

**Children of the Same God:
Unitarianism in Kinship with Judaism and Islam
Minns Lectures, 2009
Rev. Dr. Susan Ritchie**

Lecture Three:

King's Chapel, Boston; Monday, April 27, 7:30PM

Children of the Same God: European Unitarianism in Relationship to Judaism

European Unitarianism was formed in large part by the desire to honor Christianity's close kinship with Judaism and Islam. Convinced that Christians, Muslims, and Jews were a part of the same religious family, Unitarians emerged as those liberal Christians who resisted theologies of God that could not be freely shared across traditions. Eventually, this impulse became more than an abstract theology, as Unitarians sought to establish actual relationships with their Jewish and Islamic kin.

Having shared in Lecture One of this series the theology of this Unitarian, Muslim, and Jewish relationship, and in Lecture Two, the history of rich cultural interchanges between Unitarians and Ottoman Islam, tonight, I would like to tell two stories about the connections early European Unitarians and their contemporary Jewish communities.

One story is about a personal friendship made, and then lost. Between the years 1575 and 1581, something happened to alienate what had been a growing friendship between the Unitarian leader Martin Czechowic of Lublin, Poland, and a rabbi named Jacob who lived in a small town not far away. The two men had been quiet close, and they were supported in their friendship by their faith communities. Yet, by the end of the 16th century, a relationship such as theirs was no longer even conceivable.

The other story is about how the village of Bozodujfala, in the eastern part of historic Transylvania, now Romania, came to be ruthlessly destroyed, closing a very special chapter in the history of Unitarian multi-religious engagement. This four hundred year old village, while small, was unusual for the quality and quantity

of its religious diversity. People frequently visited their neighbors' places of worship, and the festivals of each tradition were celebrated by all. The village included congregations of Catholics, Reformed Christians, Unitarians, Jews, and of Szekely Jews. Szekely Jews were originally Unitarians who adopted Jewish practice as an extension of their liberal Protestant convictions, but who over many long years evolved to take on an exclusively Jewish identity. This makes the Szekely Jews the unique example of an entire community of people adopting Judaism without historic or genealogical ties to the tradition. While they once enjoyed substantial numbers, by the twentieth century, this small village was the home to the last remnants of that community.

In 1989, the residents of the Bozodujfala were told that the Romanian communist dictator Ceausescu had finally approved a long anticipated public works project to build a dam for flood control of the local river. The poverty in Romania at the time was crushing—to this day, one of the reasons that the rate of HIV infection in the area is one of the highest in the world is because of the common practice of giving people, especially children, blood transfusions to treat starvation related anemia. And so when the new project was announced, the village was doubly pleased; the project would be beneficial, and the work was desperately needed. But once the villagers proceeded with construction according to the plans they had been given, they had a horrible shock. They realized that the project they were building was not the one they had requested. They were not working on flood control. Instead they were constructing a dam could only result in the complete flooding of the entire village. They had become a part of Ceausescu's plan to annihilate Hungarian ethnicity by destroying villages and forcibly relocating the people to tiny rooms in cinderblock housing developments where it would be impossible to maintain their cultural identity. When they realized this, the people of the village tried to sabotage their work, but it was too late. Romanian troops were called in to complete the project. The people of the village had to leave without time to remove their furniture or their animals. They did gather as an entire community for one last worship service at the Unitarian Church. Today, you can visit Bozodujfala, and see eerie sight of the ruined steeples of the tallest churches rising from the middle of the artificial lake.¹

It will be my task tonight to reveal the ways in which the story of Martin and Jacob and the story of the ruined village are connected. For it is in the intertwining of these stories that we can learn of the enormous aspiration of early European Unitarianism for making meaningful connections with Jewish communities, but also to how a variety of oppressions began to trouble this dream. The unfolding story of creative engagement between Judaism and Unitarianism in Eastern Europe does not have a happy ending. What began in the mid 16th Century as both close and well-differentiated relationships between Unitarians and Jews were complicated by the end of the century by increasing waves of both anti-Semitism and anti-Unitarian persecution. This pressure caused some Unitarians to distance themselves from Judaism for safety and survival, but interestingly, it also caused others to identifying themselves both with and as Jews.

I will begin with the events that bring our two of our protagonists, Czechowic and Rabbi Jacob together. The most powerful of these forces begin unfolding in the generation just previous to them, in 1492.

