. 1:2-4)

For other curses that Aquinas and those like him are under, see in this book “Why God allowed this dilemma,” p. [17](#).

Aquinas contradicts himself and evades answering objections

While in one place Aquinas professes the dogma that the nature of God is simple and not compound, he denies it in another place and thus contradicts himself. Out of one side of his mouth, he teaches the heresy that the divine essence does not beget, is not begotten, and does not proceed; but out of the other side of his mouth (like the two-faced Janus), he teaches the dogma that the nature of God is simple and thus not compound:

Apostate Thomas Aquinas, *Summa*, I, q. 39, art. 5:

“I answer that, Concerning this, the abbot Joachim [heresy] erred in asserting that as we can say ‘God begot God,’ so we can say ‘Essence begot Essence’: considering that, [dogma] by reason of the divine simplicity God is nothing else but the divine essence. In this he was wrong, because if we wish to express ourselves correctly, we must take into account not only the thing which is signified, but also the mode of its signification as above stated.”

If the nature of God is simple and thus not compound, as Aquinas correctly states, then the Father and his divine essence (as they are one and not compound) begot the Son and his divine essence (as the Son and his divine essence are one and not compound). Hence when Aquinas teaches the heresy that the divine essence does not beget, he contradicts his correct teaching that the nature of God is simple and not compound.

In the last part of his statement, Aquinas lies about Joachim’s belief when he says the following:

“In this he was wrong, because if we wish to express ourselves correctly, we must take into account not only the thing which is signified, but also the mode of its signification as above stated.”

It is true that we must take into account not only the person (the thing which is signified) but also the manner of each person’s eternal existence (the mode of its signification); that is, the Father is unbegotten, the Son is begot, and the Holy Spirit proceeds. Joachim believed this and thus was not wrong in this regard. But that does not answer the question as to how the Father has the divine essence and how the Son and the Holy Spirit got the divine essence. This is a question that Aquinas does not answer; and if he did, it would be a heretical answer because he denies the dogma that tells us how the Father has the divine essence and how the Son and the Holy Spirit got

the divine essence. The Father's divine essence is unbegotten; the Son's divine essence is begotten from the divine essence of the Father; and the Holy Spirit's divine essence proceeds from the divine essence of the Father and from the divine essence of the Son. Yet, they all share the exact same one divine essence even though they are three distinct persons.

Here is another example in which Aquinas evades answering the question regarding the manner in which each person has or got the divine essence. Objection 3 teaches the dogma, and Aquinas evades answering the question:

“Apostate Thomas Aquinas, *Summa*, I, q. 39, art. 5:

“**Objection 3.** Further, God and the divine essence are the same, as is clear from what is above explained (3, 3). But, as was shown, it is true to say that ‘God begets God.’ Therefore this is also true: ‘Essence begets Essence.’

“**Reply to Objection 3.** Although God and the divine essence are really the same, nevertheless, on account of their different mode of signification, we must speak in a different way about each of them.”

Again Aquinas teaches the dogma that the nature of God is simple and not compound—“God and the divine essence are really the same.” And he correctly teaches that there is a difference between the persons (signification) regarding the manner of their eternal existence (the mode of signification). But in his reply, he evades answering the question of the manner in which each person has or got the divine essence.

In his reply to Objection 4, Aquinas, again, contradicts himself. Objection 4 teaches the dogma; and Aquinas' reply teaches a dogma, then a heresy, and then contradicts itself:

“Apostate Thomas Aquinas, *Summa*, I, q. 39, art. 5:

“**Objection 4.** Further, a predicate can stand for that of which it is predicated. But the Father is the divine essence; therefore essence can stand for the person of the Father. Thus the essence begets.

“**Reply to Objection 4.** [dogma] The divine essence is predicated of the Father by mode of identity by reason of the divine simplicity; [heresy] yet it does not follow that it can stand for the Father, its mode of signification being different. This objection would hold good as regards things which are predicated of another as the universal of a particular.”

