

## **From Nicea to First Constantinople**

### **By Msgr. Cantley**

One of the more disconcerting problems for the Church, as it began a favored political and socially acceptable history under the Emperor Constantine, was the involvement of civil government in Church affairs. It was probably inevitable, given the experience of the Empire where the Emperors power was nearly absolute; but it was, as we will see, dangerous when the Emperor favored interests opposed to the doctrinal truth of the Church as happened under Constantius II; or again when the Church fell into disfavor as under the Emperor Julian the Apostate. Though Constantine acted favorably toward the Church when he attempted to stamp out Donatism<sup>i</sup> in the West; and in the East at Nicea when he hoped to settle Arianism, he set a precedent for his successors that harmed the Church in its teaching and administrative functions.

Ideas die hard, and cannot be conquered by force, imperial or otherwise.<sup>ii</sup> Constantine did not settle either schism or heresy even when state power was engaged to force compliance. The unity of the Church was maintained during the era of persecution, even if precariously, because of the same faith commitment on the part of all believers; but heresy and schism nearly shattered that unity when civil power attempted to intervene, and devious attempts to curry favor with the representatives of imperial authority was attempted by Church leaders. In the West, the persistent problem was discipline; in the East, theology.

Constantine died in 337, and his united Empire was divided between his sons: Constantine II in the West, Constantius II in the East, and Constans in-between. Constantine II was killed in 340 and Constans took the West along with his own portion. The young Emperors were intolerant of paganism and moved violently against its temples, worship and idols; and many Christian bishops joined their effort, attacking paganism aggressively. This like-mindedness lasted for only a fleeting moment, creating an expectation of imperial initiative and clerical support. It initiated a dynamic of expected clerical subservience that became a long term currying of favor to obtain imperial support in theological matters that properly belonged to the Church. How would the Emperors respond to decisions promulgated at Nicea? This became a question of increasing importance not only for single issues of governance but for the critical issues of doctrine. It did not take long to find the answer, as Arianism took on new life and almost a complete victory.

Constantius, in the East, did not uphold Nicea, while his brother Constans in the West did. In the East, Athanasius and other Nicean bishops were deposed and sent into exile. The Eastern bishops took the occasion of the dedication in 341 of a church, built at Antioch by Constantius, to meet in council (called the Dedication Council) and issued a letter in which they offered their creedal statement of faith. It was Arian, but they were clever enough to disguise this by the tactic of avoiding the every formula that had been condemned at Nicea. Between 341 and 360 there were

some fourteen councils held among Arian supporters in which they tried to discover an acceptable substitute formula for the word “homoousios”(of the same substance or in Latin *consubstantialis*), experimenting with *homoiousion* (of like substance) and *homoios* (similar) to describe the relationship of the Father and Son. One group even went so far as to deny all identity, likeness and similarity with the word *anomois* (dissimilar). All of the possibilities were covered, but yielded no agreement. With the death of Constans in 350, Constantius became sole Emperor and to bring about peace insisted on the word “homoios” in the Creed, imposing it on the whole Church in 359 with two Councils that sat under Imperial threat: at Rimini in the West and at Seleucia in the East. The other three terms were outlawed. It looked as though Arianism would be triumphant in a final defeat of Nicea. However, victory for the anti-Niceans was short lived. With the death of Constantius in 361, Arianism collapsed since all it had was imperial favor which, paradoxically, drew the homoousian and homoiousian factions together, the latter coming to realize that they held the same doctrine and that the word ‘homoousion’ was richer in content. Under the leadership of Athanasius, the Cappadocians Basil, Gregory Nazianzen and Gregory of Nyssa came to see the necessity of the Three Divine Persons sharing the same identical substance. After a short return to Arianism under Valens (364-378), Theodosius I (379-395), a supporter of Nicea, outlawed Arianism in 380, and called the first Council of Constantinople in 381.

