

# The Struggle against Arianism before and after the Council of Constantinople (381)

Julia Cheung

摘要：今天我們會把每個主日彌撒都宣認的信經看作是理所當然。這信仰準則，基本上是381年的君士坦丁堡信經。本文旨在闡述召開君士坦丁堡會議（381）的歷史和神學背景，以至我們能夠對381年的信經是如何形成有更深的領會。事實上，360年的君士坦丁堡會議頒佈了亞略異端相似派的信經之後，正統要花上超過二十年的努力，才最終在同一城市召開後來被稱為第二次大公會議的君士坦丁堡會議（381），正式把不同形式的亞略異端定罪，並以寫得更完整的君士坦丁堡信經（381）去重申尼西亞的信仰。

關鍵詞：亞略異端、君士坦丁堡第一屆大公會議、信經

***Abstract:** Today we take for granted the Creed we profess at every Sunday Mass—which essentially is the Constantinople Creed (381)—as our rule of faith. This paper aims to delineate the historical and theological context from which the Council of Constantinople (381) came about, so that we may better appreciate how the Creed of 381 come into being. Indeed, it took more than two decades of struggle, after the promulgation of the Homoian Arian Creed at the Council of Constantinople (360), before another council held at the same city, which came to be known as the second ecumenical council, could at last officially condemn the various forms of Arianism and reaffirm the Nicene faith with a more fully developed Constantinople Creed (381).*

***Keywords:** Arianism, Council of Constantinople I, Creed*

My article “The Council of Nicaea and Subsequent Arian-Themed Councils up to 360 A.D.” in *Theology Annual* 39 (2018) ends with a note of seeming hopelessness for orthodoxy. The Homoian triumph, which appeared definitive at the Council of Constantinople (360), gave the illusion that “the whole world”—as Jerome calls it—had become homogeneously Arian, against which the Nicene Catholic underdogs had to struggle hard. Yet this darkest period would also mark the beginning of dawn. Orthodoxy would eventually emerge as the victor. Arianism would officially be condemned by the Council of Constantinople (381) in the East and the Council of Aquileia (381) in the West. It is the purpose of this paper to discuss the events and controversies leading up to that hard-won victory, so that it would shed light on how our profession of faith—essentially the Constantinople Creed (381)—came into being.

The road to orthodoxy is not a straight path. The wind usually blew in favour of the group favoured by the emperor. The Arians had the upper hand under the Arian Constantius II (337/351-361), but they were disadvantaged under Julian the Pagan (361-363) as well as under Jovian (363-364), the pro-Nicene Emperor. The Nicenes suffered some setback when the Arian Valens became the emperor of the East from 364-378, but won their victory under the Pro-Nicene Theodosius (379-395). But even then, Arianism would still remain among the barbarians until the Council of Toledo (589), at which the Visigothic King Reccared made an exposition of faith on the *filioque* doctrine, to testify to his conversion from Arianism to Catholicism.

In the period leading up to the Council of Constantinople (381), just as it was never a clear-cut loss or victory for either the Arian or Nicene camp, the boundary between Arian and Nicene theology was not that clear-cut either. There was a diversity of opinion. It may not be so easy to place certain theologians during this period of theological turmoil in either the orthodox or Arian camp. Eusebius of Emesa was one such example. Grillmeier and Williams call him a Homoiousian.<sup>1</sup> But he also shows Arian traits in his rejection of the divinity of the Holy Spirit and insistence on the ingenerate-generate distinction between the Father and the Son.<sup>2</sup> Yet, on the Father-Son relationship, he is closer to Athanasius than Arius.<sup>3</sup> Cyril of Jerusalem is another such example. He was orthodox, but his theology is not that of a typical Nicene.<sup>4</sup> He was eager to avoid the Sabellianism of Marcellus.<sup>5</sup> Thus he never speaks about divine unity on the basis of nature and substance and uses the word *homoousios*. Instead, he is eager to make a distinction between the Father and the Son. The Father is the ontological but not the chronological ἀρχή, thus ontologically but not chronologically prior. Furthermore, he understands Jn 10:30 in the oriental manner as a unity of will.<sup>6</sup>

---

1 Aloys Grillmeier, *Christ in Christian Tradition*, vol. 1, *From the Apostolic Age to Chalcedon (451)*, 2nd ed., trans. John Bowden (Atlanta: John Knox Press, 1975), p. 302; Daniel H. Williams, "Another Exception to Later Fourth-Century 'Arian' Typologies: The Case of Germinius of Sirmium," *Journal of Early Christian Studies* 4, no. 3 (1996): 339.

2 R. P. C. Hanson, *The Search for the Christian Doctrine of God: The Arian Controversy, 318-381* (Grand Rapids: T&T Clark, 2005), p. 395; Williams, "Another Exception," p. 339.

3 Hanson, *The Search*, p. 389.

4 *Ibid.*, p. 413.

5 *Ibid.*, p. 405.

6 Manilo Simonetti, *La crisi ariana nel IV secolo*, *Studia Ephemeridis Augustinianum* 11 (Rome: Institutum Patristicum Augustinianum, 1975), p. 208.

Remarkably, it is from this period with shifting political and theological winds, amidst difficulty in simplistically categorizing someone as either Nicene or Arian, and yet by the unceasing endeavour of the Church Fathers and Council Fathers working under the guidance of the Holy Spirit that today's standard of orthodoxy emerges.

### 1. Under Julian the Pagan (361-363)

Julian became the emperor of the Roman Empire in 361. As “the first emperor of genuine education for a century,”<sup>7</sup> he favoured the Hellenic culture and considered the rise of Christianity as a threat to this culture.<sup>8</sup> In February 362, he issued an edict to reopen temples and resume pagan sacrifices, and another edict to make it possible for bishops condemned under Constantius to return from exile.<sup>9</sup> The Homoians were no longer the privileged group as they were under the reign of Constantius. They needed to set out for a new course.<sup>10</sup>

The stage was set for a Nicene comeback. Under the leadership of Hilary of Poitiers, the Council of Paris (360/361) aimed to counter the adverse effect of the Council of Ariminum (359). The council sent a letter to the Eastern bishops and declared their acceptance of the Nicene faith and the *homousios*.<sup>11</sup> Jn 10:30 and Jn 14:9-10 were cited to legitimise

---

7 Peter Brown, *The World of Late Antiquity: AD 150-750* (London: Thames and Hudson, 1971), p. 91.

8 Brown, *The World of Late Antiquity*, p. 93.

9 Daniel H. Williams, *Ambrose of Milan and the End of the Nicene-Arian Conflicts* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1995), p. 63; Simonetti, *La crisi ariana*, p. 359.

10 Simonetti, *La crisi ariana*, p. 375.

11 Lewis Ayres, *Nicaea and its Legacy: An Approach to Fourth-Century Trinitarian Theology* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004), p. 177; Hanson, *The Search*, p. 465.

the use of *homoousios*.<sup>12</sup> But there was no discussion regarding the divinity of the Holy Spirit. Among others, the Arian Valens, Ursacius and Auxentius of Milan were condemned, though Valens retained his see at Mursa and Ursacius maintained strong control over Singidunum till his death.<sup>13</sup> Auxentius also stayed in his see undisturbed until he died in 374.<sup>14</sup> As a result of Hilary's effort and influence, "the Latin West was never again seriously threatened by Arianism."<sup>15</sup>

### 1.1 Council of Alexandria (362)

The Council of Alexandria (362) affirmed the consubstantiality of the Holy Spirit with the Father and the Son. The synodal letter "*Epistola Catholica*" points out that the Trinity being *homoousios* is a tenet established by the Council of Nicaea.<sup>16</sup> Another synodal letter "*Tomus ad Antiochenos*" was issued by a smaller assembly which stayed behind.<sup>17</sup> It was Athanasius' endeavour to make peace between the three factions in the Schism of Antioch,<sup>18</sup> setting out conditions

---

12 Simonetti, *La crisi ariana*, p. 356.

13 Williams, *Ambrose of Milan*, pp. 71-72, 76; Id., "Another Exception," p. 345.

14 Hanson, *The Search*, p. 597.

15 Karl Baus et al., *The Imperial Church from Constantine to the Early Middle Ages*, trans. Anselm Biggs, History of the Church 2, ed. Hubert Jedin and John Dolan (London: Burns & Oates, 1980), p. 59.

16 Williams, *Ambrose of Milan*, pp. 64, 235. Cf. Baus, *The Imperial Church*, p. 62.

17 Williams, *Ambrose of Milan*, p. 64.

18 The first group was the Eustathians, who were strict Nicenes loyal to the dead Eustathius of Antioch and were headed by Paulinus. They were the minority, supported by Athanasius and the West. The second and largest group supported Meletius of Antioch—the exiled but lawful successor of Eustathius of Antioch, with followers including Diodore of Tarsus and Theodore of Mopsuestia. Basil of Caesarea and the Orientals favoured this group. The third group was led by the Arian bishop Euzoius, to whom Constantius had entrusted the church of Antioch. Baus, *The Imperial Church*, pp. 60, 65; J. N. D. Kelly, *Early Christian Creeds*, 3rd ed. (London and New York: Continuum, 2011), p. 302; Simonetti, *La crisi ariana*, pp. 359, 361, 377, 412.

for the Meletians and former Arians to be united with the Paulinians.<sup>19</sup> Despite the failed settlement attempt, the *Tomus* played a crucial role in the Church's anti-Arian effort. It offers to the Meletians and ex-Arians the acceptance of Nicaea, the denunciation of the Arian heresy and the anathematisation of those who claim that the Holy Spirit is a creature as the only prerequisites for returning to communion and uniting with the Paulinians. It also anathematises Sabellius, Paul of Samosata, Valentinian, Basilides, and the Manichees.<sup>20</sup> De Halleux sees the equal anathematisation of these heretics with the Arians as putting the faith of Nicaea in the continuation of the orthodox tradition of the two preceding centuries. The Council of Alexandria was therefore of utmost importance in the history of the reception of Nicaea by its very declaration of the sufficiency of Nicaea.<sup>21</sup> For Ayres, this “technique of subscription to Nicaea as a minimum condition for communion” was Athanasius’ greatest contribution in those years.<sup>22</sup>

19 Had the agreement proceeded smoothly, Meletius could have been recognised as the bishop of Antioch, but reconciliation failed when Lucifer of Calaris was discovered to have ordained Paulinus as the bishop of Antioch instead. Hanson, *The Search*, p. 644; J. N. D. Kelly, *Early Christian Doctrines*, 5th ed. (London and New York: Continuum, 2009), p. 302; Williams, *Ambrose of Milan*, p. 66.

