

Solus Logos: A Univalent Theology of Divine Identity and Universal Mediation

Douglas C. Youvan

doug@youvan.com www.youvan.ai

July 27, 2026

Abstract

John 1:1 presents the Logos as both distinguishable from God and fully divine: the Word was with God, and the Word was God. Homotopy type theory supplies a formal language in which distinction and identity need not be mutually exclusive. The expression

God $\simeq$ Logos

states an equivalence of divine being. By univalence, such an equivalence may induce an identity at the appropriate ontological level:

God $\simeq$ Logos $\rightarrow$ God = Logos.

This formulation does not identify the Logos with Scripture and therefore does not imply *Sola Scriptura*. It instead motivates a distinct principle, here called *Solus Logos*: every finite disclosure, participation, and mediation of divine reality occurs through the Logos. The principle does not assert that only the Logos is divine, nor does it exclude the Father or Spirit. Rather, it states that divine reality becomes intelligible, manifest, relational, and communicable through the Logos. Scripture, tradition, reason, creation, and ecclesial life are consequently understood as dependent witnesses whose authority is measured by fidelity to the Logos.

Keywords: Logos, homotopy type theory, univalence, John 1:1, Solus Logos, divine mediation, Scripture, Trinitarian theology, identity, equivalence.

Google Drive: <https://drive.google.com/drive/folders/15Kd8bUjm7zVaKdVlwbPhqjiV68aUZQvc>

A collaboration with OpenAI GPT-5.6 Thinking. CC4.0.

<https://orcid.org/0009-0004-4206-4253>

1. The Johannine Structure

John 1:1 contains three connected assertions:

In the beginning was the Logos.

The Logos was with God.

The Logos was God.

These may be represented schematically as:

Beginning(Logos)

With(Logos, God)

$\text{Logos} \simeq \text{God}$

The second statement requires distinction. One cannot ordinarily be “with” oneself in precisely the same personal sense. Thus:

$\text{Logos} \neq_p \text{God}$

where the subscript p denotes personal identity.

The third statement requires ontological unity:

$\text{Logos} =_b \text{God}$

where the subscript b denotes identity of being.

The apparent contradiction arises only when personal identity and ontological identity are treated as the same judgment. John’s formulation instead suggests a three-part structure:

personal distinction + relational communion + ontological identity

The Logos is not the Father as person, yet the Logos is not less than God in being.

2. Typed Identity

Let **Person** be a type whose inhabitants include the Father and the Logos:

$F, L : \text{Person}$

Personal distinction is expressed by:

$L \neq F$

Let **Communion** be a relation between persons:

Communion : Person $\rightarrow$ Person $\rightarrow$ Type

The phrase “the Logos was with God” supplies:

$c : \text{Communion}(L, F)$

The Logos and Father are therefore distinguishable terms joined by communion:

$L \leftrightarrow F$

Distinction does not imply separation.

Now let **Being** assign to each person the structure of that person’s being:

Being : Person $\rightarrow$ Type

The full divinity of the Logos may then be represented by an equivalence:

$e : \text{Being}(L) \simeq \text{Being}(F)$

The Johannine structure becomes:

$(L \neq F) \times \text{Communion}(L, F) \times (\text{Being}(L) \simeq \text{Being}(F))$

The three components state respectively:

1. The Logos is personally distinguishable from the Father.
2. The Logos exists in communion with the Father.
3. The being of the Logos is equivalent to the being of God.

Because these statements inhabit different logical types, they do not contradict one another.

Definition 1. Personal distinction

Two divine persons are personally distinct when they are nonidentical as inhabitants of **Person**:

$x \neq_p y$

Definition 2. Ontological equivalence

Two persons are ontologically equivalent when their structures of being are equivalent:

$\text{Being}(x) \simeq \text{Being}(y)$

Proposition 1

Personal nonidentity does not entail ontological nonequivalence:

$x \neq_p y \not\Rightarrow \text{Being}(x) \neq \text{Being}(y)$

The Johannine claim is that personal distinction and ontological equivalence coexist.