In 1492, with increasing waves of anti-Semitism crossing Europe, Spanish Jews, who had previously thrived under a fairly generous tolerance, were given the choice of exile or conversion to Christianity. The dramatic cultural and theological changes that resulted from the large number of Jews who converted to Christianity to remain in their homeland was unanticipated by those who naively believed that that the dual sword of exile and conversation would be adequate to insulate Spanish Catholicism from Jewish influence.

These New Christians included all kinds of people, only some of whom would come to be called by the derogatory term “marranos”. Routing out marranos practicing Judaism in secret while outwardly adopting Christian observance became the first task of the Inquisition, and at least in the beginning, its reason for being. Others New Christians or “conversos” tried to negotiate for themselves an authentic Christian practice harmonious to their past by not engaging in the more divisive and doctrinal side of the faith. This last category included persons such as Juan deValdes, who helped to define Christian humanism with its endearing focus on everyday spirituality, self examination, and love. Other conversos wrestled more overtly with the Christian doctrines that were the most difficult for persons of

a Jewish tradition to adopt, the chief of which proved to be, not surprisingly, the doctrine of the Trinity.

Michael Servetus, the main theological inspiration for the founders of eastern European Unitarianism, emerged out of mid 16th century Spain as the most vocal of these anti-Trinitarians. While he did not have a literal family lineage that connected him to Judaism, he was certainly intimately familiar with the most radical Jewish and New Christian scholarship, in addition to displaying great familiarity with Hebrew and Jewish biblical study. As I discussed in Lecture One of this series, although he was not literally a New Christian, he was certainly enculturated as one.

It is interesting to wonder about how it was that Servetus could have learned Hebrew and Jewish apologetics so thoroughly in a Spain supposed left without any Jews. It appears that even while the climate in Spain was grossly anti-Semitic, the growing interest in biblical studies had allowed many conversos, some who still defined themselves as belonging to the line of Jewish sages, to enjoy profitable employment as teachers of Hebrew and Jewish scripture. The seeds of profound change arose from within that scriptural study, and paved the way for emerging anti-Trinitarianism.ⁱⁱ

The radical potential in Biblical Study became directly apparent in 1516, when Erasmus published his controversial edition of the Greek New Testament. He excluded from his edition what had been one of the most powerful proof texts of the Trinity, 1 John 5-8, “There are three on earth that bear record in Heaven: the Father, the Word, and the Holy Spirit and these three are one.” Erasmus had used exacting historical scholarship to demonstrate this line was not found in the oldest available manuscripts, and hence that it was a spurious late addition to the scripture. Thus, while he excluded the passage on scholarly rather than theological grounds, such close biblical work made anti-Trinitarianism thinkable. Scholars alarmed by this tried to repair the damage by compiling lists of biblical terms suggestive of the Trinity, but these attempts often had the opposite effect of their intention. This work often just highlighted concerns about the integrity of retrospectively inserting the language of 4th century doctrines of the Trinity into much older scripture.

Michael Servetus would make the next move as he deliberately uncoupled the Hebrew Bible from its later Christian interpretations. Servetus released his own edition of the bible 1528, while he was living in exile after escaping the Inquisition, working as an editor under the assumed name of Michelle Villeneuve. Rather than understand the “Old” Testament as a prophetic anticipation of the Christian revelation, he restored the Jewish scriptures to their own cultural and historical specificity. For example, when he translated the passage in Isaiah about a pregnant “virgin” that Christians leaned on heavily as a prophecy about the mother of Jesus, he did not use the word “virgin” but rather “young woman,” a more literal rendering of the Hebrew. Servetus also quietly removed the typical subtitles that Christian publishers used to suggest that the Hebrew Song of Songs be read as love songs to Christ. Most scandalously, though, he wrote a note on the 53rd chapter of Isaiah, commonly interpreted by Christians as a prophetic depiction of the sufferings of Jesus, explaining that the actual and only referent of the passage was the named character of Cyrus. ⁱⁱⁱ

Later anti-Trinitarians inspired by Servetus thus pretty naturally inherited not only his skepticism towards the Trinity, but a very particular and intentional relationship of respect for the independent authenticity of Judaism. Jews were not inferior versions of Christians; but rather, each group had its own separate and equally valid revelation. Jacob Paleologus, a radical theologian of the Polish Unitarian church and much inspired by Servetus, would eventually argue that Jesus’ teaching did nothing to invalidate the Hebrew Scripture. In this view, Jesus did not come to offer Jews a radical new teaching because Judaism was no longer complete by itself; rather, Jesus had come as a Jew to ask the Jews to follow their own ethical code more closely.