If the divine essence of the Father is one and the same with the person of the Father, then how can the divine essence not stand for the Father—“yet it [the divine essence] does not follow that it can stand for the Father.”

Aquinas then says “its [the divine essence's] mode of signification being different,” but he does not say different from what. In context, he is clearly teaching about the Father and not the Son and the Holy Spirit. Hence the subject is the Father's person and the Father's divine essence, as Aquinas distinguishes a difference between the “mode of identity” (of the person of the Father) from his “mode of signification” (the manner in which the Father eternally exists), all of which is true. But he teaches heresy when he says that the manner of the eternal existence of the Father's person is different from the manner of the eternal existence of the Father's divine essence; and, by this, he also denies the dogma that the nature of God the Father is simple and thus not compound. He denies the dogma that the manner of the eternal existence of the person of the Father is exactly the same as the manner of the eternal existence of the divine essence of the Father, being one and the same thing; so much so that the Father is referred to as the Unbegotten, or the Ungenerate, the person as well as his divine essence, as they are inseparable.

What follows is another example of Aquinas' heresy that there is a difference between the person of the Father and the divine essence of the Father in that he has the person doing a thing

the divine essence does not do, in this case begetting the Son. Objection 5 teaches the dogma, and Aquinas' reply teaches the heresy:

“Apostate Thomas Aquinas, *Summa*, I, q. 39, art. 5:

“**Objection 5.** Further, the essence is ‘a thing begetting,’ because the essence is the Father who is begetting. Therefore if the essence is not begetting, the essence will be ‘a thing begetting,’ and ‘not begetting’: which cannot be.

“**Reply to Objection 5.** ... We cannot say that the ‘essence is begetting’; yet we can say that the ‘essence is a thing begetting,’ or that it is ‘God begetting,’ if ‘thing’ and God stand for person, but not if they stand for essence. Consequently there exists no contradiction in saying that ‘essence is a thing begetting,’ and ‘a thing not begetting’; because in the first case ‘thing’ stands for person, and in the second it stands for the essence.”

Aquinas teaches the heresy that the Father's person is different from the Father's divine essence when he says that the words “essence of a thing begetting” means the person of the Father but not his divine essence and that the words “a thing not begetting” refers to the divine essence of the Father but not to his person. Hence he has the person of the Father begetting while the divine essence of the Father is not begetting. Consequently, he separates the person of the Father from the divine essence of the Father, which, again, is heresy for implying that the nature of God is compound and not simple; and it is heresy for teaching that the divine essence has not begotten the divine essence of the Son. For what is the person of the Father without his divine essence?—nothing, only a name! Consequently, Aquinass actually teaches that a name only (Father) begot a name only (Son):

St. Athanasius, *On the Councils of Ariminum and Seleucia*, 4th century: “34. ... Tell us yourselves, why is it you are not pleased with the phrase ‘of the essence’ (this must first be enquired about), when you yourselves have written that the Son is generated from the Father? If when you name the Father, or use the word ‘God,’ you do not signify essence, or understand him according to essence, who is that he is, but signify something else about him, not to say inferior, then you should not have written that the Son was from the Father, but from what is about him or in him; and so, shrinking from saying that God is truly Father, and making him compound who is simple, in a material way, you will be authors of a newer blasphemy. And, with such ideas, you must needs consider the Word, and the title ‘Son,’ not as an essence but as a name only, and in consequence hold your own views as far as names only.”⁸³

And when Aquinas says the following, he again teaches that the person of the Father is different from the divine essence of the Father:

“Yet we can say that the ‘essence is a thing begetting,’ or that it is ‘God begetting,’ if ‘thing’ and God stand for person, but not if they stand for essence.”

Hence Aquinas' thing that begets is the person of the Father but not his divine essence, which is heresy, and implies another heresy that the nature of God is compound and not simple, which, again, contradicts his teaching elsewhere that the nature of God is simple.

