

1. Those who were suspicious of or against Nicaea:
 - a. Homoiousians (“of like substance”, “like in all things”) (Ayres, *Nicaea*, 149ff; Kelly, *Creeds*, 288; Kelly, *Doctrine*, 250; Meredith, *Cappadocians*, 102f)
 - In reaction to the “blasphemy of Sirmium,” theologians of this orientation met in 358 under the leadership of Basil of Ancyra and produced a document stating categorically that there is a similarity between the Father and the Son. The Son’s *ousia* is clearly next to the Father’s *ousia* and not among the *ousiai* of creatures. However the Son’s and the Father’s substances (*ousiai*) are not identical, but alike.
 - Against Arianism, but also uneasy with Nicaea, this large group was troubled by the Nicene term *homoousios*, thinking that it led to a Sabellianian denial of any distinction between Father and Son. (They clearly suspected pro-Nicene bishop Marcellus of Ancyra of Sabellianism and repeatedly asked western theologians to condemn him.)
 - Against Arianism: Christ is not a creature but Son of the Father, for ‘creator and creature are one thing; Father and Son another’;
 - Against Marcellus: The Son was not simply an ‘energy’ of the Father but ‘a substance (*ousia*) like the Father’ (Kelly, *Doctrine*, 250).
 - Eusebius of Caesarea, Cyril of Jerusalem, George of Laodicea, Basil of Ancyra. The Cappadocians would emerge from this group.
 - b. Homoians (*homoios*—“like” without any further specification), Anti-Nicaea:
 - An alliance of Arian theologians emerged following the Council of Sirmium in 357 and had a considerable influence on emperor Constantius.
 - It rejected all theologies that see commonality of essence between Father and Son. Homoians were willing to talk of the Son being ‘like’ the Father, or ‘like according to the Scriptures’ but all further technical terminology was avoided—although a clear subordination emphasis was understood to be implied by ‘like’ (Ayres, *Nicaea*, 138). They would support Heterousians when pressed. Valens and Ursacius led a western group (cf. Rimini, Ayres, *Nicaea*, 160 & 170); Acacius of Caesarea and Eudoxius of Antioch later of Constantinople led an eastern group (Cf. Council of Seleucia, Sept. 359, Ayres, *Nicaea*, 161f). The Emperor Constantius favored the Homoians, hoping that their theology of “*the unspecified like*” would unite a majority of Christians.
 - The Niké/Constantinople Creed of 360 was decidedly Homoian and became the official creed of the empire for two decades.
 - c. Heterousians/Anomoeans (*anomoios*—“unlike”), Anti-Nicaea:
 - Led by radical homoians Aetius and Eunomius, they argued that the Son was ‘unlike the Father in every respect.’ The Son is not of the same substance (*homoousios*) nor of a similar substance (*homoiousios*), but rather of a different substance altogether. The Son is a ‘creature of the uncreated.’ Cf. Kelly, *Creeds*, 283; Eunomius—Kelly, *Doctrine*, 249; Ayres, *Nicaea*, 144f; Zizioulas, ???).
 - Eunomius and Gregory: cf. Meredith, *Cappadocians*, 64ff; Zizioulas; cf. Ayres, *Early Chr. Lit*, 433)
 - v
2. Pro-Nicaea but against the divinity of the Spirit (Ayres, *Early Chr. Lit*, 440; *Nicaea*, 214, 253)
 - a. In the late 370s there emerged a group, mostly of former Homoiousians, named after Macedonius, (Bishop of Constantinople) that accepted the divinity of the Son along Nicene lines, but resisted the move toward recognizing the divinity of the Spirit.
 - b. They were present at the Second Ecumenical Council of Constantinople (381) but withdrew. According to Kelly, the lack of the use of the word *homoousios* to describe the relation between the Holy Spirit and the Father and the Son in the creed of Constantinople (381) is due to an attempt to mollify the Macedonians (Kelly, *Creeds*, 328f).
3. Confusion, controversies and condemnations:
 - a. Athanasius’ predecessor, Alexander, had come to an agreement with the Melitians by which they would be incorporated into a unified Egyptian church. Athanasius didn’t seem happy with that agreement and after his election as bishop of Alexander (328) he “encouraged his supporters to act

violently against (them), on occasion barring them from churches, having some arrested, and at least acquiescing in the beating of some.... (He) earned the opprobrium of many eastern bishops and seems to have made little direct attempt to defend himself from the accusations. At some point in the early 330s the Melitians, as part of a campaign to elicit support against Athanasius, found an ally in some of the Eusebians and probably in Eusebius of Nicomedia himself" (Ayres, *Nicaea*, 103).

- Summoned to appear before a council in Tyre (335), attention focused on the charges of his inciting violence, although several of his investigators also opposed him on theological grounds. When his accusers "charged him with interrupting the grain supply from Egypt", Constantine turned against him. Athanasius was exiled to Trier (Ayres, *Nicaea*, 102-3).
- b. Meanwhile, Marcellus was condemned for harboring Sabellian ideas and deposed at a meeting of bishops in Constantinople in 336.
- c. Following Constantine's death in 337, "all exiled bishops were allowed to return to their sees, Constantine II writing personally to the Alexandrians about Athanasius.... The civil banishment of these bishops was revoked, but their ecclesiastical, conciliar depositions remained in force. Bishops who wished to ignore the latter frequently chose to take advantage of the former. Participants from all sides in the debate could and did complain to whichever authority best served their purposes. In 338 Athanasius held a council in Alexandria which circulated a dossier directed against his enemies but with little consequence. In 339 imperial soldiers arrived to enforce Constantius' approval of the Eusebians' reiteration of Athanasius' deposition at the council of Antioch (338/9). Athanasius then made his way to Rome, as did Marcellus, who had also been deposed again" (Ayres, *Nicaea*, 103-4).
- It was during his stay in Rome in 339-340, that Athanasius wrote the first of his three *Orations Against the Arians*. He begins by "presenting Arius as the originator of a new heresy and all later proponents of such a theology as appropriately designated 'Arians.' He had referred to his opponents as 'Arian madmen' in a 338 letter, but in a letter produced by his Alexandrian council Athanasius began to speak of an Arian conspiracy (Ayres, *Nicaea*, 107-8).
 - While Athanasius' account of Arianism was to be "of considerable importance in the west," in other areas of the Mediterranean Arius' ideas were "treated largely as one half of a formal pairing of extremes: 'orthodoxy' avoids both Arius and Sabellius" (Cf. Cappadocians. Ayres, *Nicaea*, 108-9)
- d. "Athanasius appealed to Julius of Rome in 339/40 by using his strategy of narrating a theological conspiracy of 'Arians.' Pope Julius 1 convoked a small council of about 50 bishops in 341, at which Athanasius and Marcellus were pronounced guiltless and readmitted to full communion (Kelly, *Creeds*, 264; Ayres, *Nicaea*, 109).
- e. Pope Julius 1 then sent a letter to 'those around Eusebius' announcing his council's decisions. The letter showed 'a strong influence of the emerging Athanasian account of 'Arianism'. In it Julius charges the Eusebians with accepting 'Arians' into communion despite their condemnation at Nicaea. Much of the focus in the first half of his long letter is on "the perceived attempt of the Eusebians to ignore or even overturn the decisions and canons of Nicaea. ... Relations between Rome and the Eusebians were shaped for many years by Athanasius' account of events" (Ayres, *Nicaea*, 109).
- Frend, *Rise*, 529 characterizes Julius' letter as "outraged complaint in every line" and an extraordinary "claim to speak to his colleagues on the authority of Peter and nothing else."
- f. The Dedication Council: (Kelly, *Creeds*, 263ff; Ayres, *Nicaea*, 117ff; Frend, *Rise*, 530ff) In 341 a group of some 90 bishops met in Antioch to dedicate a church whose construction was begun by Emperor Constantine. Here they also discussed Julius's letter that vindicated Athanasius and Marcellus and that accused them of accommodating Arians. Eusebius of Nicomedia (newly named bishop of Constantinople), Acacius of Caesarea, Asterius and the emperor Constantius were present. Four creed-like statements were produced:
- "The first occurs in a letter which begins with a preamble making clear one point that had come to anger the Eusebians: 'we have not been followers of Arius—how could bishops, such as we, follow a presbyter—nor did we receive any other faith beside that which has been handed down....' They also assert that they were within their rights to judge the faith of Arius and admit him to communion" (Ayres, *Nicaea*, 117-8).
 - The second is a more formal statement of faith and is known as the "Dedication" creed (See Kelly,