3. The Univalent Statement

The univalence principle identifies equivalence with identity at the level of types:

$$(A \simeq B) \simeq (A = B)$$

An equivalence

$$e : A \simeq B$$

therefore determines a path of identity:

$$ua(e) : A = B$$

Applied to the divine equivalence,

$$e : \text{Being}(L) \simeq \text{Being}(F)$$

univalence yields:

$$ua(e) : \text{Being}(L) = \text{Being}(F)$$

The compressed Johannine statement is therefore:

$$\mathbf{God \simeq Logos \longrightarrow God = Logos}$$

The equality does not erase personal distinction. It is an identity generated at the level at which the equivalence has been established.

The formulation is not simply:

$$L = F$$

Instead, it is:

$$L \neq_p F$$

together with:

$$God \simeq Logos$$

and therefore:

$$God =_p Logos$$

The distinction between persons remains, while the equivalence of divine being becomes identity under univalence.

Theorem 1. Johannine compatibility

The following propositions are jointly consistent:

With(L, F)

$L \neq_p F$

$\text{God} \simeq \text{Logos}$

Proof

The first proposition concerns relation, the second concerns personal identity, and the third concerns equivalence of being. Since they are judgments in distinct but dependent types, none negates the others. ■

The resulting statement is:

The Logos is personally distinct, relationally with God, and ontologically God.

Equivalently:

personal distinction + relational communion + ontological identity

This is identity without personal collapse and distinction without ontological division.

4. Logos Is Not Scripture

The expression

$\text{God} \simeq \text{Logos}$

does not imply:

$\text{God} \simeq \text{Scripture}$

In John 1:1, the Logos is not a written document, linguistic corpus, or canonical collection. The Logos is the divine reality through whom creation, revelation, and incarnation occur.

Scripture may witness to the Logos:

$\text{Scripture} \rightarrow \text{Logos}$

but witness is not identity:

$\text{Scripture} \neq \text{Logos}$

The distinction may be formalized by introducing a witness relation:

Witness : Type $\rightarrow$ Type $\rightarrow$ Type

with:

$w : \text{Witness}(\text{Scripture}, \text{Logos})$

Scripture bears testimony to the Logos without exhausting or containing the Logos.

A text may refer beyond itself. Its referent is not reducible to its sentences, inscriptions, or interpretations. Consequently:

$\text{Witness}(\text{Scripture}, \text{Logos}) \not\Rightarrow \text{Scripture} \simeq \text{Logos}$

The authority of Scripture may be understood as derivative from its truthful relation to the Logos:

$\text{Authority}(\text{Scripture}) \propto \text{Fidelity}(\text{Scripture}, \text{Logos})$

The Logos is therefore ontologically prior to Scripture. Scripture is a witness within history; the Logos is already present “in the beginning.”

5. Why *Sola Scriptura* Does Not Follow

Sola Scriptura is an epistemological and ecclesiological proposition. It concerns the normative status of Scripture relative to tradition, councils, ecclesial offices, reason, and other sources of doctrine.

A minimal formalization would be:

$\text{SolaScriptura} := \text{Scripture is the uniquely infallible doctrinal norm.}$

Nothing in

$\text{God} \simeq \text{Logos}$

alone establishes this claim.

To derive *Sola Scriptura*, additional premises would be required:

1. Scripture is uniquely authorized by the Logos.
2. Scripture communicates that authorization without doctrinal error.
3. No other authority possesses equal normative status.
4. Scripture is sufficient for every doctrine required of the Church.

These are substantial theological claims. They do not follow merely from the divinity of the Logos.

The invalid inference is:

God $\simeq$ Logos

Logos is called "Word"

Therefore God $\simeq$ Scripture

The word "Word" changes meaning across the inference. In the first premise it denotes the eternal Logos; in the conclusion it denotes written Scripture. This is an equivocation:

Word₁ = divine Logos

Word₂ = scriptural text

Word₁ $\neq$ Word₂

Therefore:

God $\simeq$ Word₁ $\nRightarrow$ God $\simeq$ Word₂

The univalent reading of John 1:1 does not establish *Sola Scriptura*. It establishes the ontological primacy of the Logos.

6. Definition of Solus Logos

The principle **Solus Logos** may now be defined.

Definition 3. Solus Logos

Every authentic disclosure, mediation, or participation in divine reality occurs through the Logos.