For years the radical Protestants inspired by Servetus had been kept isolated and on the run, moving around the continent in search of safety. Many eventually found refuge in Poland, which had become a refuge for radical Protestants unwelcome in other parts of Europe. A number of factors contributed to making Poland a safe place. Although it was a monarchy, power in Poland was nonetheless decentralized by a large nobility that did not distinguish ranks within its own class. Aristocrats who owned a few horses and one crumbling ancestral home were accorded the

same rank and privileges as those who controlled vast estates and many villages. All enjoyed the right of granting tolerance and refuge to whatever religious dissidents they chose to host on their own lands, and many nobles became deeply interested in the new theologies, most eventually indentifying as Protestant.

The Reformation in Poland had a radical flavor to it from the start. Lisamano, the chaplain to the Polish Queen Bona, had began holding remarkably open discussions about Protestantism quite early, and in one meeting in 1546, a mysterious guest calling himself “Spiritus” (probably the Dutch radical Adam Pastor) dropped in to ask questions about the validity of the Trinity. This episode would take on almost mythological importance as a story of origin when later Polish Unitarians came to narrate their own history. Once the Reformed Church formally gathered, it too became a place for lively discussion. As early as 1556, anti-Trinitarian questions were raised in openly synod, although they were not aggressively pursued.

Radical theological development accelerated by 1558, with dissenters inspired by Servetus, such as Georg Biandrata, making a home in Poland. Biandrata, who will become a major figure in the Transylvanian Unitarian Church, seems to have come to Eastern Europe not only for refuge, but with the explicit intention of establishing an international church movement based on the unity of God.^{iv} His subtle diplomatic skills proved quite effective in moving the Reformed Church in this direction. While moderating a debate in 1562, he asked that the synod agree on just one tiny, little principle, that the discussion not employ any non biblical language. All easily agreed, but it was only later that people realized that was exactly the same thing as throwing the debate to the anti-Trinitarians.

For all its liberal influences, the Polish government did not remain entirely non-anxious about these most radical theological developments, and in 1564 the non-native anti-Trinitarian agitators were expelled from Poland and forced into exile once again. But the anti-Trinitarian seeds were already well sown. In 1565 Trinitarians frustrated with the continued debate walked away from synod, and those left behind what became the Minor Reformed Church of Poland, formed around an explicitly unitarian theology. And one of the first moves made by this

newly gathered body was to enter into serious conversations with their Jewish neighbors. And so it is that our protagonists Jacob and Martin meet.

As early as 1569, Jacob of Belyze, along with other Jewish leaders, was an active and welcome participant in the frequent meeting of the unitarians. There were still differences of theological opinion about the nature of Jesus within the Minor Reform Church, but all had their own reasons for pursuing the dialog with Judaism. Church historians classify some of these anti-Trinitarians as “Judaizers” or “semi-Judaizers.” These terms are problematic, as they have a history of being employed in anti-Semitic ways. But it does capture how it was that many radical Reformation figures were deliberately moving towards Judaism. Protestants attempting to return to the earliest days of a Christianity uncontaminated by imperial concerns, church hierarchy, and late addition creeds, were naturally interested in the Jewish practices and belief that would have been Jesus’ own. For this reason, sometimes they were moved to adopt aspects of Judaism into their own observances. Others in the Minor Reform Church were not as drawn to Jewish practices. Even so, they felt that as advocates of the unity of God, they did indeed exist in close kinship to Judaism, and for exactly that reason, sympathetically differentiating themselves from both Judaism and Judaizers became an important part of their developing identity.

Martin Czechowic earned for himself the nickname the “Rabbi of Lublin,” for his interest in developing these dialogs with the Jewish community. He and Rabbi Jacob met frequently to debate and discuss theology together. Their friendship grew. In 1575, Czechowic published a book of arguments resisting Judaism and Judaizing Christianity that were an outgrowth of his conversations with his friend. Jacob responded in kind, publishing a response to these not long afterwards. While both men strongly defended their respective traditions, the exchange was characterized by mutual interest and respect.