Creeds, 268-270 for the creed). This creed has a clear anti-Sabellian and anti-Marcellan thrust, seen, for example, in the insistence that, as written in Matthew 28:19, the three names—Father, Son and Holy Spirit— “are not given lightly or idly but signify exactly the particular *hypostasis* and order and glory of each who are named, so that they are three in *hypostasis* but one in agreement” (Quoted in Ayres, *Nicaea*, 118; cf. Kelly, *Creeds*, 270).

- Nicaea itself was not yet so established as a definitive statement of the Christian faith that questions of other creeds supplanting it are warranted. Yet this creed “almost certainly intended to offer a better and clearer affirmation of faith than Nicaea” (Ayres, *Nicaea*, 119).
 - [On the Nicene Creed immediately being an officially accepted statement of faith and its relationship with the council of Constantinople in 381, see Kelly, *Creeds*, 313-331, and discussion on Constantinople 381, below]
- Missing in it is “Nicaea’s insistence on the Son being from the Father’s *ousia*: the already contested nature of this theology in 325 can only have been enhanced by controversy over Marcellus” (Ayres, *Nicaea*, 120).
- Using a long string of descriptive phrases (*God from God, whole from whole, perfect from perfect, King from King, etc., etc.*) to refer to the Son in his pre-incarnate state, the creed pointedly attacked Marcellus who said that such words only applied to the incarnate Son. (Kelly, *Creeds*, 271).
- “It has a markedly Origenist flavor, (speaking) of three quite separate hypostases, each possessing its own subsistence and rank and glory, but bound into a unity by a common harmony of will” (Kelly, *Creeds*, 271).
- “Nothing could be more opposed than this hierarchically constructed Trinity to the Monarchianism recently approved at Rome and represented in its extreme form by Marcellus. The synod was working with a theology which, while by no means sympathetic to Arianism, was subordinationist and pre-Nicene” (Kelly, *Creeds*, 270).
- “The real battle at this period was between two misinterpretations of the truth, an Athanasian caricature of the Eusebians as unadulterated Arians, and an Eastern caricature of the Athanasian position as indistinguishable from that of Marcellus” (Kelly, *Creeds*, 274).
 - The creed “shows us that many in Asia Minor, Syria, and Palestine followed a broad ‘Eusebian’ line”—disturbed by the apparent Sabellianism of Nicaea, but without assenting to the extreme views of Arius. For Athanasius, however, the Dedication creed was ‘Arian’ (Cf. Ayres, *Nicaea*, 120-1).
- The third creed was similar to a baptismal confession, being the personal statement of Theophronius of Tyana, who desired to clear himself of an accusation of heresy.
- The fourth creed is a summary document sent west to the Emperor Constans. It uses no *ousia* or image language and adds a very anti-Marcellus statement: ‘the Son’s kingdom has no end’ (“*whose reign is indissoluble and abides for endless ages*”). The intent was to demonstrate the bishops’ orthodoxy against the charges of Athanasius and Julius and that Athanasius had been rightly judged for malpractice. It came to be known as “The Fourth Creed of Antioch (cf. Ayres, *Nicaea*, 122; cf. Kelly, *Creeds*, 272).
- g. The Council of Serdica 343 (modern Sophia. Cf. Kelly *Doctrine*, 242; *Creeds*, 275f; Ayres, *Nicaea* 122ff; Frend, *Rise*, 530ff): Certain bishops encouraged Constans to write to his brother Constantius suggesting that a joint council be held at the border of their respective territories to resolve disputes that had risen. The suggestion was taken up, but the two sides, one from the east, the other from the west never met together.
 - The ‘easterners’ refused to meet with the ‘westerners’ who wanted Athanasius and Marcellus to participate in their joint meetings. They had no intention of allowing the ‘westerners’ to revoke the decisions of their councils. They wrote an apology and a statement of faith (the “fourth creed of Antioch”) in which they excommunicated all the ‘western’ leaders there at Serdica.
 - They first condemn Marcellus, mentioning not only his heretical views but also the fact that he had already been deposed by a council in Constantinople (336) at which Constantine himself had been in attendance.
 - Turning to Athanasius, they focused on his tyrannical behavior and his previous condemnation.