Formally:

For every x,

Participation(x, God) $\rightarrow$ Through(x, Logos)

More compactly:

$\forall x, \text{DivineParticipation}(x) \rightarrow \text{LogosMediated}(x)$

This does not mean that only the Logos is divine. It means that the Logos is the universal mediator of divine intelligibility and manifestation.

The principle therefore rejects:

Only(Logos, Divine)

but affirms:

OnlyThrough(Logos, DivineDisclosure)

The distinction is decisive.

Exclusive personhood:

Only the Logos is God.

Universal mediation:

Only through the Logos is God manifested and communicated.

Solus Logos affirms the second and rejects the first.

Its basic formula is:

God $\simeq$ Logos $\wedge \forall x(\text{DisclosureOfGod}(x) \rightarrow \text{ThroughLogos}(x))$

Thus the Logos is not one revelatory source among several independent sources. Every authentic source is revelatory only insofar as it participates in the Logos.

7. The Logos as Universal Mediation

The principle *Solus Logos* becomes stronger when mediation is treated as structural rather than merely verbal.

Let:

Divine : Type

Created : Type

and let:

Logos : Divine

A mediation operator may be written as:

$M : \text{Divine} \times \text{Created} \rightarrow \text{Type}$

where:

$M(\text{Logos}, x)$

states that the Logos mediates divine reality to a created being x .

The principle of universal mediation is:

$$\forall x : \text{Created}, \text{Revelation}(x) \rightarrow M(\text{Logos}, x)$$

This does not require that every created being explicitly recognizes the Logos. It states that every genuine participation in truth, order, life, or divine disclosure depends upon the Logos.

Definition 4. Logos-mediated disclosure

A disclosure d is Logos-mediated when there exists a path from its created form to its divine source through the Logos:

$$\text{CreatedForm}(d) \rightarrow \text{Logos} \rightarrow \text{DivineSource}(d)$$

Thus:

$$\text{AuthenticDisclosure}(d) \rightarrow \text{LogosMediated}(d)$$

The Logos is not merely the content of one revelation. The Logos is the condition under which revelation is possible.

Scripture, creation, reason, prophecy, incarnation, and ecclesial testimony may therefore be represented as distinct mediating forms:

$$\text{Scripture} \rightarrow \text{Logos}$$

$$\text{Creation} \rightarrow \text{Logos}$$

$$\text{Reason} \rightarrow \text{Logos}$$

$$\text{Prophecy} \rightarrow \text{Logos}$$

$$\text{Incarnation} \rightarrow \text{Logos}$$

$$\text{Church} \rightarrow \text{Logos}$$

These arrows do not assert that all mediations are equally clear, complete, or reliable. They assert that no authentic mediation is independent of the Logos.

Proposition 2. Derivative authority

Every finite authority concerning divine reality is derivative.

For any authority a :

$$\text{Authority}(a) \rightarrow \text{DerivedFrom}(a, \text{Logos})$$

No finite witness possesses divine authority intrinsically.

Proof

If a finite witness possessed divine authority independently of the Logos, then divine disclosure would have at least two independent ontological sources. This would contradict universal Logos mediation. Therefore every finite authority is derivative from the Logos. ■

The result is:

$$\text{Authority}(a) \propto \text{Fidelity}(a, \text{Logos})$$

Authority is not generated by institutional power, textual existence, historical age, or numerical assent alone. It depends upon fidelity to the Logos.

8. Scripture Under Solus Logos

Under *Solus Logos*, Scripture retains exceptional importance without being identified with God.

Let:

S : Scripture

L : Logos

and let:

w : Witness(S, L)

Scripture functions as a privileged witness to the Logos. Its authority may be represented by:

$$\text{ScripturalAuthority}(S) \leftarrow \text{Witness}(S, L) \times \text{Fidelity}(S, L)$$

The direction of dependence is important:

Logos $\rightarrow$ authority of Scripture

not:

Scripture $\rightarrow$ divinity of Logos

The Logos does not become divine because Scripture declares him divine. Scripture speaks truthfully because it bears faithful witness to the divine Logos.

Definition 5. Scriptural fidelity

Scriptural fidelity is the degree to which scriptural testimony preserves the identity, acts, and teaching of the Logos.