There is no doubt that in the East, the problem was largely terminological. In the West which used Latin, the correlative term *consubstantialis* admitted no ambiguity. The problem in the East was that the term *homoousion* could mean three things: it could be understood generically as in the example ‘all men share the same human nature, therefore meaning human equality; or it could signify numerical identity, as in the Father and Son are identical in being (which could be a Sebellian meaning); finally it could refer to material things, e.g., two statues sculptured from the same marble (meaning the Father and Son would be parts of something else). One of the unfortunate elements of the history of the word homoousion was that it was rejected by the Council of Antioch in 268 in the condemnation of the Adoptionist heresy of Paul of Samosata. Add to this the fact that the word is not found in the Scriptures and one can understand its unpopularity. However, by the later Fourth century, all of this was settled and the word Homoousian was clearly the most accurate term to express the theological truth it was slated to bear.

Arianism spawned a number of heresies that will be addressed in forthcoming Councils. In Christology, Arius conceded that the Logos assumed a body but insisted that it was without a human soul since it was informed by the Logos (the Word or Son of God) and, hence, there was no need for a soul. Thus laying the foundation for the heresy of Apollinarism<sup>iii</sup> or Monophysitism in germ; in Arius’ view of the progressive divinization of the person of Christ we see the seeds of Nestorianism; and in his theory of redemption effected through example, we can recognize the heralding of Pelagianism. Clearly, all heresy has its potential for

cropping up in some altered form, and so important a heresy as that of Arius had many noxious effects on future and contemporary doctrine.

We have to ask how this aberration of Christian doctrine could have succeeded as it did. The fundamental answer is political. Among the exiled and deposed bishops who supported Arius, Eusebius of Nicomedia was a leader. He succeeded in winning the support of Princess Constantia, the favorite sister of Constantine who persuaded her brother to pardon Eusebius and the others and return them to the service of the Church. Eusebius made a profession of faith, but had the cleverness to use ambiguous language the successfully hid his still Arian convictions. He continued at the imperial court, and began his counter-attack on the orthodox bishops, *St. Athanasius* the most formidable among them. Eusebius was angered when Athanasius forbade the pardoned Arius to reenter Alexandria. He engineered false charges against Athanasius and succeeded in having him called to a council at Caesarea to defend himself. Athanasius refused to appear and along with fifty bishops of Egypt called for a council at Tyre in 335. There he met new trumped-up charges and departed for Constantinople in hope of a fair hearing. In the capital city, however, the gullible Constantine was fooled by the false charge that Athanasius had prevented a shipment of much needed wheat from leaving Alexandria to relieve the shortage in Constantinople. The Emperor banished Athanasius to Treves in 335. Constantine died in 337 and Athanasius returned to Alexandria in triumph, having been acquitted of all charges against him. His success was short lived. With the death of Constantine in 350, Constantius, the Arian Emperor, now controlled the whole Empire and in 356 again exiled Athanasius. With Constantius' death in 361, Julian the Apostate became Emperor. He was a cousin of Constantius and survivor of the fratricide that killed his father, and resulted in his being treated shabbily by Constantius. He, at first, reversed the decisions of his predecessor and Athanasius returned to Alexandria. Julian was a Christian from birth, but court-Christianity disaffected him since many of the courtiers were half-baked Christians more interested in imperial preferment than authentic faith. Julian saw Christianity as a weapon Constantius used to rule tyrannously and he decided, having been educated more in pagan philosophy and literature and meagerly in Christianity, to eradicate it. Among the victims of his efforts was Athanasius, again exiled. But Julian was killed in battle in 363 having ruled only 20 months. The army elected Jovian Emperor. His rule was even shorter, only 8 months, but long enough to reverse the policies of Julian. A foolish treaty led to the break-up of the Empire once again, and two brothers ascended to rule: Valentinian in the West who favored the orthodox faith; and Valens in the East, an avid Arian who sent Athanasius into a fifth exile. Athanasius did return to Alexandria again and died there in 373. Athanasius is one of our prime sources for the history of the contest between Arianism and orthodox doctrine. Among his writings is a *Letter on the Decrees of the Council of Nicea* which describes the proceedings of the Council; an extensive treatise on Arianism in his four volume *Discourses against the Arians*; his *Apology against the Arians* (most valued for its incorporation of official documents) and his *History of the Arians* of which only fragments are extant. There is also a creed attributed to him. This attribution has

**been contested since the 17<sup>th</sup> Century. It was probably written later, by an unknown author, and originally in Latin as it reflects a later time and environment; yet it represents, in summary, the doctrine for which Athanasius fought and is worth printing here:<sup>iv</sup>**

### **Creed of Athanasius**

Whoever wishes to be saved must, above all, keep the Catholic faith. For unless a person keeps this faith whole and entire he will undoubtedly be lost forever.