20 “συνάψαντες αὐτοῦς τοῖς ἀγαπητοῖς ἡμῶν τοῖς περὶ Παυλῖνον μηδὲν πλέον ἀπατήσητε παρ’ αὐτῶν ἢ ἀναθεματίζειν μὲν τὴν Ἀρειανὴν αἵρεσιν, ὁμολογεῖν δὲ τὴν παρὰ τῶν πατέρων ὁμολογηθεῖσαν ἐν Νικαίᾳ πίστιν, ἀναθεματίζειν δὲ καὶ τοὺς λέγοντας κτίσμα εἶναι τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον καὶ διηρημένον ἐκ τῆς οὐσίας τοῦ Χριστοῦ. [...] ἀναθεματίζεσθω δὲ παρὰ πάντων ἡ Σαβελλίου καὶ Παύλου τοῦ Σαμοσατέως ἀσέβεια καὶ Οὐαλεντινίου καὶ Βασιλείδου ἡ μανία καὶ τῶν Μανιχαίων ἡ παραφροσύνη” / “unite them to our beloved Paulinus and his people, without requiring more from them than to anathematise the Arian heresy and confess the faith confessed by the holy fathers at Nicaea, and to anathematise also those who say that the Holy Spirit is a Creature and separate from the Essence of Christ. [...] But let the impiety of Sabellius and of Paul of Samosata also be anathematised by all, and the madness of Valentinian and Basilides, and the folly of the Manichaeans.” Athanasius of Alexandria, *Tomus ad Antiochenos* 3 (AW 2/8: 342-343, trans. A. Robertson, NPNF II/4: 484).

21 Andrè de Halleux, “La réception du symbole œcuménique, de Nicée à Chalcedoine,” *Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses* 61 (1985): 18-19.

22 Ayres, *Nicaea and its Legacy*, p. 175.

On the one hand, the *Tomus* secures the status of Nicaea as the one measure of orthodoxy. On the other hand, it denies that the Council of Sardica (343) had published a statement declaring that there is but one *hypostasis* in God. Hanson suggests that Athanasius—the only one at Alexandria (362) who was also present at Sardica (343)—made this false claim in the *Tomus* knowingly to avoid provoking the Easterners who prefer to speak of God as three *hypostases* in a sense not contrary to Nicaea.<sup>23</sup> The *Tomus* states that the council asked those who spoke of three *hypostases* whether they meant it in the Arian sense of having three different substances like gold, silver and brass and the answer was negative. Instead, they acknowledged the unity of the Trinity in one Godhead and the consubstantiality of the Holy Spirit.<sup>24</sup> Then the council asked those who spoke of one *hypostasis* whether they meant it in the Sabellian sense and the answer was negative. They responded that by *hypostasis* they meant *ousia*.<sup>25</sup> Athanasius has thus highlighted how “*ousia* and *hypostasis* could be used in different senses, that it was possible to speak of three *hypostases* in an orthodox sense,” though it does not mean “that henceforward all semantic confusion was at an end.”<sup>26</sup> According to Kelly, the word *hypostasis* has been used to

---

23 Hanson, *The Search*, pp. 244-245.

24 Athanasius of Alexandria, *Tomus ad Antiochenos* 5. Cf. Hanson, *The Search*, pp. 640-641. Hanson finds it most likely that this group refers to the Meletians. *Ibid.*, p. 642.

25 Athanasius of Alexandria, *Tomus ad Antiochenos* 6. Cf. Hanson, *The Search*, p. 641.

26 Hanson, *The Search*, p. 644. Athanasius’ recognition “that not all those who teach three *hypostases* imply three hierarchically ranked beings, of which only one is true God” such that “*hypostasis* might primarily indicate a logical distinction” is according to Ayres a big step for Athanasius beyond his *De synodis* written in 359-361. Ayres, *Nicaea and its Legacy*, pp. 171, 174. Kelly says that while some scholars see that Athanasius in the Council of Alexandria (362) and Hilary in his work *De synodis* were endorsing the use of *homoousios* in a *homoiousios* sense of generic unity and thus introducing a “Neo-Nicene” theology, he calls attention to the fact that “the original Nicene teaching was, not that Father and Son are numerically one in substance, but that they share the same divine nature.” Kelly, *Early Christian Doctrines*, p. 254.



refer to the persons of the Trinity after 362. “Earlier the etymology of *hypostasis* (ὕφεσταναι = ‘lie under’) had made it susceptible of the meaning ‘substratum,’ and so it had approximated to *ousia*.”<sup>27</sup> The distinction between *hypostasis* and *ousia* has thus been clarified.

Besides anathematizing heresies, the *Tomus* also reaffirms the consubstantiality of the Holy Spirit. It states that those who spoke of three *hypostases* in the orthodox sense “acknowledged a Holy Trinity but One Godhead, and one Beginning, and that the Son is coessential with the Father, as the fathers said; while the Holy Spirit is not a creature, nor external, but proper to and inseparable from the Essence of the Father and the Son.”<sup>28</sup>

It is also stated in the *Tomus* that those who desired to be in communion “confessed also that the Saviour had not a body without a soul, nor without sense or intelligence; for it was not possible, when the Lord had become man for us, that His body should be without intelligence: nor was the salvation effected in the Word Himself a salvation of body only, but of soul also.”<sup>29</sup> For Hanson, while it has been universally assumed that those who reject that Christ has a human soul (*psyche*), feeling (*asthesis*) and mind (*nous*) were the Apollinarians, the

---

27 Kelly, *Early Christian Creeds*, p. 241.

28 “ἀλλ’ εἰδέναι ἁγίαν μὲν τριάδα μίαν δὲ θεότητα καὶ μίαν ἀρχὴν καὶ υἱὸν μὲν ὁμοούσιον τῷ πατρὶ, ὡς εἶπον οἱ πατέρες, τὸ δὲ ἅγιον πνεῦμα οὐ κτίσμα οὐδὲ ξένον, ἀλλ’ ἴδιον καὶ ἀδιαίρετον τῆς οὐσίας τοῦ υἱοῦ καὶ τοῦ πατρὸς.” Athanasius of Alexandria, *Tomus ad Antiochenos* 5 (AW 2/8: 345, trans. A. Robertson, NPNF II/4: 484). Cf. Williams, *Ambrose of Milan*, pp. 100-101.

29 “ὡμολόγουν γὰρ καὶ τοῦτο, ὅτι οὐ σῶμα ἄνθρωπον οὐδὲ ἀναίσθητον οὐδὲ ἀνόητον εἶχεν ὁ σωτήρ. οὐδὲ γὰρ οἶόν τε ἦν τοῦ κυρίου δι’ ἡμᾶς ἀνθρώπου γενομένου ἀνόητον εἶναι τὸ σῶμα αὐτοῦ οὐδὲ σώματος μόνου, ἀλλὰ καὶ ψυχῆς ἐν αὐτῷ τῷ λόγῳ σωτηρία γέγονεν.” Athanasius of Alexandria, *Tomus ad Antiochenos* 7 (AW 2/8: 347, trans. A. Robertson, NPNF II/4: 485). Cf. Hanson, *The Search*, p. 641.

lack of objection against this statement by the Apollinarians present at Alexandria suggests that the *Tomus* statement was actually aimed against the Arians.<sup>30</sup>

## 2. Under Jovian the pro-Nicene (363-364)

Emperor Jovian succeeded Julian in 363. He was a pro-Nicene and supported the *homoousios*. Riding with the pro-Nicene tide, some 20 to 30 bishops including Meletius of Antioch, former followers of Basil of Ancyra and even Akakius of Caesarea (who always seemed to join the stronger party) gathered for the Council of Antioch (363). They accepted the Nicene Creed based on their acknowledgement that the Son was begotten from and like according to the *ousia* (ὁμοιος κατ' οὐσίαν) of the Father.<sup>31</sup> Simonetti sees this identification of *homoousios* with *homoiousios* as a grand concession made to the Nicenes to attain religious peace for the common objective of going against the Arians.<sup>32</sup>

---

30 Hanson, *The Search*, pp. 642-643. Apollinarianism began c. 352, first entered public discussion at the Council of Alexandria (362), and evolved into a significant heresy a decade later. Apollinaris of Laodicea was a friend and coadjutor of Athanasius. He denies that Christ had a human mind or soul—"a permanent feature in the Alexandrian tradition and the Word-flesh Christology generally." Kelly, *Early Christian Doctrines*, pp. 289-290 (quotation from p. 290). For Apollinaris, Christ is God and man conjoined, God dwelling as a composite unity in human form (σύνθεσις ἀνθρωποειδῆς) and thus not a man. Grillmeier, *Christ in Christian Tradition*, p. 331. Though Apollinarianism came to the scene after Arianism, Grillmeier views that the Apollinarian notion of the "physical, vital conjunction of Logos and sarx [...] which makes the Logos the soul" provides the Christological seed for Arian assertion of the inferiority of the Logos. *Ibid.*, pp. 329-330.