Fidelity(S, L) : Type

A faithful interpretation i of Scripture must preserve this relation:

$\text{Interpret}(i, S) \rightarrow \text{Witness}(i(S), L)$

An interpretation that terminates in the text itself fails to complete the witness relation:

Scripture $\rightarrow$ Scripture

A Logos-centered interpretation continues beyond the sign to its referent:

Scripture $\rightarrow$ Logos

Thus bibliolatry may be formally distinguished from scriptural fidelity.

Definition 6. Bibliolatry

Bibliolatry is the collapse of the witness into its referent:

$\text{Witness}(\text{Scripture}, \text{Logos}) \rightarrow \text{Scripture} = \text{Logos}$

This collapse is invalid because:

$\text{Witness}(A, B) \nRightarrow A = B$

A map is not the territory, testimony is not the witnessed person, and a proposition about God is not God.

Proposition 3. Scriptural dignity without scriptural divinization

Scripture may possess unique canonical authority without possessing divine identity.

Formally:

$\text{UniqueCanonicalAuthority}(\text{Scripture})$

is compatible with:

Scripture $\neq$ Logos

and:

Scripture $\neq$ God

Proof

Canonical authority is a relational and ecclesial property. Divine identity is an ontological property. Since the properties inhabit different types, unique canonical authority does not entail divinity. ■

Therefore *Solus Logos* does not diminish Scripture. It prevents Scripture from being placed in a category that Scripture itself reserves for God.

9. Tradition, Church, and Reason

The same structure applies to tradition, ecclesial authority, and reason.

Let:

T : Tradition

C : Church

R : Reason

Each may bear a relation to the Logos:

t : Witness(T, Logos)

c : Witness(C, Logos)

r : Participation(R, Logos)

None is self-validating.

Tradition is authoritative insofar as:

Fidelity(T, Logos)

The Church is authoritative insofar as:

Fidelity(C, Logos)

Reason is trustworthy insofar as:

Participation(R, Logos)

The governing rule is:

Authority(x) $\rightarrow$ Fidelity(x, Logos)

This rule applies symmetrically. Scripture may judge tradition, but the Logos judges both Scripture interpretation and tradition interpretation.

The final criterion is not:

Scripture alone

nor:

Tradition alone

nor:

Church alone

nor:

Reason alone

but:

Logos alone as the divine criterion

Finite authorities remain necessary because finite persons require mediated knowledge. Yet no mediation becomes absolute.

Definition 7. Logos criterion

The Logos criterion is the rule that every doctrinal claim must be evaluated according to its conformity with the identity, character, and revelation of the Logos.

For every doctrinal claim p :

$\text{Accepted}(p) \rightarrow \text{ConformsTo}(p, \text{Logos})$

This yields a hierarchy:

Logos

↓

Revelation

↓

Scripture, tradition, Church, reason, experience

↓

Interpretation

↓

Doctrine

The hierarchy is not purely chronological. It is ontological. The Logos grounds the authority of every lower level.

Theorem 2. No finite mediator is self-grounding

For every finite mediator m :

$\text{Finite}(m) \rightarrow \neg \text{SelfGrounding}(m)$

Proof

A finite mediator receives its form, intelligibility, and authority through relations beyond itself. If its authority concerns divine reality, that authority depends upon the Logos. Therefore no finite mediator is the sufficient ground of its own authority. ■

This theorem applies to texts, councils, institutions, theologians, traditions, and private experiences.

10. The Incarnation as Formal Return

The doctrine of the incarnation gives *Solus Logos* its decisive historical form.

The eternal Logos does not remain only an abstract ontological mediator. The Logos becomes embodied:

Incarnate : Logos $\rightarrow$ Human

More precisely, the incarnation may be represented as the existence of a human life whose identity remains continuous with the divine Logos:

$\exists h : \text{Human}, \text{IdentityOf}(h) \simeq \text{Logos}$

The incarnation is not merely information about God. It is divine self-presentation within created existence.

Let:

$\iota : \text{Logos} \rightarrow \text{History}$

denote the incarnational map.

The Logos enters the finite domain without ceasing to be divine:

$\text{Divine}(\text{Logos})$

and:

$\text{Historical}(\iota(\text{Logos}))$

The central claim is:

$\text{DivineIdentity}(\text{Logos}) = \text{DivineIdentity}(\iota(\text{Logos}))$

The created manifestation and eternal source are not two unrelated beings. The historical life is the finite manifestation of the eternal Logos.