But then something changed. First, Jacob noticed that his old friend was ignoring him, and was no longer inviting him to debate. He wondered if that had to do with a rumor that he heard that Czechowic was going to publish a new book more hostile to Jacob and Judaism than what he had done before. As Jacob writes of this incident, his hurt is evident: “I did not prohibit you from corresponding with

me orally as well as in writing. A long time ago, I had already asked you, not only the brother of Marcin, the tailor, and others, but also through the Jew of Lublin and myself personally, that you should at least send me your composition. Some people told me that you are writing against me. Also, I heard that you would like to attend the synod and converse with me. I wait for this with joy. But of the fact that you wanted to debate me, nobody told me.”^v

The rumor of a hostile new tome proved true. In 1581, Czechowic published a rebuttal to Jacob’s book that demonstrated nothing of his previous tone of polite regard. The book made brutal indictments against Judaism and harshly ridiculed what Czechowic characterized as a Jewish predilection for meaningless superstitions. Jacob had noticed another change in his old friend as well. When they first met, Czechowic had freely asserted that Jesus was the greatest of all prophets, but finally entirely human. With the new book, Czechowic was expressing an adorationist theology. While he still believed that Jesus was born human, he now believed that Jesus had been elevated to kind divinity through God’s unique adoption of him as his son, and that hence, he was properly an object of adoration, or worship.

Our standard histories of the Polish church claim that Czechowic was always an adorationist, and that a certain tension between adorationist and those who held to a stricter humanity of Jesus was always a part of the anti-Trinitarian movement. To an extent this is true, and yet, I do not believe that this places enough emphasis on the fairly radical changes in this regard that took place not only within Czechowic, but the movement as a whole.

For example, at one of the earliest gatherings of anti-Trinitarians at the Council of Venice in 1550, the adorationist position that reserved some category of worship worthy exceptionalism for Jesus was rejected in favor of a much more radical Judaizing theology. According to this view, Jesus was one of several human children born to human parents, and while he might serve as a model given the unselfish choices he made in his own life, he had no role in the salvation of individuals except as an example. Individuals would be saved and rewarded the afterlife by their own good works; Individual not saved would not be condemned to hell, but would simply die with their bodies.^{vi} While this theology characterized

the Council of Venice, by the later part of the 16th century, it had become an extremist position in a church increasingly focused the adorationist position.

The most tragic divide between Unitarian adorationist and Judaizers came in Transylvania, as a split between two other old friends, the leaders of the Transylvanian church, Francis David and George Biandrata. Francis David was a native of Transylvania, a man with a restless and energetic mind, who in the course of his life converted from Catholicism, to Lutheranism (where he served as Superintendent) to Reform Calvinism (where he also held leadership) to Unitarianism. His conversion to Unitarianism had everything to do with his relationship George Biandrata, who had deliberately cultivated David he sought to gather a church around what had previously only been the theology of Anti-Trinitarianism. For years the two engaged in debates together against other traditions, and they served together in the royal court, where Biandrata was physician and Francis David, largely through Biandrata's influence, court preacher.

Both men had found reason to change their understanding regarding the nature of Jesus over the years. When Unitarian king John Sigismund died in a somewhat suspicious hunting accident 1571, the official tolerance of Unitarianism fell into jeopardy and Unitarians were eventually removed from high public or court office. In 1572, it was declared that Unitarians would only remain a legal received tradition only in so far as they introduced no further theological innovations. For a young tradition that had defined precisely by being open to new thought and continuous revelation, this requirement represented a horrible bind. Biandrata, ever the diplomat, responded by attempting to re-entrench himself and the church in the less controversial, adorationist, Christ-centered Unitarianism. Francis David was less cautious.

David's own theology was becoming increasingly progressive, partially due to the influence some of the more radical theologians who had taken refuge in Transylvania. Many of these scholars had relocated on David's invitation, with a modest but good living teaching at the Unitarian school in Kolosvar already secured for them. Included in this number were Jacob Paleogus (of whose radical interfaith theology and experience I discussed in Lecture One) and Adam Neuser (who eventually takes on an Islamic identity and moves to the Ottoman Turkey, as

I discussed in Lecture Two). Between these influences and his own tendency to push against theological boundaries, David's point of view became increasingly judaizing. To Biandrata's great horror, David had started publically advocating that the Unitarian Church cease ever addressing prayers to Jesus at all, an obvious and dangerous innovation that would place the church outside the pale of the law.

Things came to a head in 1578, where Biandrata and David debated each other on this issue in front of 322 Unitarian pastors. David argued quite persuasively that worshipping Jesus was a form of idolatry, and he seemed to carry the day. But the dispute was far from over. Matthew Vehe Glirus rushed to Transylvania from Germany to help reinforce David's side. A scholar of both academic Jewish life and Jewish communities, Vehe Glirus brought to Transylvania a highly Judaized Unitarianism. He did not assume the typical Judaizing Unitarian point of view that the New Testament did not supplant Hebrew scripture. He went further, and argued that the New Testament was actually far less inspired than the Old Testament. After all, Vehe Glirus argued, Jesus had completely failed to bring about the Kingdom of God in his lifetime as he seemed to have promised. In this way, Jesus could be seen as a less than successful prophet. Accordingly, Christians should continue to observe profound respect for the Hebrew scripture and practice. Vehe Glirus thought it appropriate for unitarians to declare Saturday as the day of worship, and follow Jewish dietary laws.