This is what the Catholic faith teaches.

We worship one God in the Trinity and the Trinity in unity. We distinguish among the persons, but we do not divide the substance. For the Father is a distinct person; the Son is a distinct person; and the Holy Spirit is a distinct person. Still the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit have one divinity, equal glory, and co-eternal majesty. What the Father is, the Son is, and the Holy Spirit is. The Father is uncreated, the Son is uncreated, and the Holy Spirit is uncreated. The Father is boundless, the Son is boundless, and the Holy Spirit is boundless. The Father is eternal, the Son is eternal, and the Holy Spirit is eternal. Nevertheless, there are not three eternal beings, but one eternal being. Thus there are not three uncreated beings, nor three boundless beings, but one uncreated being and one boundless being. Likewise, the Father is omnipotent, the Son is omnipotent, and the Holy Spirit is omnipotent. Yet there are not three omnipotent beings, but one omnipotent being. Thus the Father is God, the Son is God, and the Holy Spirit is God. But there are not three gods, but one God. The Father is Lord, the Son is Lord, and the Holy Spirit is Lord. There are not three lords, but one Lord. For according to Christian truth, we must profess that each of the persons individually is God; and according to Christian religion we are forbidden to say that there are three gods or lords. The Father is not made by anyone, nor created by anyone, nor generated by anyone. The Son is not made nor created, but he is generated by the Father alone. The Holy Spirit is not made nor created nor generated, but proceeds from the Father and the Son. There is, then, one Father, not three Fathers; one Son, but not three sons; one Holy Spirit, not three holy spirits. In this Trinity, there is nothing greater, nothing less than anything else. But the entire three persons are co-eternal and coequal with one another. So that, as we have said, we worship complete unity in the Trinity and the Trinity in unity.

This, then, is what he who wishes to be saved must believe about the Trinity.

It is also necessary for eternal salvation that he believes steadfastly in the incarnation of our Lord Jesus Christ. The true faith is: we believe and profess that our Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of God, is both God and man. As God He was begotten of the substance of the Father before time; as man He was born in time of the substance of His Mother. He is perfect God; and He is perfect man, with a rational soul and human flesh. He is equal to the Father in His divinity, but He is inferior to the Father in His humanity. Although He is God and man, He is not two, but one Christ. And He is one, not because His divinity was changed into flesh, but because His humanity was assumed to God. He is one, not at all because of a mingling of substances, but because He is one person. As a rational soul and flesh are one man: so God and man are one Christ. He died for our salvation, descended to hell, arose from the dead on the third day. Ascended into heaven, sits at the right hand of God the Father almighty, and from there He shall come to judge the living and the dead. At His coming, all men are to arise with their own bodies; and they are to give an account of their lives. Those who have done good deeds will go into eternal life; those who have done evil will go into everlasting fire.

This is the Catholic faith. Everyone must believe it, firmly and steadfastly; otherwise He cannot be saved. Amen.