- Finally they justify their excommunication of the ‘westerners’ and reject the ‘western’ council ‘made up of this curdled blend of lost souls’ (See Ayres, *Nicaea*, 123-4).
 - They appended a profession of faith which was the Fourth Creed of Antioch (Dedication Council) with some additional anathemas attached.
 - The ‘westerners’ issued a number of documents, one rehabilitating Athanasius, Asclepas of Gaza and Marcellus. They then excommunicated a long list of Eastern bishops on the ground of their alleged Arianism (See Kelly, *Creeds*, 277; Frend, *Rise*, 531)).
 - They followed that with a profession of faith (the Western creed of Serdica). In it they refute 3 Arian arguments: Christ is not God and has a beginning in time; the Logos suffered and died; the hypostases of Father, Son, and Holy Spirit are different.
 - “‘Arianism’ is defined in such broad terms that almost any theology which was willing to insist on there being more than one hypostasis was in error” (Ayres, *Nicaea*, 125).
 - It was “an extreme and highly provocative statement, and the abusive language in which it was couched did not render it any more acceptable. In itself the theology involved was difficult enough for even moderate men in the Eastern camp to view with sympathy, but it finally slammed the door in their face by coming down decisively in favour of the formula ‘one hypostasis’” (Kelly, *Creeds*, 278).
 - Although it wanted to, the ‘Western’ council apparently never officially adopted the profession of faith, as Athanasius persuaded the majority to stick with the Nicene creed (Kelly, *Creeds*, 278).
 - It also “attributed to the bishop of Rome an important, if limited appellate jurisdiction in the event of disputes between bishops. A deposed bishop might appeal to the pope, who would then pronounce a final judgment himself or through his presbyters” (Frend, *Rise*, 531).
 - This “council” demonstrates the “increasingly divergent concerns of the theological trajectories now in conflict. Concerns among the Eusebians about the Father’s transcendence pushed in very different directions from theologians whose main concern was to show a direct continuity of being between Father and Son” (Ayres, *Nicaea*, 125-6).
 - “Long after the council, Basil of Caesarea commented bitterly on Western ‘double standards,’ anathematizing anything that sounded Arian, yet turning a blind eye to the worse impieties of Marcellus” (Frend, *Rise*, 531).
- h. The ‘Macrostich’ creed of 345 (Ayres, *Nicaea*, 126; Frend, *Rise*, 532f; Kelly, *Creeds*, 279ff)
- With the possibility of schism looming, both sides sought agreement. In 344 a group of 3 ‘western’ bishops travelled to Antioch but were rebuffed there by Stephen who was then deposed for the manner of his rebuff (see Ayres, *Nicaea*, 127, ft. 54). A year later his successor, Leontius, sent a group of bishops from Antioch west with a document stating their theological positions. (The notes below follow Ayres, *Nicaea*, 127f.)
 - It was a slightly changed version of the 4th creed of Antioch (Dedication Council).
 - It “argues against Marcellan doctrines which (echoing Origen’s presentation of Monarchian doctrine in his *Commentary on John*) treat the Word as ‘mere word of God and unexisting, having his being in another.
 - Marcellus’ disciple Photinus is also named and his suspected adoptionism condemned.
 - It asserts that the Son is generated in such a way that the unity of God somehow encompasses Father and Son as distinct beings.
 - In traditional Eusebian fashion, we read that the son is generated from the Father’s will as the only alternative to being generated by necessity.
 - While still far from later Nicene orthodoxy, it shows development in its theological trajectory in two ways:
 - It searches to find ways of defining the Father’s generation of the Son as a sharing of the divine existence, but without compromising the unity of God and without materialist connotation.
 - “Christ was acknowledged as ‘like in all things to the Father’, a crucial phrase, for it might allow in the last resort that ‘likeness’ be expressed as involving being of the same substance. But that time had not yet come” (Frend, *Rise*, 532).
 - It focuses quite directly on the logic of asserting three distinct ‘realities’ while still finding

- Now, “between Athanasius on the one hand, and Aetius on the other, the emperor and the majority of the Christians found themselves engaged in an ever more exasperating quest for a formula on which they could agree (Freund, *Rise*, 538-9).
 - Constantius was in Sirmium in 357 and a council was assembled at which Western bishops (including Hosius of Cordoba) were well represented. “The bishops made a supreme attempt to cut through the thicket of arguments surrounding the use of *ousia* (=substance) either as *homoousios* (identical) or *homoiousios* (like).
 - The “Second Creed of Sirmium” (drawing from the 4th Creed of Antioch—Ayres, *Nicaea*, 137) stated that, “there is one God Almighty and Father...and his only Son Jesus Christ...begotten of the Father himself before all ages.” But there were not ‘two gods’. Then, with regard to further specification about the relation between the Father’s being and the Son’s being, a prudent agnosticism was suggested: “*Who shall declare his generation?*” (Isaiah 53:8). Thus, there was to be no mention of *homoousios* or *homoiousios* nor should they be preached in church. All one could say was ‘that there is no question but that the Father is greater than the Son in honour, dignity, splendor, and majesty,’ as the Son himself testified: ‘The Father is greater than I’. So the Son was subordinate to the Father and God only in a secondary sense.” (Freund, *Rise*, 539).
 - The avoidance of divisive terms, the insistence on staying close to Scriptural language and the absence of any anathemas attached to it, made the declaration attractive to many. It resulted, according to Ayres, “n the emergence of ‘Homoian’ theology” (Ayres, *Nicaea*, 138)
 - ✚ Hosius signed it (at +/-100! For the orthodox, this ‘lapse’ cost him his title of sanctity and the world the survival of his writings) as Pope Liberius also may have (Freund, *Rise*, 539-4).
 - Sirmium 351 had condemned some uses of *ousia* language, but with Sirmium 357, the prohibition against all *ousia* language meant that a general ambivalence to Nicaea has turned to direct opposition (Ayres, *Nicaea*, 138).
 - “Without directly preaching Arianism, the formula was an edict of toleration in its favour, while the Nicene party found itself excluded from that tolerance” (J. Gummerus, as quoted in Kelly, *Creeds*, 287).
 - “The Nicene creed, towards which all sections of the Church had hitherto observed a correct and tactful attitude, suddenly found itself declared unorthodox and unlawful” (Kelly, *Creeds*, 287).
 - “Put forward as a formula of peace...in the West it raised an immense stir...and strengthened the position of the Nicene Creed” (Kelly, *Creeds*, 287; cf. Ayres, *Nicaea*, 150).
 - “In the East the effect of the publication of the Sirmian manifesto, with the contemporaneous emergence of the extreme teachings of Aetius and Eunomius...was to open the eyes of the great body of central churchmen or ‘Semi-Arians’ (Homoiousians-H. S.) to the menace involved in the new more virulent Arianism” (Kelly, *Creeds*, 287-8; cf. Ayres, *Nicaea*, 150).
- k. “A crisis meeting was held in Ancyra in 358 under the chairmanship of Basil, the local bishop, (along with Eustathius of Sebaste, George of Laodicea) and the reaction was vividly expressed in the synodical letter which announced its decisions. It was, according to Kelly, the first “*Homoiousian* manifesto” (Kelly, *Doctrine*, 250; cf. Kelly, *Creeds*, 288; cf. Ayres, *Nicaea*, 150f; Freund, *Rise*, 540).
- The term *homoousios* is condemned because it had been used by Sabellius and already had been condemned
 - “Basil argues that the language of Father/Son indicates something distinct from the language of Creator and creature, but not something that we can directly grasp. Once we remove the corporeal connotations of the Father/Son relationship then we are left with ‘only the generation of a living being like in essence (=substance—H. S.) (Ayres, *Nicaea*, 150).
 - Thus we must confess Father and Son to be like according to essence (*homoios kat ousian*) if we are not to mistake the Father/Son relationship for a Creator/creature relationship’.
 - “The Father is the Father of an *ousia* that exists according to the Father’s *energeia*. This is an anti-Marcellan argument focusing on the substantive existence of the Son. ... In distinguishing himself from the Heterousian theology (Aetius, Eunomius) Basil argues for a sharing of the