Panicked about the political implications of such radicalism, Biandrata took strong measures. He was concerned that Unitarianism would find itself on the wrong side of the law by both advancing forbidden innovations, and through its identification with Judaism, which was itself still not yet legally tolerated. He invited Faustus Socinus, the moderate adorationist and eminent theologian for the Polish movement to come to Transylvania in order to talk sense into David. Socinus actually lived with David for this period, and in spite of Socinus' daily appeals, David refused to budge, both in terms of his theology and the very public expression of his views.

In 1579 Biandrata lost all hope of persuading David to moderate his views. In a desperate move to sacrifice David but save the church, Biandrata used his political connections to have David arrested for innovation. David was sentenced to a most

horrible prison, where he soon died, broken, ill, and medically unattended. Biandrata then called the Unitarian ministers into council, where he manipulated the removal of David's most vocal followers. He also forced the Council into passing a new and strongly adorationist platform. Biandrata, ever ambitious for the future of Unitarianism, felt that only this platform would be widely acceptable and safe enough to serve as the foundation of an international Unitarian Church.

The trauma in Transylvania had an immediate effect on the Polish church. Facing a political climate which was becoming increasingly hostile to Judaism, the Polish Church sought likewise to expunge their movement of non-adorationist Judaizing elements. Some, like the progressive theologian and Judaizer Simon Bundy, were actually excommunicated. Even those, such as Czechowic, who were arguably already at least mildly adorationist, solidified their commitments and withdrew from dialog with the Jewish community. The non-adorationist Unitarian point of view survived longer in Lithuania, where Rabbi Issac ben Abraham had established relationships with Unitarians such as Paeologus and Budny, and whose major book, "Faith Strengthened" (1585) speaks approvingly of the Unitarian respect for Judaism and the Hebrew Scriptures.^{vii} And yet, even there, the Judaizing impulse did not survive increasing anti-Semitic pressures and persecutions for too much longer.

So what to make of both the profundity and brevity of the Eastern European Unitarian hope to live in close relationship with their Jewish kin? Here, we will need to return to what connected the dissolution of Czechowic and Jacob's friendship with the submerged village of Bozodijfala.

When the followers of Francis David were cast out beyond the fold of the Unitarian Church, some formed separately as Sabbatarians, adopting many Jewish practices. It was this group that over the years would transform into the Szekely Jews. Other followers of David kept their Unitarian identification, not publically quarrelling with the official adorationist platform, but nonetheless coming to personally adopt some Jewish practices and rituals. This dynamic was hardly a secret, with the Jesuit Possevino observing in 1583 that the majority of Unitarian ministers in the Eastern Transylvania did not eat pork.^{viii} By 1600 Sabbatarianism itself was clearly a separate religion, and yet as it was not a tolerated religion,

many of its adherents maintained their official membership and with the Unitarian Church.

In 1618, Prince Gabriel Bethen saw the opportunity to wreck havoc on both the Sabbatarians and the Unitarians by forcing the Unitarians to promise that they would weed out the stealth Sabbatarians from their membership books. Panicked by the scrutiny, Sabbatarians and others interested in not attracting government attention transferred their membership to the Reformed Church. Even under such great persecution, the Sabbatarians, eventually becoming known as Szekely Jews, managed to thrive in remote villages in Szeklerland, where they sometimes enjoyed protection on the estates of persons with considerable authority (Szeklerland being the eastern part of Transylvania, traditionally home to the Szekely Hungarian ethnic group). Nonetheless, the climate was harsh indeed, and by the mid 18th century, there was only one surviving community, that of the village of Bozodujfala, and we know its fate. It is hard if not impossible to say when this community stopped seeing themselves as a radically Judaizing Unitarians and instead as whole Jewish. They only declared an exclusively Jewish identity in 1867, but that year was not coincidentally the first year in which Judaism was legally tolerated.