Cardinal Newman offers another reason for Arian success: “As to the Arians, it is a matter of fact, that Arius and his friends commenced their careers with the deliberate commission of disorderly and schismatic acts; and it is a clear inference from their subsequent proceedings, that they did so for private ends.”<sup>v</sup> Both of these reasons suggest, Newman goes on to say, that their motivation was political. They merely usurped the name of religion but their methods were essentially anti-Christian. The religious issue was subordinated to their ends of achieving political influence and power. “They grafted their heresy on the schism of the Meletians...”<sup>vi</sup> and then abandoned the Meletians when their own interest made this advantageous. At Nicea, as we saw, the Arian bishops accepted the concessions demanded by the majority, but as later events showed, their concessions were insincere and they cleverly interpreted the language of the Council to advance their own positions. I think Newman would have agreed with the position I took in the first lecture that one may assume a sincere motivation for the heresiarch until the opposite can be demonstrated. But when Newman takes into account their subsequent actions he is certainly justified in his harsher judgment. He concludes: “At the Council of Nicea [the Arian Bishops] began by maintaining an erroneous doctrine; and if they were odious when they blasphemed the truth, they are still more odious when they confessed it. It was the very principal of Eclecticism to make light of differences of belief; while it was involved in the primary notion of a Revelation that these differences were of importance, and it was taught with plainness in the Gospel, that to join with those who denied the right faith was a sin.”<sup>vii</sup>

With Arianism seemingly defeated (as we noted in the first lecture it will reappear in various forms throughout history down to our own time, *Pluralist* theology being a modern example) two more problems arose. The first of these from a man of good will, Apollinaris of Laodecia (cā 300 – cā 390) he was a colleague of Athanasius and a committed anti-Arian, a firm supporter of Nicea. He was troubled, however, that the absolute divinity of Christ was not sufficiently protected by the orthodox theology. His position became known as *Apollinarianism*, and a forerunner of the later heresy of *Monophysitism*.<sup>viii</sup> Apollinaris held that the divine Word replaced the human soul in the *Hypostatic Union* and performed all of the functions of a human soul in regard to intellect and will. He had two reasons for this position: first that God and man are each complete beings; hence the union of God and a complete man could not take place since two beings could not be one being: secondly, a human soul has freedom to sin, and Christ could not sin. Here, Apollinaris’ error was his failure to see that the Hypostatic Union is not one in nature but in Person; and, as St. Gregory Nazianzen (330-390) answered regarding the second of Apollinaris’ reasons --to hold that proneness to sin is an obstacle to Christ having a human mind is to assume that God cannot heal the human mind, therefore on the principle that *what the Redeemer did not assume would not be redeemed*, Apollinaris’ position would mean that sins of the human mind could not be healed. This negates the fullness of salvation accomplished by Christ.<sup>ix</sup> How, we must ask, does Apollinaris’ position differ from that of Arius? Arius, it will be recalled, held that the Son replaced the soul of Christ, but the Son was a creature and not divine. Apollinaris also held the Son replaced the soul of Christ, but the

Son is God, the Son is divine. Apollinaris rejected a human soul in Christ precisely to prevent the Son from being reduced to the status of creature and as such to be open to change. Apollinaris preserved the unity of the Word and flesh; but he jeopardized the full and real humanity of the Redeemer.

The Apollinarianists' error was lack of vision, an inability to see that their position vitiated redemption for our *entire* human nature. Their ideas were rejected at the Synod of Alexandria in 362 after which, the recalcitrant adherents of their position continued to proselytize until the matter was remanded to Pope Damasus in 375. He repudiated it in 377 and excommunicated its adherents who would not recant. Canon 1 of the Council of Constantinople repeated the condemnation in 381. Apollinaris must have obeyed since he remained Bishop of Laodicea till his death in 385. How different from Arius! There is no evidence that the Apollinarian heresy developed into a movement in any way comparable to that of Arius.

In the first lecture where we treated the issues addressed at Nicea we recalled the content of the Nicene Creed. That Council was notably succinct in its reference to the Holy Spirit: "And in the Holy Spirit." The developments during the Fourth Century required that the Council of Constantinople clarify the Church's teaching on the Holy Spirit. Having addressed important Christological issues and advanced the theology of the Trinity, the *Pneumatological* (*pneuma* is Greek for spirit; *logein* is Greek for to speak, hence theologizing about the Spirit) question had to be resolved. Arius held that the essence of the Spirit is as unlike that of the Son as the Son is unlike the Father. Eusebius of Caesarea, under Origenist influence held that the Spirit was an *hypostasis* of third rank, one of the beings created through the Son. Later Arians held the Spirit in great honor and dignity, but insisted he was a creature produced by the Son at the direction of the Father.<sup>x</sup> By 359-360 Athanasius turned his attention to a group in Egypt called *Macedonians*<sup>xi</sup> or *Pneumatomachians* (those who fight against the Spirit). They were a mixed gathering of persons, some of whom were homoiousians and others were homoiousians in their theological positions regarding the Father and the Son (whether they were of the same substance, or of like substance). With regard to the Spirit, they taught he was neither God nor a mere creature. They depicted the Spirit as inferior to the Father and Son; and for them, Scripture said nothing explicit about the Spirit's divinity.