31 Hanson, *The Search*, pp. 581-582, 651-652.

32 Simonetti, *La crisi ariana*, p. 375.

### 3. Under Valens, Valentinian I, Gratian and Valentinian II

After the short reign of Jovian, the empire was again split into two, often ruled by emperors with conflicting religious sympathies. The East came under the rule of the Arian Valens (364-378). The West was ruled successively by the non-interventionist Valentinian I (364-375), the pro-Nicene Gratian (367/375-383), and Valentinian II with his Arian mother Justina (375-392).<sup>33</sup>

On the one hand, Valens continued the pro-Arian policies of Constantius II. On 5th May 365, he published an edict to Alexandria to re-exile those who were exiled under Constantius and called back by Julian the pagan.<sup>34</sup> On the other hand, the conflicting ideologies of the emperors facilitated the gestation of various anti-Homoian undercurrents. The pro-Nicene efforts of Hilary and the Cappadocians during this period, despite occasional setbacks, contributed immensely to the eventual Nicene victory in 381 at the Councils of Constantinople and Aquileia. This period also witnessed the rise of the Macedonians to the already heresy-swarmed theological scene.

#### 3.1 Pro-Nicene Efforts

Hilary and the Cappadocians took quite a different anti-Arian course compared to die-hard old Nicenes. For the sake of unity, Hilary was prepared to accept the *homoiousios* of Basil of Ancyra. Sparked

---

<sup>33</sup> Gratian was junior Augustus in 367. When Valentinian died in 375, he became senior Augustus and ruled the western empire together with Valentinian II, who was at the time a four-year old child.

<sup>34</sup> Simonetti, *La crisi ariana*, p. 391.

by “the blasphemy” of Sirmium (357), Hilary responded positively and wrote *De synodis*, detailing the creeds and formulae between 341 and 359, to which he showed a sympathetic understanding except “the blasphemy,” to help the West gain an insight into the development of doctrine in the East.<sup>35</sup>

While Hilary paved the way, the Cappadocians “succeeded in closing the gap between the Semi-Arians and the Nicenes through a series of sophisticated theological treatises.”<sup>36</sup> Their notion of the *perichoresis* or coinherence of the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit sheds light on both the inseparability of the Trinity and distinction of the three divine persons. Basil asserts that “the whole Son is in the Father and has all the Father in Himself,” yet the *hypostases* of the Father and Son remain distinct.<sup>37</sup> Gregory of Nazianzus deems that the Godhead

---

35 Hanson, *The Search*, pp. 470, 491. To combat Arianism, Hilary had also put together materials on the Council of Sardica, Council of Ariminum and the events after Ariminum, in a collection now known as *Collectanea antiariana Parisina*. When he became disappointed with the Council of Ariminum, he wrote *Liber contra Constantium*. *Ibid.*, pp. 469-470.

36 J. E. Merdinger, *Rome and the African Church in the Time of Augustine* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1997), p. 201.

37 “Πάντα γὰρ τὰ τοῦ Πατρὸς ἐν τῷ Υἱῷ καθορᾶται καὶ πάντα τὰ τοῦ Υἱοῦ τοῦ Πατρὸς ἐστίν, ἐπειδὴ καὶ ὅλος ὁ Υἱὸς ἐν τῷ Πατρὶ μένει καὶ ὅλον ἔχει πάλιν ἐν ἑαυτῷ τὸν Πατέρα. Ὡστε ἡ τοῦ Υἱοῦ ὑπόστασις οἰονεὶ μορφή καὶ πρόσωπον γίνεται τῆς τοῦ Πατρὸς ἐπιγνώσεως, καὶ ἡ τοῦ Πατρὸς ὑπόστασις ἐν τῇ τοῦ Υἱοῦ μορφῇ ἐπιγινώσκειται, μενούσης αὐτοῖς τῆς ἐπιθεωρουμένης ιδιότητος εἰς διάκρισιν ἐναργῆ τῶν ὑποστάσεων”/ “For all things that are the Father’s are beheld in the Son, and all things that are the Son’s are the Father’s; because the whole Son is in the Father and has all the Father in Himself. Thus the hypostasis of the Son becomes as it were form and face of the knowledge of the Father, and the hypostasis of the Father is known in the form of the Son, while the proper quality which is contemplated therein remains for the plain distinction of the hypostases.” Basil of Caesarea, *Epistula* 38.8 (Courtonne: 92, trans. Blomfield Jackson, NPNF II/8: 141). Gregory of Nyssa may possibly be its actual author. Kelly, *Early Christian Doctrines*, p. 264 n. 1.

is “undivided in separate Persons” (ἀμέριστος ἐν μεμερισμένοις [...] ἢ θεότης).<sup>38</sup> According to Kelly, both Basil and Gregory of Nazianzus “have transferred their emphasis from mere numerical unity to unity of nature.”<sup>39</sup>

In terms of the development of the doctrine of the Holy Spirit, the Cappadocians have also played an instrumental role. There was little discussion about the Holy Spirit prior to 360—the Nicene Creed “dismissed the subject in six words καὶ εἰς τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον (and in the Holy Spirit).”<sup>40</sup> The Cappadocians added much to the discourse according to Kelly. Basil suggests that the Holy Spirit comes from God but not by generation; Gregory of Nazianzus says that the Holy Spirit proceeds (ἐκπορεύεται) from the Father based on Jn 15:26, though he does not explain what procession means; and Gregory of Nyssa almost reaches the notion of twofold procession in stating that the Holy Spirit “is out of God and is of Christ; He proceeds out of the Father and receives from the Son; He cannot be separated from the Word.”<sup>41</sup>

---

38 “Ἡμῖν εἷς Θεός, ὅτι μία θεότης· καὶ πρὸς ἕν τὰ ἐξ αὐτοῦ τὴν ἀναφορὰν ἔχει, κἂν τρία πιστεύηται. Οὐ γὰρ τὸ μὲν μᾶλλον, τὸ δὲ ἥττον Θεός· οὐδὲ τὸ μὲν πρότερον, τὸ δὲ ὕστερον· οὐδὲ βουλήσει τέμνεται, οὐδὲ δανᾶμει μερίζεται, οὐδέ τι τῶν ὅσα τοῖς μεριστοῖς ὑπάρχει, κἀνταῦθα λαβεῖν ἔστιν· ἀλλ’ ἀμέριστος ἐν μεμερισμένοις, εἰ δεῖ συντόμως εἰπεῖν, ἢ θεότης” / “To us there is One God, for the Godhead is One, and all that proceedeth from Him is referred to One, though we believe in Three Persons. For one is not more and another less God; nor is One before and another after; nor are They divided in will or parted in power; nor can you find here any of the qualities of divisible things; but the Godhead is, to speak concisely, undivided in separate Persons.” Gregory of Nazianzus, *Oratio* 31.14 (SC 250: 302, trans. Charles Gordon Browne and James Edward Swallow, NPNF II/7: 322). Cf. Kelly, *Early Christian Doctrines*, p. 264.

39 Kelly, *Early Christian Doctrines*, p. 268.

40 Hanson, *The Search*, p. 741.

41 Kelly, *Early Christian Doctrines*, p. 262.

### 3.2 The Period of Shifting Loyalty

In the meantime, conciliar effort against Arianism continued. Hilary was in Milan from the end of 364 to autumn 365. At the instigation of Hilary and Eusebius of Vercelli, the Council of Milan (364/365) was convened as an attempt to depose the Arian Auxentius of Milan but failed. Hilary wrote *Contra Auxentium* as a result.<sup>42</sup>

Besides, Homoiousians dissatisfied with the eastern emperor Valens gathered at the Council of Lampsacus (364) to pronounce the correctness of *homoiousios*, reject the Ariminum Creed and decisions of the Council of Constantinople (360). They sent Eustathius of Sebaste and two others to the western and senior emperor Valentinian I. The three bishops were received instead by Liberius of Rome, who, upon accepting their confession of the Nicene Creed, gave them a letter that admitted their group into communion. The letter and the decision to reject the Homoian creed and endorse Nicaea were ratified at the Council of Tyana in Cappadocia (366). There, a larger council at Tarsus in Sicilia was planned to discuss the union of these eastern Homoiousians with the western Nicenes. But the council was prohibited by Emperor Valens upon the urging of the Homoian Eudoxius of Constantinople.<sup>43</sup> This demonstrates the direct interference of Emperor Valens in Church affairs.<sup>44</sup> It also shows the shifting loyalty of Eustathius of Sebaste, who began as Arian, later a Homoiousion, then pledged allegiance to

---

42 Hanson, *The Search*, pp. 466-467.

43 Ayres, *Nicaea and its Legacy*, p. 170; Baus, *The Imperial Church*, pp. 61-62; Hanson, *The Search*, pp. 684, 763-764; Simonetti, *La crisi ariana*, 398.

44 Baus, *The Imperial Church*, p. 85.

Liberius' pro-Nicene formula, and would eventually become a leader of the Macedonians in 375.<sup>45</sup> Ayres comments well that the willingness of some Homoiousians to accept Nicaea as a way “to gain friends against the Homoians [...] does not mean they yet saw Nicaea’s terminology as preferable to that of the Dedication creed.”<sup>46</sup> In any case, the shaping of Nicaea as the measure of orthodoxy continued to take place.