Geza Szavai is a contemporary author who grew up in the village before it was flooded, and in his published account of his people, Szavai comments on how the oppression of his people actually solidified his identification as a Jew. He writes, “To become a Jew or to be a Jew must be a very complicated issue. But to be made a Jew—that is very easy. I was made a Jew.”^{ix}

Historians often refer to this interesting and unique group of chosen Jews as the happy result of creative Jewish and Unitarian interchange. That it certainly was. And yet I find the suppression of the Judaized form of Unitarianism extremely sad. With it, the understanding of Unitarianism as a specifically liberal Christianity that holds one of its highest values to be its kinship with Judaism and Islam was also obscured.

History, of course, works in ironic ways, and contemporary Unitarianism has definitely a stronger flavor of Judaizing, non-adorationist thinking than not. Even

the contemporary Hungarian Unitarian church has come around again to claim Francis David's cry that "God is One." Most people believe this famous Unitarian slogan to refer to the unity of God in contrast to a Trinitarian view of God, and yet, it was actually originally directed by the Judaizing Unitarians against the adorationists.^x And as for North American Unitarianism, Historian Joseph Friedman concludes his article on Unitarians and New Christians in 16th Century Europe by wondering what it means that even though a the adorationist point of view seemed to win the day in the 16th century, contemporary American Unitarian congregations are often not only nonadorationist in theology, but have in their membership many persons of Jewish background.

Throughout these lectures, I have made references to Al-Andalusia, the Muslim ruled empire of the Spanish peninsula in 7th-15th century Spain. I have held it up as a profound realization of an ideal of religious tolerance: with Christians, Jews, and Muslims living together in a spirit of mutual regard and cooperation. This lived tolerance was, of course, as all human experiments, not perfect. But when we remember that the Andalusian dream was shattered in 1492, and that in that very same year, with Spanish regents Isabella and Ferdinand banishing all of the Jews from the area, we might realize how vital even imperfectly realized ideals are in guiding us towards justice. Indeed, I like to think of Andalusia as existing in the realm of what the Sufis call the "imaginal." The space of the imaginal is one almost total forgotten in the West—it is a space where the imaginary is also real.^{xi}

I like to think of our engagement with Judaism in Eastern Europe as lived example of our Unitarian imaginal vision of living in enmeshed and respectful ways with our Jewish and Islamic kin. This imaginal has seen variously imperfect and all too brief incarnations in our movement, but it nonetheless lies very close to our heart, and it waits, I believe, for us to overt champion multi-religious engagement once again.

ⁱ Judit Gellard, "Spiritual Jews of Szekler Jerusalem: A Four Century History of Translyvanian Szekler Jerusalem," a Center for Free Religion electronic publication, accessed Feb. 11, 2009 from <http://w3.enternet.hu/sandor64/cffr/index.html>.

ⁱⁱ Richard H. Popkin, “Marranos, New Christians, and The Beginnings of Modern Anti-Trinitarianism,” *Jews and Conversos at the Time of the Expulsion*, Yom Tov Assis and Yosef Kaplan, eds. (Jerusalem: The Zalman Shazar Center for Jewish History, 1999): 143-160.

ⁱⁱⁱ Roland H. Bainton, *Hunted Heretic: The Life and Death of Michael Servetus: 1511:1553* (Providence: Blackstone Editions, 1953; 2005): 64-65.

^{iv} Massimo Firpo in *Antitrinitari nell'Europa orientale de '500: Nouvi testi di Szymon Budny, Niccolo Paruta e jacop Paleologo*, summary by Anne Jacobson Schutte available in English in *Renaissance Quarterly*, 33:2 (Summer, 1980): 242-244.

^v Judah M. Rosenthal, “Marcin Czechowic and Jacob of Belzyce: Arian-Jewish Encounters in 16th Century Poland *Proceedings of the American Academy of Jewish Research* (1966): 77-97:89.

^{vi} George Huntson Williams, *The Radical Reformation* (First edition, Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1962; this edition, 1992 by Sixteenth Century Journal Publishers): 871.

^{vii} Williams, 1265.

^{viii} Wilbur Earl Morse Wilbur, *A History of Unitarianism: Socinianism and Its Antecedents* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1946): 64.

^{ix} As quoted and translated by Béla Pomogáts in “Jews by Choice,” *The Hungarian Quarterly* XLII:164 (Winter 2001) : available on line <http://www.hungarianquarterly.com/no163/8.html> accessed 3/11/2009.

^x Williams, 1129.

^{xi} William C. Chittick, *Imaginal Worlds: Ibn-al'Arabi and the Problem of Religious Diversity* (Albany: SUNY Press, 1994).