- existence (=substance—H. S.) in the Son’s relationship to the Father” (Ayres, *Nicaea*, 152).
- According to Kelly, in the terminology of this “manifesto,” “*ousia* approximated to the sense of ‘Person.’ (So) the likeness between Father and Son is not to be conceived of as identity; being another *ousia*, the Son can be like the Father, but not identical with Him. So the document speaks of ‘the likeness of *ousia* to *ousia*’, and condemns anyone who defines the Son as *homoousios* or *tautousios* (identical) with the Father” (Kelly, *Doctrine*, 250).
- l. “Flushed with his success and confident of being able to steer a course between the Anomoean (better-“Heterousians”—H. S.) teaching and the troublesome *homoousion*, Basil of Ancyra now pressed the emperor to summon a general council which might legislate a final settlement” (Kelly, *Creeds*, 288).
- In response, Constantius wrote a letter to the church in Antioch in which he states: “when we first made a declaration of our belief...we confessed that our Saviour is the Son of God, and of like substance with the Father” (!! Ayres, *Nicaea*, 153). It seems that Basil convinced Constantius of the correctness of the phrase “of like *substance* with the Father.
 - Constantius had agreed to call that general council, but at the suggestion of Heteroousian advisors, he decided that two parallel councils would be better, one at Rimini to which western bishops would be invited, the other at Seleucia for eastern bishops.
 - But first, in May of 359, he summoned a small committee to Sirmium to draft a creed for discussion (and hopefully for approval) at the two meetings. This ‘Fourth Creed of Sirmium’ became derisively known as the “Dated Creed” (For reason, see Frend, *Rise*, 540; Kelly, *Creeds*, 288ff).
 - In its final paragraph the ‘creed’ states: “But whereas the term ‘substance’ (*ousia*) has been adopted by the fathers in simplicity, but being unknown by the people gives offense, because neither do the Scriptures contain it, it has seemed good to remove it, and that there should be no further mention of substance in regard to God...” (Kelly, *Creeds*, 290).
 - It then goes on assert, “we say that the Son is like the Father in all things” which is far from the assertion that “the Father and the Son are alike according to substance” that Basil had championed and that Constantius himself had recently written in his letter to the church in Antioch.
 - The Arian (*Homoian*—H. S.) theologian Valens of Mursa tried to write simply ‘like’ in the copy he was taking to Rimini, leaving out ‘in all things’, while Basil appended to his copy that the Son was like the Father ‘in all things, and not just in will, but in hypostasis and in existence and in substance’ (Kelly, *Creeds*, 291; cf. Ayres, *Nicaea*, 158).
 - Between the “Dated Creed” and the opening of the council in Seleucia, George of Laodicea wrote a letter in which he summed up the Heterousian position by the statement: ‘like in will, unlike in essence.’ He argued against that illogical position, observing that they had just signed a creed that stated that the Father and the Son were ‘like in all things’. In the creed to come, ‘in all things’ will be struck and the Son will be said simply to be ‘like the Father’ (Cf. Ayres, *Nicaea*, 158-9).
- m. Rimini (Ariminum—Frend), May 359 (Kelly, *Creeds*, 291ff; Ayres, *Nicaea*, 160; Frend, *Rise* 540ff):
- “The twin councils...were intended to be vast affairs and finish what Nicaea had set out to do, namely to define the creed of Christendom” (Frend, *Rise*, 540).
 - The western council met first. Note: “The imperial presence was in evidence through Taurus, the praetorian prefect who supervised proceedings” (Frend, *Rise*, 541; cf. Kelly, *Creeds*, 292 where Leonas, an imperial commissioner at Seleucia is mentioned).
 - The Arian (now Homoian?—H. S.) bishops Valens and Ursacius tried to get the group (over 400 bishops!) to adopt a creed almost identical to the “Dated Creed,” but failed. The council was decidedly Homoousian, and acclaimed the Nicene Creed and the use of “substance.” It further deposed and excommunicated Valens and Ursacius and then sent a delegation to Constantius to inform him of its decisions (Kelly, *Creeds*, 291).
 - The Emperor was not pleased that his Homoian drafted creed was rejected and sent the delegation to Niké, where they were gradually worn down by long delays, cramped quarters, a hot Italian summer and by threats and lies (See Ayres, *Nicaea*, 161 and Kelly, *Creeds*, 291).
 - Constantius made it clear that he was willing to exile those who resisted;

- They were told that the eastern council had already signed the new creed;
 - Valens publicly professed some 'anti-Arian' statements, in particular insisting that he did not think the Son to be a creature. (Later he reportedly admitted that he meant that the Son was not a creature like other creatures.)
 - The Nicene Creed was not yet fully recognized to be the statement of orthodoxy and many might not have seen it to be the standard by which to measure other creeds.
 - The delegation at Niké capitulated. "They consented to sign a revision of the Dated Creed, which was now put forth as 'Nicene'" (Kelly, *Creeds*, 291).
 - In this revision was "(a) the omission of *in all things* after *like* (*We believe in the only-begotten Son of God...like the Father in all things who begot him* -x2), and (b) the prohibition not only of *ousia* but also of 'one hypostasis' in the doctrine of the Trinity (*nor indeed should the term hypostasis be used of Father and Son and Holy Spirit*) (Kelly, *Creeds*, 291-3).
 - The delegation returned to Rimini and spent two weeks trying to convince the western council to change its mind. It finally succeeded.
- n. Seleucia: The eastern council met in September of 359 and "was divided between those around Acacius and Eudoxius (leaders of the Eastern Homoian party) who were keen to promulgate a new creed as the universal faith of the empire, and a larger party (Homoiousians) sympathetic to those bishops who had recently stood with Basil of Ancyra" (Ayres, *Nicaea*, 161-2).
- The great majority were Homoiousians, led by George of Laodicea, and wanted to endorse officially the second Creed of the dedication Council. At the second session that Creed was ratified after the minority Homoians retired.
 - At the next session, however, the minority returned and with the imperial commissioner Leonas acting as their spokesman, put forward their creed. It did not reject the creed of the Dedication Council but spoke of the troubles caused by the words *homoousios*, *homoiousios* and *anomoios*. It then proposes the simple use of *homoios* (like) with no further specificity attached. The creed it offered was very similar to the Dated Creed of Sirmium. (Note: there are differences in the sequence of events in Ayres and Kelly. The above reflects the sequence found in Kelly. Ayres, *Nicaea*, 162; Kelly, *Creeds*, 292).
 - Again, the crucial words *in all things* were omitted after the word *like*.
 - Leonas dissolved the council without the matter having been put finally to the vote (Kelly, *Creeds*, 292. Again, Ayres has different description of events, cf. *Nicaea*, 164).
 - Both groups send delegations to Constantius in Constantinople.
 - "Constantius was determined that the Homoiousians, no less that the Western Homoousians, should sign his Homoian draft" (Kelly, *Creeds*, 292).
 - "After much pressure, in part involving assuring the bishops that the western council had unanimously agreed to this creed, the Homoiousian delegation finally agreed on the last night of 359" (Ayres, *Nicaea*, 164).
 - "Thus the Homoian victory was complete, and it was this sequence of events which St. Jerome had in mind when he wrote that 'the whole world awoke with a groan to find itself Arian'" (Kelly, *Creeds*, 293 and Frend, *Rise*, 541).
- o. Synod of Niké/Constantinople, January 60, 360 (Ayres, *Nicaea*, 164f; Kelly, *Creeds*, 293f)
- From the official point of view the faith of the church was now Homoian. To complete the work, however, it was necessary to bring the decisions of the delegates of Rimini and Seleucia before a great united council and obtain its final ratification for them" (Kelly, *Creeds*, 293).
 - The council, though, was small, and was presided over by Acacius and dominated by Homoian bishops. Beyond ratifying a creed, the main act of business was to depose a number of Homoiousian bishops, Basil of Ancyra among them.
 - In this creed, the phrase '*in all things*' after '*like*' disappears.
 - All *ousia* language is strongly rejected.
 - Key terms such as 'only-begotten Son of God' function to distinguish the Son very clearly from the Father.
 - "The creed was circulated to all the bishops of Christendom with an imperial letter commanding them either to sign it or take the consequences" (Kelly, *Creeds*, 295).