Definition 8. Formal return

Formal return is the movement by which created signs, doctrines, and interpretations are referred back to the incarnate Logos as their governing source.

The path is:

Doctrine $\rightarrow$ Scripture $\rightarrow$ Witness $\rightarrow$ Incarnate Logos

This return prevents theology from terminating in its own formal systems.

A doctrine is not validated merely because it is logically coherent:

Coherent(p) $\nRightarrow$ True(p)

Nor merely because it is traditional:

Ancient(p) $\nRightarrow$ True(p)

Nor merely because it is scripturally phrased:

ScripturalLanguage(p) $\nRightarrow$ True(p)

The stronger condition is:

TrueChristianDoctrine(p) $\rightarrow$ ConformsTo(p, IncarnateLogos)

Proposition 4. Incarnational constraint

No interpretation of divine revelation is complete if it contradicts the disclosed character of the incarnate Logos.

Formally:

Contradicts(p, IncarnateLogos) $\rightarrow \neg$ AuthenticChristianDoctrine(p)

The Logos is therefore both source and corrective operator:

Logos : Source $\times$ Criterion $\times$ Correction

The same reality that generates revelation also judges its interpretations.

This gives *Solus Logos* a metacognitive dimension. Theology must repeatedly examine whether its concepts, institutions, and inherited formulas still point toward the Logos or have become self-referential.

The correction cycle is:

Witness

→ interpretation

→ doctrine

→ comparison with Logos

→ revision

Let C be the correction operator:

$C(p) = \text{Revise}(p, \text{Logos})$

A stable doctrine satisfies:

$C(p) = p$

A distorted doctrine satisfies:

$C(p) \neq p$

Thus theological fidelity may be expressed as a fixed-point condition:

$\text{Faithful}(p) \rightarrow C(p) = p$

The Logos is not only the object of theology. The Logos is the standard by which theology is recursively corrected.

11. Trinitarian Limits of Solus Logos

Solus Logos must not be interpreted as a denial of the Father or the Spirit.

The principle does not state:

Only the Logos is God.

It states:

Only through the Logos is God made manifest, intelligible, and communicable within creation.

Let:

F : Father

L : Logos

S : Spirit

The three may remain personally distinguishable:

$F \neq_p L$

$L \neq_p S$

$F \neq_p S$

while sharing divine being:

$\text{Being}(F) \simeq \text{Being}(L)$

$\text{Being}(L) \simeq \text{Being}(S)$

$\text{Being}(F) \simeq \text{Being}(S)$

By univalence:

$\text{Being}(F) = \text{Being}(L)$

$\text{Being}(L) = \text{Being}(S)$

$\text{Being}(F) = \text{Being}(S)$

This does not produce:

$F =_p L =_p S$

The equivalences concern divine being, not personal identity.

The Trinitarian structure may therefore be expressed as:

Personal distinction + relational communion + ontological equivalence

For the three persons:

$\text{Distinct}(F, L, S)$

$\text{Communion}(F, L, S)$

$\text{Being}(F) \simeq \text{Being}(L) \simeq \text{Being}(S)$

Definition 9. Trinitarian univalence

Trinitarian univalence is the identity of divine being induced by equivalences among personally distinct divine persons.

Formally:

$\forall x, y : \text{DivinePerson},$

$\text{Being}(x) \simeq \text{Being}(y) \rightarrow \text{Being}(x) = \text{Being}(y)$

The identity is located in the family **Being**, not directly in **DivinePerson**.

Proposition 5. Noncollapse

Trinitarian univalence does not entail personal collapse.

$$\text{Being}(F) = \text{Being}(L) \not\Rightarrow F = L$$

Proof

The left side is an identity in the type of divine being. The right side is an identity in the type of divine persons. An identity in one type does not automatically induce identity in another type.

■

Thus the statement

$$\text{God} \simeq \text{Logos}$$

must be typed carefully. Without qualification, it may conceal whether **God** denotes divine being, the Father, or the triune God.

The preferred formal statement is:

$$\text{Being}(\text{God}) \simeq \text{Being}(\text{Logos})$$

or, when **God** denotes divine nature:

$$\text{God} \simeq \text{Logos}$$

The latter is a compressed ontological statement, not a denial of interpersonal distinction.