Eustathius of Sebaste was not alone in changing his allegiance. In 366, Germinius of Singidunum, a supposed Homoian accredited with drawing up the Dated Creed (359), wrote a letter professing that the Son is the true Son of God generated from true God the Father and resembles the Father in all things (*similis per omnia*). Shocked by this statement, his previous Homoian allies including Valens and Ursacius held a small Council of Singidunum (366) in the hope of obtaining a retraction from Germinius. They failed, for a rescript from Germinius to eight Illyrian bishops shows that he intends “*similis per omnia*” in a strong sense given that the concept is scripturally based.<sup>47</sup>

---

45 Hanson, *The Search*, pp. 683-684.

46 Ayres, *Nicaea and its Legacy*, p. 170.

47 Hanson, *The Search*, pp. 592-593; Michel Meslin, *Les Ariens d'Occident 335-430*, Patristica Sorbonensia 8, ed. H.-I. Marrou (Paris: Éditions du Seuil, 1967), pp. 296-297; Simonetti, *La crisi ariana*, p. 386; Williams, *Ambrose of Milan*, p. 33. Cf. “cotidie docemus, Christum dei filium dominum nostrum per omnia patri similem excepta innatiuitate, deum de deo, lumen de lumine, uirtutem de uirtute, integrum de integro, perfectum de perfecto, ante saecula et ante uniuersa, quae intellegi uel dici possunt, genitum”/“we teach [...] Christ the Son of God our Lord like in all respects to the Father, ingenerateness excepted, God from God, Light from Light, Power from Power, Whole from Whole, Perfect from Perfect, generated (*genitum*) before the ages and before absolutely everything which can be conceived or uttered.” Germinius of Sirmium, “Epistula Germinii ad Rufianum, Palladium et ceteros,” in Hilary of Poitiers, *Coll. antiariana* B.6.1 (CSEL 65: 161, trans. Hanson, *The Search*, p. 594).

The tide was indeed turning in the favour of the Nicenes. Damasus I (366-384), who succeeded Liberius as Pope, was a fervent pro-Nicene who decided to take actions against the Homoians. The Council of Rome (368/369) held under him had Valens and Ursacius technically deposed, though the two bishops were able to hold their sees till death. Damasus also held another Council of Rome (371/372), which condemned Auxentius of Milan, though it was unable to depose him.<sup>48</sup> But a setback for the pro-Nicene camp happened when Gregory of Nyssa was accused of having mismanaged church funds and was exiled by the Homoian-dominated Council of Ancyra (375) and deposed by the Council of Nyssa (376).<sup>49</sup>

At the same time, Macedonianism was also on the rise. Macedonian bishops who met at the Council of Antioch in Caria (376) rejected the *homoousios* and Nicene Creed and opted for the *homoiousios* and the Dedication Creed.<sup>50</sup> A certain Council of Cyzicus (376) asserted that the Son is “like in respect of ousia” and rejected the divinity of the Holy Spirit like Eunomius while remaining silent about the *homoousios*.<sup>51</sup> In contrast, the Council of Iconium (376) supported the Nicene Creed as well as the doctrine of Basil of Caesarea on the divinity of the Holy Spirit.<sup>52</sup> The controversy on the Holy Spirit had come to the forefront.

---

48 Hanson, *The Search*, pp. 591-592, 757, 796-797; Williams, *Ambrose of Milan*, p. 80.

49 Hanson, *The Search*, pp. 715-716.

50 *Ibid.*, pp. 765, 770-771.

51 *Ibid.*, pp. 765-766.

52 *Ibid.*, p. 685.



Damasus of Rome thus held a further Council of Rome (377/378) to deal with the rising Macedonians and Apollinarians.<sup>53</sup> The resulting *Tomus Damasi* states the Nicene Creed in Latin and includes a list of anathemas which condemns the opinion that the Holy Spirit was created through the Son and judges against Sabellius, Arius, Eunomius, the Macedonians, Photinus and the Apollinarians.<sup>54</sup> The Macedonians are identified for the first time as a distinct heresy in the *Tome*.<sup>55</sup> There is also a letter from this council to Emperor Gratian violently denouncing the harm done by Restitutus of Carthage,<sup>56</sup> who yielded to the Homoian cause at Ariminum. Orthodoxy was henceforth measured by Nicaea plus the full divinity and consubstantiality of the Holy Spirit. This would become the standard in the Constantinople Creed.

The momentum in favour of the pro-Nicenes continued. In August 378, the Arian eastern emperor Valens disappeared after badly losing a battle with the Goths at Adrianople.<sup>57</sup> With the support of Emperor

---

53 Leo Donald Davis, *The First Seven Ecumenical Councils (325-787): Their History and Theology* (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1990), p. 116. Apollinaris was condemned by the council. Grillmeier, *Christ in Christian Tradition*, p. 351; Kelly, *Early Christian Doctrines*, p. 295.

54 Hanson, *The Search*, p. 758; Basil Studer, *Trinity and Incarnation*, ed. Andrew Louth, trans. Matthias Westerhoff (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1993), p. 160. Studer asserts that the *Tomus Damasi* and a few surviving fragments of the letters of Damasus reflect the reception of Nicene faith in the West around 380. Damasus' writings show that the Latin tradition of the Nicene faith, while being influenced by Hilary of Poitiers, Eusebius of Vercelli and Athanasius who had visited the West, focuses on the Son's unique generation and the equality of the Son with the Father. Given the eastern influence and the condemnation of the Sabellianism of Marcellus of Ancyra in *Tomus Damasus*, the distinction of the *tres personae* in the Trinity has been clarified while the unity of Godhead as *una substantia* or *ousia* maintained. *Ibid.*, pp. 160-161.

55 Hanson, *The Search*, p. 760.

56 Georges Folliet, "L'Épiscopat Africain et la crise Arienne au IV<sup>e</sup> siècle," *Revue des Études Byzantines* 24 (1966): 220.

57 Hanson, *The Search*, p. 685. According to most accounts, Valens is considered to have been killed in the battle of Adrianople (378).

Gratian, Ambrose deposed six Arian bishops at the Council of Sirmium (378).<sup>58</sup> But Palladius would contest the symbol of faith approved by this council in his *Apology*, calling its confession that God is three omnipotents, eternal and equals a blasphemy (*blasphemiam*)<sup>59</sup> against the Arian hierarchical ranking of the Father, Son and Holy Spirit. The consubstantiality of the Trinity is the main thrust of this council according to Gryson.<sup>60</sup> Some scholars, however, find the existence of this council dubious.<sup>61</sup>

#### 4. Under the Pro-Nicene Theodosius I (379-395)

In 378, Gratian issued an Edict of Toleration to all religious sects except the already outlawed Manichees, Photinians and Eunomians. That autumn, he even gave the Arian Gothic refugees who flooded into

---

58 Davis, *The First Seven Ecumenical Councils*, p. 116; Roger Gryson, ed., *Scolies Ariennes sur le Concile d'Aquilée*, Sources chrétiennes 267 (Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 1980), p. 108. The council probably happened in the summer or autumn of 378 when Gratian was present in Sirmium. Williams, *Ambrose of Milan*, p. 124.

59 “Talem blasphemiam apud Sirmium confirmandam duxistis, [...] uos tres omnipotentes deos credendos duxistis, tres sempiternos, tres aequales, tres ueros, tres cooperarios, tres consessores, tres indifferentes, tres irresolutos, tres nihil impossibilitatis habentes.” *Scholias Arrianae* 345v.10-33 (SC 267: 310, 312).

60 Gryson, ed., *Scolies Ariennes*, p. 108.

61 Besides Theodoret, “no other authority mentions this council.” Hanson, *The Search*, pp. 793-794 n. 16. McLynn also views the existence of this council as doubtful, as it left no record in the documents of the fourth century except in Palladius’ *Apology*. Neil McLynn, “The ‘Apology’ of Palladius: Nature and Purpose,” *The Journal of Theological Studies*, New Series 42 no. 1 (1991): 57. For McLynn, “one might conclude that the council was invented by a Nicene pressure-group operating in Asia Minor who created these imposing documents to lend themselves authority.” *Ibid.*, p. 58. Williams also points out that “Ambrose never makes mention of such a council.” Williams, *Ambrose of Milan*, p. 125.

Milan a Catholic church for worship. The picture changed dramatically after Theodosius I ascended the throne as the eastern emperor on 19<sup>th</sup> January 379. To restore Church unity, Gratian and Theodosius jointly issued an anti-heretical law on 3<sup>rd</sup> August 379 which overrode the Edict of Toleration, theoretically condemning all heresies including Arianism.<sup>62</sup> Wiles calls it “the beginning of the end” of Arianism in the eastern empire.<sup>63</sup> Liebeschuetz views Theodosius’ choice of siding with the Nicenes logical, for at the time, “whether as friends or opponents, the orthodox would be more formidable than the Arians. If his conscience forced him to choose one faction rather than the other, Theodosius had respectable political as well as religious reasons for opting for orthodoxy.”<sup>64</sup> The climate was ready for a condemnation of those who deny the consubstantiality of the Son or the Holy Spirit.

---

62 Hanson, *The Search*, p. 794; J. H. W. G. Liebeschuetz, *Barbarians and Bishops: Army, Church, and State in the Age of Arcadius and Chrysostom* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990), p. 157; Williams, *Ambrose of Milan*, pp. 135, 157-158. Simonetti notes that the exclusion of Eunomians from Gratian’s Edict of Toleration remained inoperative until the two edicts of Theodosius. Simonetti, *La crisi ariana*, p. 453. Despite his anti-heretical law, Hanson thinks that Gratian “continued broadly his policy of tolerating within wide limits differences within Christianity at this period.” Hanson, *The Search*, p. 795. Heather agrees that “Theodosius seems to have practised *de facto* toleration” as the Arian Goths “even continued to play a public role.” P. J. Heather, *Goths and Romans* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1991), p. 182.

63 Maurice Wiles, *Archetypal Heresy: Arianism through the Centuries* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996), p. 32.