- This creed “remained the imperially sanctioned statement of orthodoxy for almost two decades (especially in the east)” (Ayres, *Nicaea*, 165).
4. Nicene theology: from unease to resolution (Frend, *Rise*, 541; Ayres, *Nicaea*, 165ff; Kelly, *Doctrine*, 252ff; Pelikan, *Emergence*, 211ff; Meredith, *Cappadocians*, 102f)
- a. Antagonism develops between some church leaders and the emperor. “If Basil of Ancyra and his friends were prepared to keep quiet (following Niké/Constantinople), Athanasius and Hilary were not” (Frend, *Rise*, 541).
 - “For Athanasius the years 356-61 nourished a steadily growing conviction that Constantius was indeed the forerunner of antichrist, and that his previous unequivocal loyalty to the throne must be revised” (Frend, *Rise*, 541). He denounced Constantius as ‘worse than Saul’, ‘worse than Ahab’, the ‘forerunner of Antichrist.’
 - Athanasius was moving “toward espousing the dualistic theory of church-state relations that prevailed in the West” (Frend, *Rise*, 542).
 - But notice, then, his support for Emperor Juvian in 563! (Frend, *Rise*, 616)
 - Other Eastern bishops, however, regarded the emperor as ‘having no peer in the world’, as a sacred personage, a priest as well as king. “Athanasius’ brush with Constantius failed to alter the basic political theory of the East focused on the emperor as the godly monarch (Frend, *Rise*, 542).
 - “In the West, opposition was more deeply rooted and directed against the emperor himself.”
 - Hilary of Poitiers wrote *Against Constantius* in 360/1. ‘You distribute episcopal sees to your partisans and substitute bad bishops for good. You imprison priests and use your army to terrorize the Church.’ Constantius was not the forerunner of the Antichrist (as per Athanasius), he was the Antichrist himself.
 - Lucifer, bishop of Cagliari “never tired of justifying his attitude by reference to the rebellion of the Maccabees against Antiochus. That tradition had run deep in the Western church, inspiring the martyrs of Lyons, Cyprian, and Lactantius.... The limited monarchy bestowed on the Israelite kings by the Lord was the most that Western theologians were prepared to concede to the Christian emperor” (Frend, *Rise*, 542).
 - For a further look at church-state relationships in the 4th century, see Constantine and the Donatists and the Circumcellions (“the first Christian group to aim openly at the overthrow of the existing social order and a complete reversal of its values”).
 - See also Ambrose and Theodosius I (Frend, *Rise*, 488-492, 572-574, 615-626). For a description of the two different relations between church and state, western and eastern, see Frend, *Rise*, 626.
 - “With the emperor Theodosius I (379-95) emerges a concept of state-catholicism to which all subjects of the empire must adhere” (See Frend, *Rise*, 616).
 - b. The changing importance of creeds in Christianity
 - What did adopting creeds mean? “Constantius’ policies focused attention much more clearly on the precise wording of creeds and on their possible function as binding identifiers of orthodox belief” (Ayres, *Nicaea*, 167).
 - It began to dawn on many that the “Homoian leaders intended to use the creed as a cipher for a highly subordinationist theology that excluded not only Athanasian theologies but also theologies of a broadly Homoiousian nature” (Ayres, *Nicaea*, 167).
 - Thus, as the Homoian leaders celebrate their victory, “we also begin to see an increasing number willing to adopt Nicaea as a standard during the early 360s” (Ayres, *Nicaea*, 167).
 - c. A changing political situation:
 - Constantius died in 361 and his immediate successor was Julian (“The Apostate”). (See Frend, *Rise*, 594-609 for details of Julian’s short reign—died 363.)
 - “In his attempt to undermine the Church, Julian tried to foment dissension between groups in the Church—initially by recalling all bishops who had been banished under Constantius.” This meant that “there had been no time for the Homoians to consolidate their power and Julian had afforded their opponents every opportunity to regroup and realign” (Ayres, *Nicaea*, 169, 170, 177).
 - [See Julian’s *School Law* of 362 in which Christians were forbidden to teach in the schools of

the empire: Meredith, Cappadocians, 115f]

- While the Western Emperor, Valentinian (364-75), displayed sympathy for the Nicene position, the Eastern Emperor, Valens (364-78), supported a broadly Homoian position and was especially hostile to Heterousian theology. (His advisors were the Homoian bishops Eudoxius and Acacius.)
 - Valens faced a serious military revolt in 365-6 and, in order to gain wide support, recalled bishops (including Athanasius) who had been exiled. Theological discussions took place and “the period saw a steadily strengthening group of those who recognized the creed of Nicaea as a superior standard to Constantius’ creed’ (Ayres, *Nicaea*, 170).
 - Several Homoiousian groups held councils that affirmed the creeds of 341 and condemned that of 360.
 - “These events demonstrate that many of the leading Homoiousians saw that a time was ripe for realignment and were prepared to go to some lengths to gain support against the Homoians” (Ayres, *Nicaea*, 170).
- d. Athanasius and Hilary take steps toward an alliance with Homoiousians (Cf. Ayres, *Nicaea*, 171ff; Kelly, *Doctrine*, 253ff; Frend, *Rise*, 605f).
- While in exile in Egypt from 359-361, Athanasius wrote *De synodis* (On the Councils of Rimini and Seleucia). In it he addresses Homoiousians as brothers “who in essentials were at one with himself. Since they recognized that the Son was ‘out of the Father’s *ousia* and not from another hypostasis’ ...they were near enough to admitting the homoousion, which alone expressed with precision the truth which they evidently accepted” (Kelly, *Doctrine*, 253; cf. Ayres, *Nicaea*, 171f for a more extensive analysis).
 - Hilary went further: He admitted that homoousion language lent itself to Sabellian interpretations and allowed the use of homoiousian language in certain circumstances. “His conclusion was that, since they acknowledged the distinction of Persons, the Catholics, i.e. the Nicenes, could not deny the homoiousian, while the Homoiousians for their part were bound to allow unity of substance if they believed seriously in the perfect likeness of substance” (Kelly, *Doctrine*, 253; for in-depth notes on Hilary’s theology see Ayres, *Nicaea*, 179f).
 - Upon his return from exile in 361, Athanasius convened a council in Alexandria, 362 (Ayres, *Nicaea*, 173F; Frend, *Rise*, 605; Kelly, *Doctrine*, 253):
 - The ‘Catholic Epistle’ set out the basic rules for re-establishing communion with bishops who had subscribed to the decisions of Rimini and Seleucia.
 - It set fairly minimum conditions focused around subscription to Nicaea and an acknowledgment of the Spirit’s divinity.
 - Assumed that many who had subscribed to the decisions of Rimini and Seleucia did so without great conviction.
 - Recognized that Nicaea was the only obvious rallying point in opposition to the Homoian creed of 360.
 - “The Holy Spirit was recognized as coequal with the Father and the Son (for how else was the baptismal formula of the church to be understood?)” (Frend, *Rise*, 605).
 - But, “for all his friendliness to the Homoiousians, (Athanasius) still insists that, in regard to the divine substance, ‘identity’ is a more appropriate term than ‘likeness’ and that Father and Son must be ‘one in substance’” (Kelly, *Doctrine*, 254)
 - Following that council Athanasius and others wrote a letter to the church in Antioch known as the ‘Antioch Tome’ (Ayres, *Nicaea*, 173).
 - In it Athanasius accepts that not all those who teach three hypostases imply three hierarchically ranked beings, of which only one is true God (Arianism-H. S.).
 - He thus “admits that hypostasis might primarily indicate a logical distinction: indicating only that the persons are truly and eternally distinct, doing so in the context of a belief that whatever is God is immaterial and simply God.”
 - He then parallels that “admission with an insistence that those who confess only one hypostasis are doing so only to indicate that the divine is one reality distinct from the created order and not indicating a belief that the Son and Spirit are not truly existent realities” (Ayres, *Nicaea*, 173).