Definition 10. Solus Logos without exclusion

Solus Logos is nonexclusive when it assigns universal mediation to the Logos without denying the divinity or agency of the Father and Spirit.

The principle is:

$$\forall x, \text{DisclosureOfGod}(x) \rightarrow \text{ThroughLogos}(x)$$

It is not:

$$\forall x, \text{Divine}(x) \rightarrow x = \text{Logos}$$

The first concerns mediation. The second would collapse divine personhood into a single person.

Theologically, the Logos may reveal the Father through the Spirit:

$$\text{Father} \rightarrow \text{Logos} \rightarrow \text{creation}$$

Spirit → recognition of Logos

The created knower encounters divine reality through a relational sequence rather than through an isolated term.

A schematic structure is:

Father

↓

Logos

↓

Spirit-enabled participation

↓

created understanding

This hierarchy does not rank the divine persons by degree of divinity. It describes the order of manifestation and reception.

Theorem 3. Solus Logos is compatible with Trinitarian communion

Universal Logos mediation is compatible with personal plurality and shared divine being.

Proof

Universal mediation assigns a functional role to the Logos:

Mediator(Logos)

Personal plurality assigns distinct terms to the type **DivinePerson**:

F, L, S : DivinePerson

Shared divine being supplies equivalences:

$\text{Being}(F) \simeq \text{Being}(L) \simeq \text{Being}(S)$

None of these judgments negates the others. Therefore universal Logos mediation, personal distinction, and ontological unity are jointly consistent. ■

The result may be stated succinctly:

The Logos alone is the universal divine mediation, but the Logos is not alone in divine communion.

12. Consequences and Conclusion

The formulation

$\text{God} \simeq \text{Logos}$

is stronger than a metaphor and weaker than an unrestricted identification.

It states that the Logos is not merely similar to God, inspired by God, sent by God, or representative of God. The Logos possesses divine being without remainder.

By univalence:

$\text{God} \simeq \text{Logos} \rightarrow \text{God} = \text{Logos}$

Yet this identity must remain typed:

$\text{God} =_{\beta} \text{Logos}$

not necessarily:

$\text{Father} =_{\rho} \text{Logos}$

The Johannine structure is therefore:

$\text{Logos} \neq_{\rho} \text{Father}$

$\text{With}(\text{Logos}, \text{Father})$

$\text{Being}(\text{Logos}) \simeq \text{Being}(\text{Father})$

These statements jointly express:

distinction without division

communion without confusion

identity without collapse

From this structure, *Sola Scriptura* does not follow. Scripture is a finite witness to the Logos:

$\text{Scripture} \rightarrow \text{Logos}$

The witness relation does not become an identity relation:

$\text{Witness}(\text{Scripture}, \text{Logos}) \not\Rightarrow \text{Scripture} = \text{Logos}$

The stronger implication is instead *Solus Logos*:

$\text{God} \simeq \text{Logos}$

together with:

$\forall x, \text{DivineDisclosure}(x) \rightarrow \text{ThroughLogos}(x)$

The Logos is therefore the universal ground of divine manifestation.

Scripture, tradition, Church, reason, creation, experience, and doctrine possess derivative authority:

$\text{Authority}(x) \rightarrow \text{Fidelity}(x, \text{Logos})$

No finite witness is self-grounding:

$\text{Finite}(x) \rightarrow \neg \text{SelfGrounding}(x)$

Every theological system must consequently remain open to correction by the Logos it attempts to describe.

Let:

$C_i : \text{Doctrine} \rightarrow \text{Doctrine}$

be the Logos-relative correction operator.

Then theological stability requires:

$C_i(p) = p$

A doctrine that changes when compared with the Logos requires revision:

$C_i(p) \neq p \rightarrow \text{Revise}(p)$

The fixed point is not produced by institutional repetition, textual literalism, formal consistency, or historical longevity alone. It is produced by conformity to the Logos.

Theorem 4. Logos primacy

For every Christian doctrinal authority a:

$\text{ValidAuthority}(a) \rightarrow \text{DerivedFrom}(a, \text{Logos})$

Proof

A Christian doctrinal authority concerns the identity, acts, or purposes of God. Under universal Logos mediation, every authentic disclosure of God occurs through the Logos. Therefore every valid Christian authority is derivative from the Logos. ■

Corollary 1

No Christian authority can possess greater authority than the Logos.