Again, it was Athanasius who entered the fray and at the same time enriched his own theology. He advanced his arguments regarding the Spirit from the Scriptures: "The Spirit is said to come from God, to bestow sanctification and life, to be unchangeable, omnipotent and unique; therefore, He is more than a creature. The Spirit makes us partakers of God; if the Spirit thus makes humans divine, His nature must be that of God. The Trinity itself is eternal, homogeneous and indivisible: if the Spirit is a member of it, He is consubstantial with the Father and the Son."<sup>xii</sup> In his *Letters to Serapion*, Athanasius uses the baptismal formula in Matthew 28: 19 "Go, therefore, make disciples of all nations, baptize them (*eis tò onoma*) in the name (singular) of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit"

concluding “from the baptismal formula that the Spirit shared the same divinity as the Father and the Son in the unity of the same substance.”<sup>xiii</sup>

The Creed of the First Council of Constantinople had a long history before being accepted as Ecumenical and an authentic statement of the Christian faith. Perhaps the conclusions of J.N.D. Kelly<sup>xiv</sup> may be the most acceptable attempt at an explanation of how it was finally accepted. He notes that an alleged silence about the Council, until it was accepted at the Council of Chalcedon in 451, is not as absolute as supposed. There are hints of it in the writings of Gregory Nazianzus, the second president of the Council. Failure to discover widespread use of this Creed in the liturgy may also be explained by the fact that the Council was not recognized as Ecumenical until so declared at Chalcedon where it was used for the first time. It was discovered in the Episcopal archives of Constantinople and read out to the assembly at Chalcedon, ratified there, and ratified again at the sixth Ecumenical Council, Constantinople III in 680. We may reproduce it here:

We believe in one God, the Father, the Almighty,  
maker of heaven and earth, of all that is seen and unseen.  
 We believe in one Lord, Jesus Christ,  
 the only Son of God, eternally begotten of the Father,  
 (Nicaea had: “only begotten, that is, from the substance of the Father”)  
 God from God, light from light, true God from true God,  
 begotten, not made, one in Being with the Father.  
 Through Him all things were made.  
 [Ὁμοούσιον τῷ Πατρὶ, δι' οὗ τὰ πάντα ἐγένετο]  
 (Nicaea had: “things in heaven and things on earth”)  
 For us and for our salvation he came down from heaven,  
 By the power of the Holy Spirit he was born of the Virgin Mary and became man.  
For our sake he was crucified under Pontius Pilate;  
 He suffered, died and was buried.  
 On the third day he rose again in fulfillment of the Scriptures;  
 He ascended into heaven and is seated at the right hand of the Father.  
 He will come again in glory to judge the living and the dead,  
and his kingdom will have no end.  
 We believe in the Holy Spirit, the Lord, the giver of life,  
Who proceeds from the Father [and the Son *Filioque*]  
With the Father and the Son he is worshiped and glorified.  
He has spoken through the Prophets.  
We believe in one holy catholic and apostolic Church.  
We acknowledge one baptism for the forgiveness of sins.  
We look for the resurrection of the dead, and the life of the world to come. Amen.

The italicized words are those that appear in the Nicene Creed but were omitted at Constantinople; while the underlined words are additions to the Nicene Creed. However, it would be a mistake to assume that the Creed of Constantinople is merely a matter of adding additional phrases to that of

Nicea. From what we have learned, there were new issues raised in the intervening fifty-six years: the issues raised by Apollinaris; the doctrine about the divinity of the Holy Spirit; and the struggle against the efforts of the Arians to reinterpret the language of Nicea to accord with their own teachings an effort that brought into existence the phenomenon that came to be known as semi-Arianism.