- Athanasius “then exhorts the addressees of the letter to accept any who explain their theology in either of the ways described....”
- “For the first time we have...a text that offers the logic of unity at one ‘level’ and distinction at another as the context within which to understand the Son’s generation” (Ayles, *Nicaea*, 173).
 - Athanasius went to Antioch with the intention (according to Basil of Caesarea) “of communicating with Meletius and thus sealing the union between ‘Old’ and ‘New’ Nicenes. Meletius for some reason delayed, and Athanasius then took the fateful step of acknowledging as rightful bishop his old friend, the Western-supported Paulinus. The Antiochene schism had deepened...” (Frend, *Rise*, 616. For the story of Paulinus and the two parties in the Antiochian church, see Ayles, *Nicaea*, 176, 254 and Frend, *Rise*, 632).
- Hilary, for his part, was an “important influence at a council in Paris sometime in 360 or 361. This council issued a statement of faith in favour of Nicaea and the term *homoousios*.”
- Liberius of Rome (having now come to his pro-Nicene senses) issued a letter saying that all who desired to be accepted back should be asked only to commit ‘to the apostolic and catholic creed up to and including the meeting of the synod of Nicaea.’ (Ayles, *Nicaea*, 178).
- e. Under Bishop Meletius of Antioch, a council of 25 bishops assembled in Oct. of 363.
 - It “acknowledged the Creed of Nicaea and reluctantly the *homoousios*, with the important gloss, ‘the Son is born of the substance of the Father, and in respect of substance is like him’” (Frend, *Rise* 161).
- f. The Cappadocians (Meredith, *Cappadocians*, 102ff; Kelly, *Doctrine*, 263ff; Ayles, *Nicaea*, 187ff; Frend, *Rise*, xxx)
 - “On the whole it can be said that the central aim of all parties was to steer some sort of middle course between the position of Arius on the one hand and that of Marcellus of Ancyra on the other” (Meredith, *Cappadocians*, 103).
 - This means that though all agreed that Arius had been wrong, if he meant that the Son was not co-eternal with the Father, Marcellus was no less wrong in denying any real and eternal distinction between the Father and the Son (Meredith, 103).
 - Cappadocian theology is an attempt to interpret the central term *homoousios* in such a way as to insist on the full deity of the Son and of his eternal distinction from the Father” (Meredith, 103).
 - “Emerging from the Homoiousian tradition, it was natural that (the Cappadocians) should make the three hypostases, rather than the one divine substance, their starting point. Hence, while the formula which expresses their position is ‘one *ousia* in three *hypostaseis*,’ their emphasis often seems to be on the latter term...” (Kelly, *Doctrine*, 264).
 - Basil seemed to be of the Homoiousians who upheld the basic sense of Nicaea, but had “difficulty in understanding *homoousios* appropriately” (Ayles, *Nicaea*, 189f).
 - On the one hand, Basil’s hesitancy in using the term *homoousios* may be due to his argument against Marcellus. The Nicene term “light from light” might imply that the Father and the Son are the same one light (Marcellus would assert that!). (Eastern bishops long suspected western pro-Nicene bishops of being Sabellian and waited for them to condemn Marcellus.)
 - Or Basil might be concerned that *homoousios* means that the Father and the Son are of an identical status, implying the existence of two ultimate principles (Arius charged Alexander with that heresy!) (Ayles, 190).
 - To speak of Father and Son as simply having the same *ousia* would be to ignore the differences that follow from the Son being the sort of *ousia* he is because of being generated from the Father and to present him as logically another God (Ayles, 1090).
 - Basil articulates a distinction between natures and individuated realities that enables him to assert that Father and Son are, indeed, the same in essence, but distinct at another level...” (Ayles, *Nicaea*, 195).
 - *Hypostasis* is “that which is spoken of distinctively rather than the indefinite notion of the *ousia*.” ... Theologians varied in their designations for the mode of origin of each hypostasis, as well as in their degree of emphasis upon the individuality of each; but individuality, however defined, was now to be predicated of Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. (Pelikan, *Emergence*, 220).

- This conception of three hypostases effectively removed the taint of Sabellianism from the Nicene confession, but it did so by raising another specter, at least equally terrifying to Christian faith—the threat of tritheism. The monotheistic confession of Deuteronomy 6:4...seemed to be at stake once more...! (Pelikan, *Emerg.* 220-1).
- Basil responds by saying that the “distinction between *ousia* and *hypostasis* is the same as that between the general and particular....”
 - ✚ The three persons of the Trinity all belong to the same general category of Godhead; all are therefore equally spiritual and uncreated, because all share the same nature. Yet this nature does not have an independent reality apart from the three persons. (The one generic nature is exhausted by the three persons—H.S.)
 - ✚ In the Basilian scheme each person of the Trinity can be thought of as a union of the general divine nature and an individual characteristic, sometimes referred to as a *tropos hyparxeos* or way of existing. So the Father is as it were a compound of divinity + Fatherhood, and so on for the Son and Spirit” (Meredith, 105; cf. Ayres, *Nicaea*, 198ff; Pelikan *Emerg.* 220f where Gregory of Nyssa speaks of Peter, James, and John are called three humans....)