64 Liebeschuetz, *Barbarians and Bishops*, p. 158. Hanson, however, finds Theodosius’ endeavour to achieve Church unity more partisan and ruthless than that of Constantine and Constantius. Hanson, *The Search*, 851. Theodosius had also massacred Thessalonians who rose against their military government and almost did the same to Antiochenes who objected to paying taxes. Brown, *The World of Late Antiquity*, p. 104. Given his hard-line policies, Brown finds it paradoxical that Theodosius went down in history as “the Great.” *Ibid.*, p. 106.

## 4.1 Before Constantinople

In 379, Meletius, the leader of the orthodox camp since Basil's death, gathered together 153 bishops for the Council of Antioch (379) to seek an accord with Rome and a solution to the Schism of Antioch.<sup>65</sup> It appears that the council adopted from some doctrinal document of Damasus to issue a pro-Nicene statement, indicating the adherence to it by the western bishops, to show Theodosius "the way in which many influential people in the East hoped that he would move if he wished to bring unity to the Church and the Empire."<sup>66</sup>

In February 380, Theodosius issued an edict called *Cunctos Populos* to the people of Constantinople, ordering them to adhere to a Nicene Trinitarian faith which believes in one God under the equal majesty and pious Trinity of the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit. The faith handed down by Peter the Apostle as professed by Damasus of Rome and Peter of Alexandria was named the measure of orthodoxy.<sup>67</sup> This edict was not welcomed, as Arianism was then the "predominant brand of Christianity" in Constantinople.<sup>68</sup>

---

65 Baus, *The Imperial Church*, p. 68; Simonetti, *La crisi ariana*, pp. 446-447.

66 Ayres, *Nicaea and its Legacy*, p. 242; Hanson, *The Search*, pp. 803-804 (quotation from p. 804). The doctrinal document of Damasus "might even have been a version of the *Tomus Damasi*." *Ibid.*, p. 803 n. 63. Gryson, however, finds it doubtful that this council knew about the *Tomus Damasi*. Gryson, ed., *Scolies Ariennes*, p. 117.

67 Ayres, *Nicaea and its Legacy*, p. 251; Baus, *The Imperial Church*, p. 68; Hanson, *The Search*, p. 804; Liebeschuetz, *Barbarians and Bishops*, p. 158; Williams, *Ambrose of Milan*, p. 164. It is worth noting that in this edict "Theodosius does not define orthodoxy by reference to Nicaea alone, but by outlining a basic logic of belief in the Trinity." Ayres, *Nicaea and its Legacy*, p. 251. Later, Theodosius would distance himself from the pro-Nicene tradition of Damasus and move closer to that of Meletius and Basil. *Ibid.*; Simonetti, *La crisi ariana*, p. 452.

68 Liebeschuetz, *Barbarians and Bishops*, p. 158. To the fact that there were more Arian than Nicene Christians in Constantinople, Wiles adds that the church there had been headed by Arians for forty years. Wiles, *Archetypal Heresy*, p. 32.

In April 380, Gratian issued another anti-heretical edict with the specific target of confiscating the religious shrines held by the heretics.<sup>69</sup> In January 381, Theodosius issued an edict *Nullis Haereticis* to the Praetorian Prefect of the East, identifying Nicene faith as the official religion of his empire. The edict condemned the Photinians, Arians, and Eunomians by name, and forbade them to occupy any church or to hold assembly. The Macedonians or Pneumatomachians were not mentioned, nor was the belief in the divinity of the Holy Spirit explicitly required.<sup>70</sup> The divinity of the Holy Spirit would be more evidently established at the Council of Constantinople (381).

#### 4.2 Council of Constantinople (381)

In the summer of 380, the western emperor Gratian and the eastern emperor Theodosius met to discuss holding a council to deal Arianism and other matters. In May 381, Theodosius decided to hold a separate council of eastern bishops. All the 150 participants, not counting the Macedonian bishops who walked out, were orthodox from the East, with no representatives from the West or Roman Africa.<sup>71</sup>

So the council was not intended to be ecumenical at the outset. It came to be known as the second ecumenical council by the eventual

---

69 This followed Gratian's edict on religious tolerance in 378 and his general anti-heretical law in 379, demonstrating that his attitude was increasingly pro-Nicene. Simonetti, *La crisi ariana*, p. 441.

70 Hanson, *The Search*, p. 805; Williams, *Ambrose of Milan*, p. 165.

71 Norman P. Tanner, *The Councils of the Church. A Short History* (New York: Crossroad, 2001), p. 16; Id., ed., *Decrees of the Ecumenical Councils*, p. 21; Gryson, ed., *Scolies Ariennes*, p. 130. There were originally 36 Macedonian bishops at the early sessions of the council. But Eleusius of Cyzicus led them to walk out of the council when an attempt of the council to resolve the Macedonian controversy with a doctrine of the Holy Spirit based on Nicene faith fell through. Davis, *The First Seven Ecumenical Councils*, p. 119.

universal reception of the Constantinople Creed which came out of the council, though the creed was not referenced at the Council of Ephesus (431).<sup>72</sup> The council met in May, June and July. The acts of this council do not survive.<sup>73</sup> Gregory of Nyssa gives a vivid description of the atmosphere in the streets of Constantinople at the time—even ordinary people were keen to express their theological opinion.

If you ask for change, the man launches into a theological discussion about begotten and unbegotten; if you enquire about the price of bread, the answer is given that the Father is greater and the Son subordinate; if you remark that the bath is nice the man pronounces that the Son is from non-existence.<sup>74</sup>

As Hanson observes, all these street views are Arian.<sup>75</sup> Arianism was widely spread and had taken deep root in the Roman Empire.

Immediately following the council, Theodosius promulgated an edict on 30<sup>th</sup> July in the eastern empire called *Episcopis tradi*, to enforce the council's decision to have all churches handed over to orthodox bishops of the Nicene Trinitarian confession. This defined

---

72 Besides the Council of Ephesus (431), Flavian's Council of Constantinople (448) and the "Robber Council" (449) also referenced only the Nicene Creed but not the Constantinople Creed. Kelly, *Early Christian Creeds*, p. 308.

73 Hanson, *The Search*, p. 805. Upon the sudden death of Meletius of Antioch, the first president of the council, Gregory of Nazianzus succeeded as its second president. *Ibid.*, p. 807.

74 "ἐὰν περὶ τῶν ὀβολῶν ἐρωτήσης, ὁ δέ σοι περὶ γεννητοῦ καὶ ἀγεννητοῦ ἐφίλοσόφησεν· κἂν περὶ τιμήματος ἄρτου πύθη· μείζων ὁ πατήρ, ἀποκρίνεται, καὶ ὁ υἱὸς ὑποχείριος· εἰ δὲ τὸ λουτρὸν ἐπιτήδειόν ἐστιν εἶποις, ὁ δὲ ἐξ οὐκ ὄντων τὸν υἱὸν εἶναι διωρίσατο." Gregory of Nyssa, *De deitate filii et spiritus sancti* (GNO 10/2: 121, trans. Hanson, *The Search*, p. 806).

75 Hanson, *The Search*, p. 852.

Nicene Christianity as the official religion of the Roman Empire.<sup>76</sup> On the surface, it appears that Emperor Theodosius' uncompromising pro-Nicene policy was the factor most responsible for the Nicene triumph. But to a large extent, the series of Councils of Rome held by the zealous pro-Nicene Pope Damasus had helped pave the way for Theodosius. This does not mean that the emergence of Nicaea as the standard of orthodoxy was entirely a top-down effort, whether from the emperor or from the Pope. According to Hanson, pro-Nicenes could not have succeeded without "a genuine widespread consensus of opinion in the church."<sup>77</sup>

Simonetti is right that the Arian crisis started out as a doctrinal controversy and, despite strong political interference, its primarily religious character remained till the very end.<sup>78</sup> Councils could not just be a political ploy of the emperor. Congar asserts that Church Fathers understood that the value of a council lies in its double consent—the vertical consent of tradition and the horizontal consent of the people at the time. This is the reason why the Council of Nicaea has a unique authority.<sup>79</sup> Nicaea stays as the absolute foundation of orthodox faith. All councils that follow are moments at which that

---

76 Hanson, *The Search*, pp. 820-821; Ayres, *Nicaea and its Legacy*, p. 434; Williams, *Ambrose of Milan*, p. 182.

77 Hanson, *The Search*, p. 855.

78 Simonetti, *La crisi ariana*, p. 559.

79 Yves Congar, "Quelle idée s'est-on faite du concile entre Nicée I et Nicée II ?" *Revue des Sciences Philosophiques et Théologiques* 63, no. 3 (1979): 430-431.

same Church Tradition is affirmed and better articulated.<sup>80</sup> Congar's attitude is consistent with that of the Council Fathers at Constantinople, who viewed the Constantinople Creed as a ratification of the Nicene Creed.

The earliest surviving evidence about the existence of the Constantinople Creed is its being read out at the Council of Chalcedon (451).<sup>81</sup> Most scholars until Kelly have thus believed that the Constantinople Creed did not come out of the 381 council but was some local baptismal creed that became associated with the council.<sup>82</sup> Kelly, on the other hand, believes that the complete silence about the Constantinople Creed between 381 and 451 indicated that the council "did not conceive of itself as promulgating a new creed. Its sincere intention, perfectly understood by contemporary churchmen, was simply to confirm the Nicene faith." The liturgical style of the creed suggests that the Council Fathers took a creed already in existence in Christian worship, edited it according to their doctrinal concerns, and then adopted and endorsed it at the council.<sup>83</sup> Kelly believes that the Nicene and Constantinople Creeds are "really two utterly different

---

80 "Nicée demeurant le fondement absolu—c'est encore et toujours sa Foi que nous confessons chaque dimanche! —, les conciles subséquents devaient être reconnus comme des moments originaux d'affirmation et de précision de sa Tradition par l'Église." Congar, "Quelle idée s'est-on faite," p. 432.

