

Twenty-three queries about the word Homoousian ὁμοούσιος

Author: Isaac Newton

Source: Keynes Ms. 11, King's College, Cambridge, UK

Published online: March 2002

- Additional Information
-

[\[Diplomatic Text\]](#)

[\[Catalogue Entry\]](#)

<1r>

4

Quære 1. Whether Christ sent his Apostles to preach Metaphysick{s} to the unlearned common people & to their wives & children.

Qu. 2. Whether the word Ὁμοούσιος ever was in any Creed before the Nicene; or any Creed was produced by any one Bishop at the Council of Nice for authorizing the use of that word.

Qu. 3. Whether the introducing the use of that word is not contrary to the Apostles rule of holding fast the form of sound words.

Qu. 4. Whether the use of that word was not pressed upon the Council of Nice against the inclination of the major part of the Council

Qu. 5 Whether it was not pressed upon them by the Emperor Constantine the great a Chatechumen not yet baptized & no member of the Council.

Qu. 6 Whether it was not agreed by the Council that that word when applied to the Son of God should signify nothing more then that Christ was the express image of the father, & whether many of the Bishops in pursuance of that interpretation of the word allowed by the Council, did not in their subscriptions by way of caution add τουτεστιν ὁμοιούσιος?

Quære 7. Whether Hosius (or whoever translated that Creed into Latin) did not impose upon the western Churches by translating ὁμοούσιος by the words unius substantiæ instead of consubstantialis & whether by that translation the Latin Churches were not drawn into an opinion that the father & son had one common substance called in the Greek Hypostasis & whether they did not thereby give occasion to the eastern Churches to cry out (presently after the Council of Serdica) that the western Churches were become Sabellian.

Qu. 8. Whether the Greeks in opposition to this notion & language did not use the language of three hypostases, & whether in those days the word hyposta{sis} did not signify a substance.

Qu. 9. Whether the Latins did not at that time accuse all those of Arianism who used the language of three hypostases & thereby charge Arianism upon the Council of Nice without knowing the true meaning of the Nicene Creed.

Q. 10. Whether the Latines were not convinced in the Council of Ariminum that the Council of Nice by the word ὁμοούσιος understood nothing more then that the son was the express image of the father. the Acts of the Council of Nice were not produced for convincing them. And whether upon producing the Acts of that Council for proving this, the Macedonians & some others did not accuse the Bishops of hypocrisy who in subscribing those Acts had interpreted them by the word ὁμοιούσιος in their subscriptions.

Qu. 11. Whether Athanasius, Hilary & in general the Greeks & Latines did not from the time of the reign of Iulian the Apostate acknowledge the father Son & holy Ghost to be three substances & continue to do so till the Schoolmen changed the signification of the word hypostasis & brought in the notion of three persons in one single substance.

Qu. 12. Whether the opinion of the equality of the three substances was not first set on foot in the reign of Iulian the Apostate by Athanasius Hilary &c.

Qu. 13. Whether the worship of the Holy Ghost was not first set on foot presently after the Council of Serdica.

Qu. 14 Whether the Council of Serdica was not the first Council which declared for the doctrine of the consubstantial Trinity & whether the same Council did not affirm that there was but one hypostasis of the father son & H. Ghost.

<1v>

Qu. 15 Whether the Bishop of Rome five years after the death of Constantine the great A.C. 341 did not receive appeals from the Greek Councils & thereby begin to usurp the universal Bishopric

Qu. 16 Whether the Bishop of Rome in absolving the Appellants from excommunication & communicating with them & did not excommunicate himself & begin a quarrel with the Greek Church.

Qu. 17 Whether the Bishop of Rome in summoning all the Bishops of the Greek Church to appear at the next Council of Rome A.C. 342 did not challenge dominion over them & begin to make war upon them for obtaining it.

Qu 18 Whether that Council of Rome in receiving the Appellants into Communion did not excommunicate themselves & support the Bishop of Rome in claiming appeals from all the world.

Qu. 19 Whether the Council of Serdica in receiving the Appellants into Communion & decreeing Appeals from all the Churches to the Bishop of Rome did not excommunicate themselves & become guilty of the schism which followed thereupon, & set up Popery in all the west.

Qu. 20 Whether the Emperor Constantius did not by calling the Council of Millain & Aquileia A.C. 365, abolish Popery, & whether Hilary, Lucifer, were not banished for adhering to the authority of the Pope to receive appeals from the Greek Councils.

Qu. 21 Whether the Emperor Gratian A.C. 379 did not by his Edict restore the Vniversal Bishopric of Rome over all the west? And whether this authority of the Bishop of Rome hath not continued ever since

Qu 22 Whether Hosius Saint Athanasius, Saint Hilary, Saint Ambrose, Saint Hierome, Saint Austin were not Papists.

<2r>

Qu. 23 Whether the western Bishops upon being convinced that the Council of Nice by the word Ομοούσιος did