5. The *homoousios* of the Spirit: (Kelly, *Doctrine*, 255ff; Pelikan, *Emergence*, 211ff; Ayres, *Nicaea*, 211ff; Meredith, *Cappadocians*)
- a. At Nicaea, the doctrine of the Holy Spirit was “disposed of in lapidary brevity: ‘And we believe in the Holy Spirit.’ Nor does thee seem to have been a single treatise dealing specifically with the person of the Spirit composed before the second half of the fourth century” (Pelikan, *Emergence*, 211).
 - Gregory of Nanzianzus “conceded as late as 380 (that) ‘to be only slightly in error (about the Holy Spirit) was to be orthodox.’ ... Of the wise men among ourselves, some have conceived of him as an activity, some as a creature, some as God; and some have been uncertain which to call him.... And therefore they neither worship him nor treat him with dishonor, but take up a neutral position” (Pelikan, *Emergence*, 212-3).
 - b. Alexander merely repeated the truth that the Holy Spirit inspired the prophets and apostles.
 - c. Arius considered the Spirit to be a hypostasis, but whose essence was as entirely unlike that of the Son as the Son’s essence was unlike that of the Father.
 - d. Eusebius of Caesarea agreed that he was a hypostasis, but of a third rank.
 - e. Cyril of Jerusalem (313-386) published his *Catechetical Lectures* around 348 in which he expressed a full orthodox doctrine of the Holy Spirit. The Spirit belongs to the Trinity, and ‘we do not divide the holy Triad as some do....’ Like the Son, the Holy Spirit is far removed from creatures and enjoys a perfect knowledge of the Father. The Father gives to the Son and the Son communicates to the Holy Spirit. He is ‘subsistent’, ever-present with the Father and the Son, and is glorified inseparably with them’ (Kelly, *Doctrine*, 256).
 - f. In 359 or 360, Athanasius was asked to respond to a group of Egyptian Christians (“Tropici”) who argued that the Holy Spirit was a creature created out of nothing, one of the ministering angels mentioned in Heb. 1:14, and consequently ‘other in substance’ from the Father and the Son (Kelly, *Doctrine*, 256-7). In his response, Athanasius argues that
 - “Scripture as a whole is unanimous that the Spirit ‘belongs to and is one with the Godhead Which is in the Triad.’ While creatures come from nothingness, are the recipients of sanctification and life, and are mutable, circumscribed and multiple, the Spirit comes from God, bestows sanctification and life, and is immutable, omnipresent and unique.” See his exegesis of Isaiah 63:9 in Pelikan, *Emergence*, 214;
 - “The Triad is eternal, homogeneous and indivisible and that since the Spirit is a member of it, He must be consubstantial with Father and Son;
 - Observing the close relation between the Spirit and the Son, Athanasius “deduces that he belongs in essence to the Son exactly as the Son does to the Father. (This “provoked the not unwarranted taunt that the Holy Spirit would then have to be interpreted as the son of the Son and hence the grandson of the Father” (Pelikan, *Emergence*, 213).
 - Athanasius “infers the Spirit’s divinity from the fact that he makes us all ‘partakers of God’—1 Cor 3:16. If he were a creature we would have no participation in God through him” (Kelly, *Doctrine*, 256-7; cf. Pelikan, *Emergence*, 215-6).

- In his arguments against Arius, Athanasius saw in the liturgy of Baptism—reflecting Matthew 28:19—reason to believe not only in the deity of the Son but also of the Spirit: “When baptism is given, whom the Father baptizes, him the Son baptizes; and whom the Son baptizes, he is consecrated with the Holy Spirit. If the Spirit did not belong properly to the Godhead, ‘how can he deify me by baptism’” (Pelikan, *Emergence*, 216).
 - In his *Letters to Serapion*, Athanasius lists various texts which reveal the Spirit’s function. The purpose of his list “serves to shape a vision of the Father, Son and Spirit working together in an ordered and harmonious manner. ... It is only a small step from here to a clear statement of the doctrine of inseparable operation (DIO) as part of his explanation of why the Spirit’s sanctifying action reveals it to be God...” (Ayres, *Nicaea*, 213).
- g. Basil of Ancyra circulated a document after the council of 358 vaguely stating that the Spirit “is given to the faithful from the Father through the Son” and “has His being from the Father through the Son” (Kelly, *Doctrine*, 259).
- h. At the Council of Alexandria (362) “Athanasius secured acceptance of the proposition that the Spirit is not a creature but belongs to, and is inseparable from, the substance of the Father and the Son.” It is possible that Athanasius had the Pneumatomachians (‘Spirit-fighters’) who argued that the Spirit was neither creator nor creature but something in between. (Kelly, *Doctrine*, 259).
- i. Hilary of Poitiers: (Ayres, *Nicaea*, 184f). “In *De Trinitate* Hilary says explicitly that the Spirit is neither generated nor created and that the Spirit exists with the Father. His account of the Spirit’s role is, however, entirely economic. The Spirit is the gift that enables contemplation, understanding, and perseverance in faith” (Ayres, *Nicaea*, 184-5).
- j. The Cappadocians: (See Meredith, *Cappadocians* 29-36 –Basil; Ayres, *Nicaea*, 211ff)
- Basil of Caesarea (330-379). His move to the position of Athanasius was gradual.
 - *Against Eunomius* (written c. 364).
 - Eunomius argued that the Spirit was unlike the Father and the Son because
 - (1) Being mentioned third after the other two proved that his nature was inferior to theirs;
 - (2) his work of sanctifying was an inferior activity;
 - (3) since he was neither creator nor generated there could be no place for him in the Godhead
 - (4) Amos 4:13 (God created the wind/spirit) and John 1:3 (All things were made by him) implied the creaturely character of the Holy Spirit.
 - Basil argues that the Holy Spirit ‘finishes things off, brings them to perfection’, and therefore participates in the same work of the Father.
 - Yet, preaching in 372, he “studiously abstained from speaking openly of the Spirit’s deity” (Kelly, *Doctrine*, 260).
 - *On the Holy Spirit* (375) Basil argues against his former friend and mentor Eustathius, Bishop of Sebaste, a leader of the Pneumatomachians (see Kelly, *Doctrine*, 259-60; Ayres, *Nicaea*, 215).
 - Basil notes that we always unite the Spirit with the two other members of the Trinity in our prayers and hymns, and above all in our doxologies. In doing so, we honor all three equally.
 - Persons “so conjointly honoured must share a common nature” (Meredith, *Cappadocians*, 33). “He must be reckoned ‘with’, not reckoned ‘below’ them” (Kelly *Doctrine*, 261). To many, this ‘with’ “seemed an innovation, for it placed the Spirit on the same level as the Father and the Son” (Pelikan, *Emergence*, 217).
 - Gregory of Nyssa sees the three ‘persons’ “to be all involved in each unitary action which ‘flows’ from the Father, through the Son, and is completed in the Spirit.” Basil, however, sees “the peculiar action of the Spirit, completing and sanctifying, as a constant part or aspect of God’s activity” (Ayres, *Nicaea*, 216).
 - Gregory of Nyssa emphasized the oneness of nature shared by the three persons, quoting Psalm 33:6: *By the word of the Lord were the heavens established, and all the power of them by the Spirit (lit. breath) of his mouth* to prove that the Word and the Spirit are coordinate realities. (Kelly *Doctrine*, 261).