He then goes on to teach again the heresy that there are two things in God the Father and thus his nature is compound and not simple. One thing (the Father's person) begets, but the other thing (the Father's divine essence) does not beget:

“Consequently there exists no contradiction in saying that ‘essence is a thing begetting,’ and ‘a thing not begetting’; because in the first case ‘thing’ stands for person, and in the second it stands for the essence.”

⁸³ pt. 3.

What follows is yet another example of Aquinas' heresy that there is a difference between the person of the Father and his divine essence. Objection 6 teaches the dogma, and Aquinas' reply teaches the heresy:

Apostate Thomas Aquinas, *Summa*, I, q. 39, art. 5:

“Objection 6. Further, Augustine says (De Trin. iv, 20): ‘The Father is the principle of the whole Godhead.’ But he is principle only by begetting or spirating. Therefore the Father begets or spirates the Godhead.

“Reply to Objection 6. ... We may also say that he [God the Father] is the principle of the whole Godhead; not as generating or spirating it, but as communicating it by generation and spiration.”

What, then, has the Father begotten?—Only the person of the Son and not his divine essence? Hence Aquinas teaches that the person of the Father begot the person of the Son but did not beget the divine essence of the Son. And he has the divine essence of the Father communicating but not begetting itself to the Son and hence denies the dogma that the Father's divine essence begot the Son's divine essence. But Aquinas does not even attempt to say how the Father communicated his divine essence to the Son without begetting it.

And, again, Aquinas is teaching that the nature of God the Father is compound and not simple because he has the person of the Father and his divine essence performing two separate actions or not performing the same action. In this case, he has the Father's person begetting the person of the Son but not begetting his divine essence while he has the Father's divine essence communicating but not begetting itself to the Son. How can this be if the nature of God is simple and not compound, if the person of the Father is the exact same thing as his divine essence!

And since Aquinas believes that there would be two divine essences if the divine essence of the Father begot the divine essence of the Son, he would also have to likewise believe that there would also be two divine essences if the divine essence of the Father communicated itself to the Son; either way, the Son got the divine essence from the Father. And, of course, it is heresy to believe that the divine essence of the Father has not begotten the divine essence of the Son. Hence, on this point alone, Aquinas is a heretic for teaching that the divine essence of the Father was communicated to the Son without having been begotten in the Son.

Aquinas says “essence from essence” does not really mean “essence from essence”

In the following quote, Aquinas teaches that the words “essence from essence” as used by some of the Church Fathers is inaccurate and thus actually does not really mean “essence from essence.” Objection 6 teaches the dogma, and Aquinas' reply teaches the heresy:

Apostate Thomas Aquinas, *Summa*, I, q. 39, art. 5:

“Objection 1. It would seem that abstract essential names can stand for the person, so that this proposition is true, ‘Essence begets essence.’ For Augustine says (De Trin. vii, i, 2): ‘The Father and the Son are one Wisdom, because they are one essence; and taken singly Wisdom is from Wisdom, as essence from essence.’

“Reply to Objection 1. To express unity of essence and of person, the holy Doctors have sometimes expressed themselves with greater emphasis than the strict propriety of terms allows. Whence instead of enlarging upon such expressions we should rather explain them: thus, ... when we find ‘essence from essence’; or ‘wisdom from wisdom’; we should take the sense to be, ‘the Son’ who is essence and wisdom, is from the Father who is essence and wisdom.’ ”

Hence, Aquinas waves his magic wand and wants us to see what we do not see. He wants us to believe that the words “essence from essence” or otherwise stated “the divine essence of the Son

is from the divine essence of the Father” means that even though the Son is from the Father, and they both have the same divine essence, that does not mean that the divine essence of the Son is really from the divine essence of the Father. So, according to Aquinas, the Church Fathers used sloppy words. They should have never said “essence from essence” but only “Son from Father” or “person from person.”