81 Hanson, *The Search*, p. 812.

82 Kelly, *Early Christian Creeds*, p. 305. Cf. Hanson, *The Search*, p. 813.

83 Kelly, *Early Christian Creeds*, pp. 307, 325 (quotation from p. 325). Cf. Ayres, *Nicaea and its Legacy*, p. 256; Davis, *The First Seven Ecumenical Councils*, p. 123. Some scholars argue that the creed adopted at Constantinople (381) was framed at the Council of Antioch (379) based on the Old Roman Creed and the Creed of Jerusalem. Frederick W. Norris, "Greek Christianities," in *The Cambridge History of Christianity*, vol. 2, *Constantine to c. 600*, ed. Augustine Casiday and Frederick W. Norris (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007), p. 85.



texts”<sup>84</sup>. In contrast, Hanson finds most of the twelve differences he locates between the Nicene and Constantinople Creeds insignificant.<sup>85</sup> Regardless of whether the two creeds are different, Hanson, like Kelly, judges that the framers, those who knew about and taught the Constantinople Creed for the next half of a century “did not think of it as a new, separate, creed.”<sup>86</sup> After all, “the council’s primary object was to restore and promote the Nicene faith in terms which would take account of the further development of doctrine, especially with regard to the Holy Spirit, which had taken place since Nicaea.”<sup>87</sup> To this end the Constantinople Creed helped the council to achieve its goal.

For Hanson, the Constantinople Creed well illustrates the doctrine of the Holy Spirit professed by Basil of Caesarea and with which Gregory of Nyssa sympathised, for Basil would not go as far as Gregory of Nazianzus in confessing that Holy Spirit is “God” and consubstantial with the Father and the Son.<sup>88</sup> The creed instead claims that the Holy Spirit deserves the same worship (συμπροσκυνούμενον) and the same glorification (συνδοξάζόμενον) as the Father and the Son.

---

84 Kelly, *Early Christian Creeds*, p. 304. Ayres criticises Kelly for exaggerating the differences between the two texts but commends him for recognising the fidelity of the Constantinople Creed to the Nicene faith. Ayres, *Nicaea and its Legacy*, p. 255.

85 Hanson, *The Search*, p. 816. Cf. Ayres, *Nicaea and its Legacy*, p. 256.

86 Hanson, *The Search*, p. 820.

87 Kelly, *Early Christian Creeds*, p. 331. Cf. Davis, *The First Seven Ecumenical Councils*, p. 124. “The Nicene Creed was ratified, though it was still considered expedient to omit the gloss on *monogenēs*, to dispense with the anathemas, to add that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father, and to append the clauses on baptism, the church and resurrection which had figured in older creeds.” Mark Edwards, “The first Council of Nicaea,” in *The Cambridge History of Christianity*, vol. 1, *Origins to Constantine*, ed. Margaret M. Mitchell and Frances M. Young (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), pp. 566-567.

88 Hanson, *The Search*, pp. 818-819.

This, for Basil, essentially identifies the Holy Spirit as *homoousios*.<sup>89</sup> A literal repetition of the word *homoousios* would also have weakened the linguistic elegance of the creed.

Though the council had adopted milder phrases upon Theodosius' behest, the attempt to unite with the Macedonians did not succeed.<sup>90</sup> After all, the creedal statement that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father (ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς ἐκπορευόμενον)—Gregory of Nazianzus' concept based on Jn 15:26—is in direct opposition to the Macedonian claim that the Holy Spirit is created by the Son.<sup>91</sup>

The first canon of Constantinople reaffirmed the anti-Arian Council of Nicaea (325) as the standard of orthodoxy and explicitly condemned the many forms of Arianism. It also condemned those on the opposite extreme of the Arians—that is, the Sabellians, Marcellians, Photinians and Apollinarians.<sup>92</sup>

---

89 Baus, *The Imperial Church*, pp. 73-74; Davis, *The First Seven Ecumenical Councils*, p. 125. Cf. “And in the Spirit, the holy, the lordly and life-giving one, proceeding forth from the Father, co-worshipped and co-glorified with Father and Son, the one who spoke through the prophets” / “καὶ εἰς τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον, τὸ κύριον καὶ ζωοποιόν, τὸ ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς ἐκπορευόμενον, τὸ σὺν πατρὶ καὶ υἱῷ συμπροσκυνούμενον καὶ συνδοξαζόμενον, τὸ λαλῆσαν διὰ τῶν προφητῶν.” Concilium Constantinopolitanum I, “Expositio fidei CL partum,” in Norman P. Tanner, ed., *Decrees of the Ecumenical Councils* (London: Sheed and Ward; Washington DC: Georgetown University Press, 1990), p. 24.

90 Kelly, *Early Christian Creeds*, p. 341.

91 Baus, *The Imperial Church*, p. 73. Cf. Gregory of Nazianzus, *Oratio* 31.8. Though the Constantinople Creed describes the relationship of the Holy Spirit with the Father and the Son as one of procession, “the difference between the generation of the Son and the procession of the Spirit was left open.” Studer, *Trinity and Incarnation*, pp. 159-160.

92 Kelly commends that “it is fitting that those whose error lay on the Sabellian side should be proscribed as well.” Kelly, *Early Christian Creeds*, pp. 338-339. The Apollinarians also belonged to one of the condemned groups in canon 1. Grillmeier notes that Diodore of Tarsus, a staunch anti-Apollinarian, played a significant role in defining the canons of the council. Grillmeier, *Christ in Christian Tradition*, p. 358.

The profession of faith of the holy fathers who gathered in Nicaea in Bithynia is not to be abrogated, but it is to remain in force. Every heresy is to be anathematised and in particular that of the Eunomians or Anomoeans, that of the Arians or Eudoxians, that of the Semi-Arians or Pneumatomachi, that of the Sabellians, that of the Marcellians, that of the Photinians and that of the Apollinarians.<sup>93</sup>

### 4.3 Council of Aquileia (381)

On 3<sup>rd</sup> September 381, a small council with 25 bishops mostly from north Italy met at Aquileia. The council issued a synodal letter, called *Benedictus*, with 34 signatures to convey the condemnation of Palladius of Ratiaria and Secundianus of Singidunum to the emperor.<sup>94</sup> The only representative from the East was Evagrius the presbyter and legate.<sup>95</sup> There were two delegates from North Africa—Felix of Selemseli and Numidius of Maxula.<sup>96</sup>

McLynn thinks that Gratian had no prejudice against Palladius, for his original plan was to hold a universal council at Aquileia to demonstrate his superiority over the other emperors.<sup>97</sup> But Ambrose persuaded Gratian to limit the number of bishops such that the council became effectively a heresy trial for the Homoian Palladius

---

<sup>93</sup> Concilium Constantinopolitanum I, “Canon 1,” in Tanner, ed., *Decrees of the Ecumenical Councils*, p. 31.

<sup>94</sup> Gryson, ed., *Scolies Ariennes*, pp. 130-131; Williams, *Ambrose of Milan*, p. 175.

<sup>95</sup> *Scholia Arriana* 338r.49 (SC 267: 282). Cf. Williams, *Ambrose of Milan*, p. 175.

<sup>96</sup> Folliet, “L’Épiscopat Africain,” p. 221. Cf. Gryson, ed., *Scolies Ariennes*, p. 130 n. 3.

<sup>97</sup> McLynn, “The ‘Apology’ of Palladius,” p. 71.

and Secundianus.<sup>98</sup> Hence, “there is nothing in the summoning of the councils of Constantinople and Aquileia to demonstrate that they were initially intended to mirror or be in harmony with one another.”<sup>99</sup> They should not be considered as parallel councils, for the purpose of Constantinople was to “outlaw Arianism in all its known forms and to establish the Nicene faith,” while Aquileia “was more local in character and more narrowly directed at the deposition of particular Arian bishops.”<sup>100</sup> Kazakov believes that “the participants of the Council of Aquileia knew nothing at the time about the Council of Constantinople” based on the supposed lack of logic of the letter *Quamlibet* from the Council of Aquileia (381) to the emperors,<sup>101</sup> but Ayres thinks that the bishops at Aquileia were well-informed about the Council of

---

98 Williams, *Ambrose of Milan*, pp. 156-157. Meslin believes that actually Palladius and Secundianus had already been forced to leave their church buildings after the Theodosian edict of 30<sup>th</sup> July 381 (*Episcopis tradi*) and before the Council of Aquileia, but they had remained as the clandestine heads of their respective Homoian community. M. Meslin, *Les Ariens d'Occident*, p. 91.

99 Williams, *Ambrose of Milan*, p. 164.

100 Wiles, *Archetypal Heresy*, p. 37.

101 Mikhail M. Kazakov, “Letters of Western Bishops to the Emperor Theodosius I and Relations between Eastern and Western Churches at the End of the Fourth Century,” *Studia Patristica* 44 (2010): 95-96. Kazakov reads the phenomenon of Christianisation in the 4<sup>th</sup> century politically, and sees it as a struggle for “more authority, more power and more wealth.” *Ibid.*, p. 92. He uses three letters from western bishops to portray the East and the West as diametrical opposites, with the latter attempting to aggressively impose their demands on the former. The *Quamlibet* from the bishops at the Council of Aquileia (381) to Gratian, Valentinian II and Theodosius I includes a claim of West primacy. The *Sanctum* and the *Fidei* are from Ambrose and other Italian bishops to Theodosius I. The *Sanctum* demonstrates strong discontent with the Council of Constantinople (381) with a demand for an ecumenical council of western and eastern bishops at Rome, while the *Fidei* seems more cordial in tone with a willingness to change the place of the council. *Ibid.*, pp. 95-99. The *Quamlibet*, *Sanctum* and *Fidei* have come down to us as Ambrose’s *ep.* 12, 13, 14 in Migne’s *Patrologiae latina* respectively. They are now collected as Ambrose’s *Epistulae extra collectionem ep.* 6 (CSEL 82/3: 186-190), *ep.* 9 (CSEL 82/3: 201-204) and *ep.* 8 (CSEL 82/3: 198-200) respectively.