- Gregory of Nazianzus is emphatic: “Is the Spirit God? Yes indeed. Then is he consubstantial? Of course, since he is God.” (Kelly, *Doctrine*, 261; cf. Meredith, *Cappadocians*, 45).
 - “Unlike those who went before him and claimed, as did Origen...that the Spirit was to be found in the OT in Genesis 1:2 and Psalm 33:6, Gregory holds that the OT contains no doctrine of the Holy Spirit” (Meredith, *Cappadocians*, 45f).
 - “To explain the lateness of his recognition as God, Gregory produces a highly original theory of doctrinal development. Just as the acknowledgment of the Father’s Godhead had to precede the recognition of the Son’s, so the latter had to be established before the divinity of the spirit could be admitted. The Old Testament revealed the Father, the New the Son; the latter only hinted at the Spirit, but he dwells in us and discloses his nature more clearly (Kelly, *Doctrine*, 261; cf. Meredith, *Cappadocians*, 45).
 - Gregory, more than any other theologian before him wrote of ‘deification’ (*theosis*). ‘We are in intimate connexion as human persons with the living God. To be with him is to dwell in him and to share his perfection’ (Florovsky, quoted in Meredith, *Cappadocians*, 48).
 - The agent of deification is God, and so the Spirit must be divine because it is the Spirit who draws us into communion with God; it is the Spirit who deifies us (Meredith, 48)
- k. A challenge: If the Spirit were homoousios with the Father, Arians would say that such a belief implies that the Father has two Sons. The answer was to differentiate between the mode of origin of the Son and that of the Spirit.
 - The task is somewhat complicated by the lack of clear scriptural verbs enabling us to speak distinctly of the Spirit’s origin—parallel to what ‘generation’ allows for the Son. The distinction between generation and procession used on the basis of John 15:26 delivers a distinction but little else. (Ayres, *Nicaea*, 217)
 - Basil wrote that “the Spirit issues from God, not by way of generation, but ‘as the breath of His mouth”” (Kelly, *Doctrine*, 262).
 - Gregory of Nazianzus was satisfied with John 15:26, that the Spirit ‘proceeds’ from the Father. “What ‘procession’ means he can no more explain than can his adversaries what the Father’s *ungenerateness* or the Son’s generation means, but it distinguishes the Spirit from both” (Kelly, *Doctrine*, 262).
 - Gregory of Nyssa provided “what was to prove the definitive statement. The 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. From this it is a short step to the idea of the twofold procession of the Spirit. The three Persons are to be distinguished by their origin, the Father being cause and the other two caused.”
 - “The two persons who are caused may be further distinguished, for one of Them is directly produced by the Father, while the other proceeds from the Father through an intermediary.”
 - “It is clearly Gregory’s doctrine that the Son acts as an agent, no doubt in subordination to the Father who is fountainhead of the Trinity, in the production of the Spirit.”
 - “After him, the regular teaching of the Eastern Church is that the procession of the Holy Spirit is ‘out of the Father through the Son”” (Kelly, *Doctrine*, 263).
- l. Among the Homoiousians were some who were known as *Pneumatomachians* (or *Macedonians*) who were willing to affirm the consubstantiality of the Son with the Father, but not that of the Holy Spirit. They thought that the Spirit occupied some middle position, being neither God nor a creature. The failure of Constantinople to include the homoousios of the Spirit in its creed might have been due to a negotiating tactic with the Macedonians (Cf. Council of Constantinople, below, Kelly, *Creeds*, 305-331).
- m. Apollinarius,
- n. Valentinus and
- k. The relation between Nicene Creed and the Constantinopolitan Creed: (Kelly, *Creeds*, 305-331, *327; Ayres, *Nicaea*, xxxxxx)
- l. The Nicene (325)/***Constantinopolitan** (381) Creed:

We believe in one God, the Father almighty,
maker ***of heaven and earth and** of all things visible and invisible.

And in one Lord Jesus Christ, the ***only** (μονογενῆ) Son of God,
begotten (γεννηθεντα) from the Father, (*Omit: only begotten (μονογενῆ), that is from the
substance [ousia] of the Father, see Zizioulas, *Lect.*, 61;
Communion..., 108 ft.18; 120; Ayres, *Rethinking*, 12)

***before all ages**

God from God,
light from light, (Cf. Ayres, *Nicaea*, 23)
true God from true God,

begotten, not made; (γεννηθεντα ού ποιηθεντα)

of the same substance (ομοουσιος) as the Father. (cf. *homoousios* vs. *anomoios*; vs. *homoiousios*)

Through him all things were made, (*Omit: things in heaven and things on earth)

For us and for our salvation

he came down from heaven;

he became incarnate ***by the Holy Spirit and the virgin Mary**, and was made human.

***He was crucified for us under Pontius Pilate**

He suffered ***and was buried**.

The third day he rose again, ***according to the Scriptures**

He ascended to heaven ***and is seated at the right hand of the Father**.

He will come ***again with glory** to judge the living and the dead.

***His kingdom will never end**. See Pelikan, *Emergence*, 208))

And ***we believe** in the Holy Spirit,

***the Lord, the giver of life.**

He proceeds from the Father,

and with the Father and the Son is worshiped and glorified.

He spoke through the prophets.

We believe in one holy catholic and apostolic church.

We affirm one baptism for the forgiveness of sins.

We look forward to the resurrection of the dead,

and to life in the world to come. Amen.

(Omit: *But for those who say, there was when He was not, and, Before being born He was not, and that He came into existence out of nothing, or who assert that the Son of God is of a different *hypostasis* or *ousia*, or is subject to alteration or change—these the Catholic and apostolic Church anathematizes.)

a. Notes on the additions and subtractions to the Nicene Creed:

i. Add, **of heaven and earth:**

ii. Add **only:** (μονογενῆ)

iii. Add **before all ages:**

iv. Omit **only begotten, that is from the substance of the Father:**

- The Nicene Creed spoke of the generation of the Son “from the substance of the Father.” Under the influence of the Cappadocians, the Council of Constantinople struck the word ‘substance’ and had the creed simply read ‘*from the Father,*’ thus emphasizing the fact that the Trinity emerges “from a personal rather than an *ousian* source” (Zizioulas, *Communion*, 120; cf *Lect.* 61).

v. Omit, **things in heaven:**

vi. Add **by the Holy Spirit and the virgin Mary** (Kelly, *Creeds*, 299)

vii. Add **He was crucified for us under Pontius Pilate**

viii. Add **and was buried**

ix. Add **according to the Scriptures**

x. Add **and is seated at the right hand of the Father**

xi. Add **again with glory**

- xii. Add **His kingdom will never end** (anti-Marcellus phrase)
- xiii. Add **we believe**
- xiv. Omit the **anathemas**
- xv. Add **the Lord and giver of life...and to life in the world to come. Amen.**
- xvi. **NOTE** lack of *homoousios* language in reference to the Holy Spirit

We believe in one God, the Father almighty: Does 'almighty' go with God, or Father? See Kelly, Creeds 132-139; Ziz, Communion, 113