Actually Aquinas also, by implication at least, condemns as sloppy the words “God of God,” as professed in the Nicene Creed:

Nicene Creed, 325: “We believe in...the Son of God, the only begotten, born of the Father...God of God, light of light, true God of true God, born, not made, of one substance with the Father.”

For if “God” means the “stuff” that makes God God (which is the divine essence), then it is the same to say “divine essence of divine essence.”

For more against Aquinas, see in this book “The heresy that there is a fourth entity in the Holy Trinity,” p. [10](#).

The apostate Dimond Brothers hold the heresy

The apostate Dimond Brothers have also despised and rejected many dogmas of the Catholic Church that were handed down during the first 1000 years of the Catholic Church and choose to follow and obey the scholastics and the apostate antipopes and their invalid and heretical councils. One of their many heresies is the heresy of Peter Lombard and the Fourth Lateran Council that the divine essence does not beget, is not begotten, and does not proceed. And they denounced as polytheists those who believe the dogma that the divine essence is unbegotten, begot, is begotten, and proceeds. What follows is an excerpt from a letter I received from an inquirer. I will call him Mr. X:

“12/29/2020

“Dear RJMI,

“I hope you had a blessed and merry Christmas.

“I have a bit of a deep question that I have tried my hardest to solve on my own, but I really think I need your help. It regards what you said about the Fourth Lateran Council on pages 81-82 of your book *Non-Catholics Cannot Hold Offices in the Catholic Church*. The apostate Dimonds have objected to it. I know Peter was familiar with the issue beforehand, because in his video *The Trinity & The Filioque: Catholicism Refutes Eastern “Orthodoxy,”* starting at timestamp 27:26 he explains it:

“[Peter (Bob) Dimond:] ‘In other words, we don’t say that the divine essence generates, or that the divine essence is begotten, or that the divine essence proceeds. Rather, we say that the Father generates, the Son is begotten, and the Holy Spirit proceeds. “...That reality (i.e., the divine essence, nature or substance) is not generating, nor generated, nor proceeding, but it is the Father who generates, the Son who is generated, and the Holy Spirit who proceeds, so that distinctions are in persons and unity in nature.” – Pope Innocent II, Fourth Lateran Council.’

“But recently the Dimonds stated in a message to a man from Brazil named Mr. Y (He is a potential convert, I have contacted him and recommended that he contact you guys, maybe you have already heard from him):

“[Peter (Bob) Dimond]: ‘[the belief that the divine essence begot, is begotten, and proceeds] even teaches polytheism because it holds that the divine

substance itself is begotten. That is heresy and it would mean that it was begotten from another divinity. It confuses the personal properties of the Persons (which distinguish them from the other Persons) with what is predicated of the oneness or divine substance common to all three Persons.’ ”

While it is true that the divine essence of the Father is unbegotten, it is heresy to say that the divine essence of the Father has not begotten the divine essence of the Son and thus the divine essence of the Son is not begotten. That does not mean that there are two divine essences and thus two Gods any more than the dogma that God begot God (as stated in the Council of Nicea) means that there are two Gods. Hence this dogma stated in the Council of Nicea, as well as other dogmas of the solemn magisterium and dogmas of the ordinary magisterium, condemn this heresy and thus condemn the Dimond Brothers:

Nicene Creed, 325: “We believe in...the Son of God, the only begotten, born of the Father, that is of the substance [divine essence] of the Father, God of God, light of light, true God of true God, born, not made, of one substance with the Father.”⁸⁴

And Pope St. Damasus I, in the Council of Rome in 382, infallibly teaches the following:

Pope Damasus I, *Council of Rome*, 382: “(11) If anyone does not say that the Son was begotten of the Father, that is, of the divine substance of him himself, he is a heretic.” (D. 69)

These two quotes alone (as well as all the rest of the teachings in this book that teach the dogma that the divine essence begot, is begotten, and proceeds) condemn as heretics the Dimond Brothers and all others who hold the heresy that the divine essence does not beget, is not begotten, and does not proceed.