$\text{Authority}(a) \leq \text{Authority}(\text{Logos})$

Corollary 2

A finite authority that contradicts the Logos defeats its own claim to Christian authority.

$\text{Contradicts}(a, \text{Logos}) \rightarrow \neg \text{ValidChristianAuthority}(a)$

Corollary 3

Scripture is properly honored when it directs the reader beyond itself to the Logos.

$\text{FaithfulReading}(\text{Scripture}) \rightarrow \text{Encounter}(\text{Logos})$

The central thesis of the paper may therefore be compressed into one expression:

$\text{God} \simeq \text{Logos} \wedge \forall x [\text{DisclosureOfGod}(x) \rightarrow \text{ThroughLogos}(x)]$

By univalence:

$\text{God} \simeq \text{Logos} \rightarrow \text{God} = \text{Logos}$

By mediation:

$\text{God} \rightarrow \text{Logos} \rightarrow \text{creation}$

By interpretation:

$\text{Scripture} \rightarrow \text{Logos}$

By correction:

$\text{Doctrine} \rightarrow \text{Logos} \rightarrow \text{revised doctrine}$

The principle *Solus Logos* may finally be stated as follows:

The Logos alone is the universal criterion, mediation, and manifestation of divine reality within creation.

This principle does not divinize Scripture, tradition, reason, or the Church. It does not exclude the Father or Spirit. It does not claim that human language exhausts divine being.

It affirms that every authentic Christian witness receives its truth from the Logos, points toward the Logos, and remains answerable to the Logos.

The final univalent statement is:

God $\simeq$ Word

The final theological statement is:

Through the Word, God is made known.

The final epistemic rule is:

No witness outranks that to which it bears witness.

The final principle is:

Solus Logos.

13. References

Athanasius. *On the Incarnation*. Translated by John Behr. Yonkers, New York: St Vladimir's Seminary Press, 2011.

Augustine. *The Trinity*. Translated by Edmund Hill. Brooklyn, New York: New City Press, 1991.

Barth, Karl. *Church Dogmatics I/1: The Doctrine of the Word of God*. Translated by G. W. Bromiley. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1975.

Bauckham, Richard. *Jesus and the God of Israel*. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans, 2008.

Behr, John. *The Way to Nicaea*. Crestwood, New York: St Vladimir's Seminary Press, 2001.

Brown, Raymond E. *The Gospel According to John I–XII*. Garden City, New York: Doubleday, 1966.

Gregory of Nazianzus. *On God and Christ: The Five Theological Orations and Two Letters to Cledonius*. Translated by Frederick Williams and Lionel Wickham. Crestwood, New York: St Vladimir's Seminary Press, 2002.

Hofmann, Martin, and Thomas Streicher. "The Groupoid Interpretation of Type Theory." In *Twenty-Five Years of Constructive Type Theory*, edited by Giovanni Sambin and Jan M. Smith, 83–111. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998.

Irenaeus. *Against Heresies*. In *The Ante-Nicene Fathers*, Volume 1. Edited by Alexander Roberts and James Donaldson. Buffalo, New York: Christian Literature Publishing, 1885.

Luther, Martin. *Luther's Works, Volume 26: Lectures on Galatians 1535*. Edited by Jaroslav Pelikan. St. Louis, Missouri: Concordia Publishing House, 1963.

Martin-Löf, Per. *Intuitionistic Type Theory*. Naples: Bibliopolis, 1984.

McGrath, Alister E. *Christian Theology: An Introduction*. 6th edition. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell, 2017.

The Univalent Foundations Program. *Homotopy Type Theory: Univalent Foundations of Mathematics*. Institute for Advanced Study, 2013.

Voevodsky, Vladimir. “Univalent Foundations of Mathematics.” In *Logic, Language, Information and Computation*, edited by Lev D. Beklemishev and Ruy de Queiroz, 4–4. Berlin: Springer, 2011.

Wright, N. T. *Paul and the Faithfulness of God*. Minneapolis, Minnesota: Fortress Press, 2013.

The Holy Bible. John 1:1–18; John 14:6–11; Colossians 1:15–20; Hebrews 1:1–4.