The bracketed words added to the affirmation of the Holy Spirit as proceeding from the Father *and the Son*, with the addition of the Latin expression *Filioque* was and remains an issue of contention between Eastern and Western Christendom. “Filioque” was an addition to the Creed that was probably inserted for the first time in Spain, in the 5<sup>th</sup> Century. Rome, at first resisted its use in the Liturgy, not for any doctrinal objection but out of respect for the theological sensibilities of the East which preferred to describe the procession of the Spirit as “from the Father through the Son”. Photius, Patriarch of Constantinople objected in 967 to Rome’s wrongly adding a phrase to the Creed already approved in Council. However, possibly at the urging of Emperor Henry II, Rome accepted the phrase for use in 1013. This became a major issue at the final break between the Eastern and Western Churches in 1054. The East based its objection on the prohibition from the Council of Ephesus (431) declaring that nothing be added to a Creed approved by an Ecumenical Council. Theologically, the Eastern objection was based on the Greek notion of *monarchy*, i.e., that there is only one Principal (*archē*) in the Godhead and that is the Father. Hence they formulated the formula that the Spirit proceeds from the Father through the Son. At the reunion Council of Lyons (1274) the Greeks accepted the validity of the Western formula, but were not required to include it in their recitation of the Creed. The reunion established there was short-lived. Since then, the “Filioque” issue has become more a symbol of disagreement on the seat of doctrinal authority in the Church than a matter of belief.

The First Council of Constantinople was held from May till July 381 and attended by 150 Fathers, all from the East. Pope Damasus was not represented, so its status as an Ecumenical Council was not immediately recognized. There is no mention of Constantinople at Ephesus, but at Chalcedon it was accepted as a valid Council. In the West, acceptance would take considerably longer, till the 6<sup>th</sup> Century. This post-factum recognition gave it its status as an Ecumenical Council and this includes the Creed it authored and the theology of the Holy Spirit it teaches. Here we have the orthodox Catholic faith represented.

---

<sup>1</sup>This was a north-African schism that began in 312 as a result of the election of Caecilian a Bishop of Carthage in 311. Opposing bishops attempted to invalidate his ordination as bishop and selection to that see on the grounds that his consecrator was a *traditor* (one who handed over the Books of the Scriptures to the pagans during the persecution of Diocletian), installing a rival bishop, Majorinus in his place. Pope

Miltiades ruled in favor of Caecilian, and the oppose bishops appealed to Constantine who supported the Pope and banished Donatus, Majorinus' successor. In 362 when Julian the Apostate became Emperor he reversed that decision and the schism lasted another 50 years.

<sup>ii</sup> See Robert M. Grant, *Augustus to Constantine: The Emergence of Christianity in the Roman World*, Barnes & Noble, 1970, pg. 242ff.

<sup>iii</sup> Apollinarius opposed the emphasis on the duality of natures in Christ that was emphasized by the Syrian school, and suppressed the natural soul in Christ insisting that it was the Son Who united the human body to himself. Christ was, then, the divine Nature dressed in human flesh.

<sup>iv</sup> See J. Neuner-J. Dupuis, *The Christian Faith in the Doctrinal Documents of the Catholic Church*, 7<sup>th</sup> enlarged edition, Alba House, 2001, pg. 12.

<sup>v</sup> John Henry Cardinal Newman, *The Arians of the Fourth Century*, University of Notre Dame Press, 2001, pgs. 1; 259-260.

<sup>vi</sup> Named for Meletius, Bishop of Lycopolis in Egypt (d. 326). He usurped the primacy of the Egyptian Church when Bishop Peter of Alexandria was hiding during the persecution of Diocletian (305-306), and refused to relinquish it when the Bishop was able to return. Rather, he gathered followers into a separatist Church which became active supporters of the Arian crisis.

<sup>vii</sup> Idem.