According to the Dimond Brothers, the belief that the divine essence begot and is begotten is polytheism because they heretically believe that if the Son’s divine essence is begotten from the Father’s divine essence there would be two divine essences and thus two Gods. Hence, like the apostate Thomas Aquinas, they treat the Creator as a creature in regards to begetting. And to be consistent with their heresy, they would have to believe that if God begot God there would be two Gods. Hence they believe what the Arians and Moslems believe:

Nominal *Catholic Encyclopedia*, “Arianism”: “The drift of all he advanced was this: to deny that in any true sense God could have a Son; as Mohammed tersely said afterwards, ‘God neither begets, nor is he begotten’ (Koran, 112).”

Muslims reject the Trinity because they do not understand it, by MDI TEAM, 12/8/2014: “In simple terms then, you have three gods, if you have three different persons who are all God... So we Muslims do not understand the Trinity, and that’s why we reject it, it makes no sense, it isn’t monotheistic. Interestingly enough there are millions of Christians, not Muslims, who also believe the Trinity is polytheistic, such as Unitarian Christians, and Oneness Christians... Not only Christians as well, but it’s very well known that the Jews regard the Trinity as polytheism as well.”

Note how the Moslem says that the dogma of the Holy Trinity makes no sense and thus he puts reason over faith. He should know that many miracles in the Old Testament that he claims to believe in are above human reason and thus can only be understood by faith; such as the burning bush that does not burn; turning a rod into a serpent; parting of the Red Sea; fire burning in hail and the hail does not melt; water coming out of a rock; and the raising of the dead to life. And he should also know that the dogma that God always existed is also above human reason. This Moslem’s lack of faith in things above human reason regarding the Holy Trinity is precisely what the Dimond Brothers and all who hold the same heresy are guilty of because they believe it is

⁸⁴ Denzinger 13, Epiphanius’ version; Denzinger 54, Hilary of Poitiers’ version.

nonsense (illogical) and polytheistic to believe that the divine essence beget, is begotten, and proceeds.

Hence the Dimond Brothers, as well as all who believe like them, are akin to Arians and Moslems in regard to their heresy that the divine essence does not beget, is not begotten, and does not proceed. St. Augustine condemns not only as heretics but also as carnal all who believe that God could not beget God and thus the divine essence could not beget the divine essence:

St. Augustine, *Against the Heretic Maximus*, c. 428: “2. Full of carnal thoughts [you Dimond Brothers], you do *not* think that the substance of God begets the Son from its very self, unless by this it suffers what a substance of flesh suffers when it begets. *You err not knowing the Scriptures nor the Virtue of God.* (Mt. 22:29) For in no manner do you think (that there is) a true Son of God, if you deny that he has been born from the substance of the Father.”⁸⁵

St. Augustine, *The Trinity*, 400-416: “He [the Father] has begotten his own essence [in his Son]...”⁸⁶ The Word, therefore, the only-begotten Son of God the Father, like and equal in all things to the Father, God of God, light of light, wisdom of wisdom, essence of essence.⁸⁷”

St. Ambrose also condemns them:

St. Ambrose, *Exposition of the Christian*, 4th century: “10. We say, then, that there is one God, not two or three Gods, this being the error into which the impious heresy of the Arians doth run with its blasphemies. For it says that there are three Gods, in that it divides the Godhead of the Trinity; whereas the Lord, in saying, ‘Go, baptize the nations in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit,’ hath shown that the Trinity is of one power. We confess Father, Son, and Spirit, understanding in a perfect Trinity both fullness of Divinity and unity of power.”⁸⁸

⁸⁵ b. 2, c. 14, n. 2. For more of this quote, see in this book “Against the Heretic Maximus,” p. [27](#).

⁸⁶ b. 7, c. 1, n. 1.

⁸⁷ b. 15, c. 14, n. 23.

⁸⁸ b. 1, n. 10.