Constantinople (381) based on the letter *Sanctum* sent from Ambrose and the other bishops of Italy to Theodosius I.<sup>102</sup>

Palladius had not willed the Council of Aquileia, though Nicene sources depicted the council as his initiative.<sup>103</sup> He came to Aquileia with an expectation that there would be eastern bishops capable of understanding him.<sup>104</sup> On discovering otherwise, he complained that the council was not general and plenary.<sup>105</sup> As reported in Maximinus' *Commentary on the Acts of Aquileia*, Palladius said he would say nothing since Aquileia did not have the authority of a plenary council.<sup>106</sup> Palladius in his *Apology for those Condemned at Aquileia* complained that Aquileia was not a proper council since he desired to meet also with the Oriental bishops but there were not any; he desired a debate in religious spirit but there was none.<sup>107</sup> Considering Aquileia as local and therefore unauthoritative, he stresses that decisions regarding matters of faith should be reserved to a general council with participation of all bishops, including the oriental bishops.<sup>108</sup>

---

102 Ayres, *Nicaea and its Legacy*, p. 266. The *Sanctum* is apparently written by Ambrose on behalf of the Council of Aquileia. It expresses dissatisfaction against Paulinus not succeeding as the bishop of Antioch after the death of Meletius, the election of Gregory of Nazianzus and subsequently Nectarius to the see of Constantinople, and the failure of the Council of Constantinople (381) to consult these matters with the Roman church. Hanson, *The Search*, p. 822. Cf. *Ibid.*, 810-811.

103 Gryson, ed., *Scolies Ariennes*, p. 133.

104 McLynn, "The 'Apology' of Palladius," p. 71; Williams, *Ambrose of Milan*, p. 172.

105 "Vestro studio factum est ut non esset generale et plenum concilium." *Scolia Arriana* 298v.2-4 (SC 267: 206).

106 "Vbi auctoritas pleni concilii non est non dico." *Scolia Arriana* 303r.4-5 (SC 267: 226).

107 *Scolia Arriana* 337r.53-337v.5 (SC 267: 274).

108 "auctoritati generalis concilii consortioque orientali"; "concilii generalis examini congrua consideratione reseruabatur." *Scolia Arriana* 339r.3-4, 343r.43 (SC 267: 282, 302). Cf. Gryson, ed., *Scolies Ariennes*, p. 179 n. 5.

Maximinus' *Commentary* relates that Ambrose attempted to put the blame for the barbarian invasions on the Arianism of Palladius.<sup>109</sup> Ambrose then pulled out Arius' *Letter to Alexander* and attempted to accuse Palladius of its claim that the Son of God was not eternal.<sup>110</sup> Palladius replied that he had neither seen nor known Arius.<sup>111</sup> He complained that while the Homoians had come to Aquileia as Christians to Christians, Ambrose was dishonest in removing the crucial word "unbegotten" from Arius' letter,<sup>112</sup> when in fact "unbegotten" (*ingenitum*) should have been placed between "true" (*uerum*) and "eternal" (*sempiternum*).<sup>113</sup> Palladius was consequentially charged—as summarised by Ambrose and recorded in the council *Gesta*—for his

---

109 "tu, o Ambrosi, fecisse conprobaris, etiam uastationem barbarae incursionis nobis aplicans." *Scholia Arriana* 300r.24-30 (SC 267: 214). Cf. Wiles, *Archetypal Heresy*, p. 38.

110 *Scholia Arriana* 302v.1-6 (SC 267: 224). This action, rather than having a discussion on Palladius' own writings is, according to Williams, an illustration that Ambrose "had no intention of debating theology at all" and "wanted simply a damning pretext." Williams, *Ambrose of Milan*, p. 178. It also shows that the Nicene attitude at Aquileia was "reactive, almost regressive." *Ibid.*, p. 173.

111 "Arrium nec uidi nec scio qui sit." *Scholia Arriana* 303r.2 (SC 267: 226). Palladius in his *Apology for those Condemned at Aquileia* also protested against the use of Arius' *Letter to Alexander* against him since Arius had long been dead. "Arri olim mortui quae ignota esset epistulam proferres." *Scholia Arriana* 337v.45-46 (SC 267: 276). Secundianus similarly tried to disassociate himself from Arius at the council when he was questioned on whether the Son is true Lord and was reminded that Arius believed that only the Father is true God. "Qui fuerit ignoro, quid dixerit nescio." *Gesta Aquileia* 66 (SC 267: 376). Cf. Hanson, *The Search*, pp. 124-125.

112 "Cristiani ad cristianos." *Scholia Arriana* 302r.36 (SC 267: 224); "Solum aeternum, solum sine initio, solum uerum, solum immortalitatem habentem." *Scholia Arriana* 303v.1 (SC 267: 228). Cf. Neil McLynn, "From Palladius to Maximinus: Passing the Arian Torch," *Journal of Early Christian Studies* 4, no. 4 (1996): 492.

113 "Credo in unum solum uerum Deum, auctorem omnium, solum ingenitum, solum sempiternum Deum. Interuerum et sempiternum ingenitum professus est Arrius." *Scholia Arriana* 304r.4-5 (SC 267: 232).

refusal to condemn the impious ideas of Arius and for denying that the Son of God is eternal.<sup>114</sup>

Palladius was also interrogated on whether the Son is true God (*Filium Deum uerum*) and he acknowledged that the Son is “true Son”; Secundianus was asked if the Son of God is the true God (*Deum uerum Dei Filium*) and he recognised the Son as “the only begotten god and the true Son of God.”<sup>115</sup> But that was not enough to save them from being condemned, for admitting that the Son is true Son is not the same as professing that he is true God. Besides the issues of whether the Father alone is eternal and whether the Son is true God, Ambrose also interrogated Palladius on his views of whether the Son is immortal, wise, good, powerful, whether the Father is greater and whether the Son is a creature.<sup>116</sup> Ambrose quoted Phil 2:6-8 and explained to Palladius that the Son is less than the Father according to his flesh, but equal to God according to his divinity; that the Son is God according to his

---

114 “condemnemus Palladium, quia impii Arri noluit damnare sententiam et quia ipse Dei Filium sempiternum et cetera quae actis harent negauit.” *Gesta Aquileia* 53 (SC 267: 370). Ambrose had simply assumed that Palladius was not willing to condemn Arius’ *Letter to Alexander*. Hanson, *The Search*, p. 124.

115 “Filium uerum qui non dicat?” *Gesta Aquileia* 17 (SC 267: 342); “Filius unigenitus deus est Dei Filius uerus.” *Gesta Aquileia* 66 (SC 267: 376). Williams comments that the refusal of Palladius and Secundianus to admit that the Son is true God “did not mean that Palladius denied the divinity of Christ. To be “verum filium” was a clear indication that his ontological status was wholly different from the rest of creation. The uniqueness of the Son made it possible for Palladius to agree that Christ’s divinity did not die on the cross.” Williams, *Ambrose of Milan*, p. 179.

116 *Gesta Aquileia* 9, 17, 24, 27, 28, 31, 33, 43 (SC 267: 334, 340, 346, 348, 350, 352, 354, 362).

divinity, and man according to his flesh.<sup>117</sup> Palladius on the contrary held that the Father is greater by the very fact that the Son was the one who was sent and became flesh.<sup>118</sup>

#### 4.4 Aftermath of Constantinople and Aquileia

The Council of Constantinople (381) had successfully curbed Arianism in the East. Arianism had also, according to Gryson, definitively lost its foothold in the West after the Council of Aquileia (381). Latin Arianism was reduced to a marginal survival and its torch was taken up by the Goths.<sup>119</sup> Simonetti call these barbarians the “nuovi ariani.”<sup>120</sup> Williams, however, disagrees with the argument that Nicene Christianity had won its ultimate victory against Arianism at Constantinople and Aquileia in 381 due to the continuous effort since Nicaea (325). He believes that the Council of Aquileia in fact escalated rather than ended the tension between the Homoians and Nicenes.<sup>121</sup> To a certain extent, Gryson and Williams are both correct. The Council of Aquileia had hit the Homoians hard, but it was not enough to completely uproot them. Yet, it undoubtedly soured the relationship between the East and the West.

---

117 “Secundum carnem Filius minor est Patre, secundum diuinitatem aequalis est Patri”: “Deus ergo Filius Dei est secundum diuinitatem et homo est secundum carnem.” *Gesta Aquileia* 37, 40 (SC 267: 356, 360). Ambrose’s citation of Phil 2:6-8 is in *Gesta Aquileia* 35 (SC 267: 356).

118 “*Qui me misit maior me est. Caro missa est a Deo, aut Filius Dei?*” *Gesta Aquileia* 36 (SC 267: 356). Cf. Williams, *Ambrose of Milan*, pp. 179-180.

119 Gryson, ed., *Scolies Ariennes*, pp. 143-144.

120 Simonetti, *La crisi ariana*, p. 443.

121 Williams, *Ambrose of Milan*, p. 7. The Homoian revival which led to sieges of the basilica in Milan in the mid-380s is evidence that Latin Arianism did last beyond Aquileia.