<sup>viii</sup> Condemned at Chalcedon in 451. We treat this in the fourth lecture. Briefly it was concerned to emphasize the immutable and perfect nature of the Word after the Incarnation and would admit of only one nature, the divine, totally suppressing the human nature. The result would be that Jesus is true God, but not true man.

<sup>ix</sup> See a development of this in Leo Donald Davis, *The First Seven Ecumenical Councils (326-787): Their History and Theology*, Michael Glazer/The Liturgical Press Collegeville Min., 1990, pgs. 104-105.

<sup>x</sup> See Leo Donald Davis, op. cit., pgs. 106-107.

<sup>xi</sup> Named after Bishop Macedonius of Constantinople

<sup>xii</sup> Leo Donald Davis, op. cit. pg. 107.

<sup>xiii</sup> See Yves Congar, *I believe in the Holy Spirit*, Vol. I, Seabury Press, 1983, pg. 74.

<sup>xiv</sup> J.N.D. Kelly, *Early Christian Creeds*, London, 1973.

### **Addendum:** From Davis, *The First Seven Ecumenical Councils*

**Adoptionists:** theologians who sought to ensure monotheism by describing Jesus as a man gifted by the Father with divine powers, Paul of Samosata and his followers, called Paulianists by the Council of Nicea I, are usually styled Adoptionists or dynamic monarchians.

**Apollinarianists:** faction led by Apollinaris of Laodicea, a staunch Nicene, who maintained that the divine Logos functioned as the mind of Christ who possessed a sentient body.

**Communicatio Idiomatum:** an interchange of properties, is the theological principle that though the human and divine natures of Christ are distinct, the attributes of the one may be predicated of the other because of their union in the one Person.

**Hypostasis:** Greek term adapted to theological use meaning individual reality or person. The Cappadocian Fathers standardized eastern Trinitarian theology by insisting on the formula three hypostases or persons in one ousia or substance.

---

**Hypostatic union:** the substantial union of the divine and human natures in the one divine Person of Jesus Christ.

**Macedonians:** those who denied the full divinity of the Holy Spirit; their name seems to have been derived from Macedonius of Constantinople, deposed in 360. Called also Pneumatomachians or fighters against the Holy Spirit.

**Monarchians:** theologians who attempted to safeguard monotheism by viewing Father, Son and Holy Spirit as a succession of monads or operations of the single Godhead. Thus they are sometimes called Modal Monarchians. Sabellius is usually regarded as this theory's principal proponent. Monarchians are sometimes termed Patripassians because of their contention that the Father suffered with the Son.

**Ousia:** theological term which signifies positive, substantial existence, that which exists. The Cappadocian Fathers insisted on the formula, one ousia but three hypostases in the Trinity.

.....

### **Questions for discussion:**

- 1) Our political philosophy favors the separation of Church and State. Do you find corroboration for this in the early history of the Church?
- 2) After Nicea, when the authentic faith was declared and Arius was condemned, the issue did not die. What tactics were used to keep it alive?
- 3) Why would calling the Son "of like substance" or "of similar substance" to the Father be inadequate?
- 4) The most radical semi-Arian group declared the Son's nature as dissimilar to that of the Father. What would that imply?
- 5) When Constantius became sole Emperor in 350, what effect did his forced intervention at Rimini and Selenica have on: doctrine? On the authority of the Church?
- 6) After Constantius died in 361, harmony was established because opposing groups saw the need to advance the formula "Three divine Persons in one and the same substance." What does that mean?
- 7) In the East, Homoousios was thought ambiguous since it could mean three things, one accurate, and the others heretical. How so?
- 8) What was taught by the Adoptionists and the Sebellians? What doctrinal problems do they represent? Many of the problems centered around personalities: Eusebius of Nicomedia and St. Athanasius of Alexandria. How did their positions contrast?
- 9) Constantinople addressed two additional issues: Apollinarianism and the recognition of the divinity of the Holy Spirit. What was central to each?
- 10) What does the expression "what is not assumed is not saved" mean? How is it involved in the resolution of the errors addressed at Constantinople?
- 11) What was the problem regarding the procession of the Holy Spirit? What is the problem surrounding the use of the word "Filioque"?