To deal with the complaints regarding the Council of Aquileia (381), many eastern bishops who participated at Constantinople (381) gathered again for the Council of Constantinople (382). They sent a synodal letter to Pope Damasus, refusing to attend the Council of Rome (382) and promised only to send delegates.<sup>122</sup> The Council of Rome (382) gave Alexandria second position after Rome in response to canon 3 of Constantinople (381), which called Constantinople the new Rome,<sup>123</sup> thus severing the relationship between the East and the West<sup>124</sup>. The Council of Rome (382) also reaffirmed the Nicene faith, interpreted it in the Cappadocian way and extending it to the Holy Spirit.<sup>125</sup>

As a matter of fact, the synodal letter of the Council of Constantinople (382) declares steadfast adherence to the Nicene faith as well. It states that this faith believes in the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit as “a single Godhead and power and substance” (θεότητος και δυνάμεως και ουσίας μιᾶς) of “three most perfect hypostases” (τρῖσι τελειοτάταις ὑποστάσεσιν) as the *via media* between Sabellius at one extreme and the Arians, Eunomians and

---

122 Hanson, *The Search*, p. 822; Kelly, *Early Christian Creeds*, p. 306.

123 Hanson, *The Search*, p. 822.

124 Kazakov, “Letters of Western Bishops,” pp. 100-101.

125 Simonetti, *La crisi ariana*, p. 550. The Council of Rome (382) also reaffirmed the condemnation of Apollinarianism. Besides, Paulinus was once again recognised as the legitimate bishop of Antioch. Hanson, *The Search*, p. 822.

Pneumatomachians at the other.<sup>126</sup> Its explicit proclamation of “the full deity and consubstantiality of the Holy Spirit, and His existence as a separate hypostasis”<sup>127</sup> contrasts with the relative vagueness of the Constantinople Creed, which does not overtly declare the Holy Spirit as God.

The Council of Constantinople (383), also called the Council of the Sects,<sup>128</sup> was Theodosius’ last endeavour to bring unity to the Church.<sup>129</sup> The council was aborted and the result was a new series of rigorous Theodosian decrees. The edicts of 25<sup>th</sup> July 383 and 21<sup>st</sup>

---

126 “It tells us how to believe in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the holy Spirit: believing also, of course, that the Father, the Son and the holy Spirit have a single Godhead and power and substance, a dignity deserving the same honour and a co-eternal sovereignty, in three most perfect hypostases, or three perfect persons. So there is no place for Sabellius’ diseased theory in which the hypostases are confused and thus their proper characteristics destroyed. Nor may the blasphemy of Eunomians and Arians and Pneumatomachi prevail, with its division of substance or of nature or of Godhead, and its introduction of some nature which was produced subsequently, or was created, or was of a different substance, into the uncreated and consubstantial and co-eternal Trinity” / “δηλαδή θεότητος και δυνάμεως και ουσίας μιᾶς τοῦ πατρὸς και τοῦ υἱοῦ και τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος πιστευομένης, ὁμοτίμου τε ἄξιας και συναΐδιου τῆς βασιλείας, ἐν τρισὶ τελειοτάταις ὑποστάσεσιν, ἧγουν τρισὶ τελείοις προσώποις, ὡς μήτε τὴν Σαβελλίου νόσον χώραν λαβεῖν συγχεομένων τῶν ὑποστάσεων εἴτ’ οὖν τῶν ιδιοτήτων ἀναιρουμένων, μήτε μὴν τὴν εὐνομιανῶν και ἀρειανῶν και πνευματομάχων βλασφημίαν ἰσχύειν, τῆς οὐσίας ἢ τῆς φύσεως ἢ τῆς θεότητος τεμνομένης και τῆ ἀκτίστῳ και ὁμοουσίῳ και συναΐδιῳ τριάδι μεταγενεστέρας τινὸς ἢ κτιστῆς ἢ ἑτεροουσίῳ φύσεως ἐπαγομένης.” Concilium Constantinopolitanum I, “Epistula Constantinopolitani concilii ad papam Damasum et occidentales episcopos,” in Tanner, ed., *Decrees of the Ecumenical Councils*, p. 28.

127 Kelly, *Early Christian Creeds*, p. 341.

128 Peter Heather and John Matthews, *The Goths in the Fourth Century*, Translated Texts for Historians 11 (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 1991), p. 131. Meslin calls it “Conférence des Sectes.” M. Meslin, *Les Ariens d’Occident*, p. 128.

129 Hanson, *The Search*, pp. 717-718.

January 384 confirmed the previous measures against the heretics which prohibited their meetings and their possession and use of the place of cults.<sup>130</sup> One point to note is that while canon 1 of Constantinople (381) condemned the Pneumatomachians without calling them Macedonians, the edict of 25<sup>th</sup> July 383 condemned both the Pneumatomachians and Macedonians.<sup>131</sup>

The path for the Nicenes was not all plain sailing after 381. After all, the pro-Homoian Valentinian II would still be in control of the prefecture of Italy until 387. On 23<sup>rd</sup> January 386, he published an edict which gave freedom of worship to those who follow the faith defined at Ariminum (359) and ratified at Constantinople (360), effectively making Homoianism the religion in the territory under his jurisdiction.<sup>132</sup> It was only when Maximus invaded Italy in the summer of 387 and became the western emperor that the Homoians were forced to go underground.<sup>133</sup> This, according to Williams, was the point at which Homoianism as a political or religious force ended in the west, a moment at which “the ostensible ‘triumph’ of Nicene Christianity was complete.”<sup>134</sup> On 19<sup>th</sup> May 389, Theodosius issued a general anti-heretical edict which

---

130 Simonetti, *La crisi ariana*, p. 552.

131 Simonetti, *La crisi ariana*, p. 365. Cf. Hanson, *The Search*, p. 761.

132 Williams, *Ambrose of Milan*, p. 212.

133 Williams, *Ambrose of Milan*, pp. 218, 227. Maximus (383/387-388) usurped the throne from Gratian and became the emperor of Gaul in 383. Being a pro-Nicene, his “veiled threat” helped curb the persecution of Valentinian II against Ambrose and the Nicenes. *Ibid.*, p. 217. At the end of 387, Theodosius I married Galla, the daughter of Justina, with an agreement that the Valentinian family would renounce Arian beliefs. *Ibid.*, p. 228. The Homoians thus suffered a double setback in 387—a pro-Nicene became the western emperor, and the Valentinian court could no longer be pro-Homoian.

134 Williams, *Ambrose of Milan*, p. 10.

expelled all heretics, prohibited them from assembly, and annulled the tolerance granted to the Homoians in 386.<sup>135</sup> Legislation against heretics, pagans and Jews continued under the “Arcadian Establishment” (392-412).<sup>136</sup> Yet, the fact that Arian Goths made up a large proportion of the Roman army might have caused anti-Arian laws of this period to be directed more towards the Eunomians than the Arians.<sup>137</sup> Gothic Arianism was therefore able to still linger on. It would not be until the Council of Toledo (589), at which King Reccared of the Visigoths and his Visigothic people formally renounced Arianism and converted to Catholicism, that the archetypal Christological heresy is said to have come to an end. What is more, canon 2 of this council demands that the

---

135 Williams, *Ambrose of Milan*, p. 230.

136 “Loyal belief was not punished, nor was mere membership of a heretical group sufficient to incur a penalty—as a rule. What the laws proscribed were specific ‘external’ acts.” Liebeschuetz, *Barbarians and Bishops*, p. 146. Among heretical groups, the Novatians were dealt with most leniently while the Manichees were treated most severely. *Ibid.*, p. 147. While legislation against pagans prohibited pagan sacrifice and excluded them from imperial service, cultural paganism was tolerated and literary paganism was considered acceptable. *Ibid.*, p. 150. Remarkably, laws against Jews were more lenient than those against pagans and heretics. *Ibid.*, p. 151.

137 Liebeschuetz, *Barbarians and Bishops*, p. 148. Eunomian authors, teachers and clergy were to be expelled from the cities. Furthermore, “Eunomians, like heretics in general, were excluded from the imperial service, but they were penalized more severely than the others in that they were eventually disqualified from bequeathing or receiving property through wills.” *Ibid.*, p. 149. On the other hand, much of the *Theodosian Code* was in fact not enforced on the Arians. “Arians continued to live and worship, even at Constantinople, in considerable numbers. If they had been deprived of recognized churches they nevertheless continued to meet outside the city at regular meeting houses, led by their own clergy and even bishops.” *Ibid.*, p. 152. The *Theodosian Code* was compiled by the lawyers of Theodosius II (408-450), binding together the edicts of previous Christian emperors. It was framed in Constantinople in 436, and promulgated in Rome in 438, “as a potent symbol of the reach of a technically undivided empire.” Peter Brown, *The Rise of Western Christendom: Triumph and Diversity, A.D. 200-1000*, rev. ed. (Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell, 2013), pp. 75, 97 (quotation from p. 97).

Constantinople Creed (381) should be recited at every Sunday Mass following the custom of the Eastern churches.<sup>138</sup>

This Creed of 381 is essentially the creed still being professed at Mass every Sunday. In hindsight, the Council of Constantinople (381) was therefore a defining moment of victory for orthodoxy over Arianism. But the picture of victory was not so clear back then. For many years, Westerners in particular seemed quite unaware of this council attended by 150 bishops from the East, to such an extent that canon 7 of the Council of Ephesus (431) would impose a prohibition on the composition of any new creed other than that of Nicaea. It was not until 70 years after the Council of Constantinople (381)—at the Council of Chalcedon (451)—that the Creed of 381 was read out and recognised as the seal to that of Nicaea. It is through the test of time that orthodoxy emerges. Just as it appeared almost unimaginable that Arianism would ever come to an end on New Year day 360, the Council Fathers at Constantinople (381) would undoubtedly find it incredible that the Creed of 381 has come to be and still is—notwithstanding even the Reformation—essentially the very formula of faith that binds together Christians from all over the world.

---

138 Kelly, *Early Christian Creeds*, p. 351.