

Arian and Related Doctrines DDT 62-75

Origin: Alexandria

For fifty years a source of turmoil in the Eastern Church
Spread to the barbarians in the north and by them transported
into Italy Africa Spain. Hence Augustine 5th century De trinitate
In the eastern period distinguish

Under Constantine I (ob 337) stubborn defenders of Nicea found
themselves for one reason or another expelled from their sees

Under Constantius (ob. 361) about fifteen reunions of bishops
and reformulation of creeds with added anathemas

Under Julian the Apostate, who wished to restore paganism,
thought it a good idea to let all bishops return to their sees
and fight it out with one another. In a fairly short time
the Nicene creed was generally accepted.

Different Arian Views

Arius taught that the Son was a creature

Eusebius of Caesarea and his followers (Semi-Arians) did not so
much follow Arius as object to Nicea (1) because it employed
non-scriptural terms, (2) because they took the doctrine of
Marcellus on Ancyra for the real meaning of Nicea, (3) because
they were content to repeat the formulas of Origin, e. g.
that the Son without difference was most similar to the Father
Anomeans Aetius and Eunomius who proposed demonstrations
that the Son was a creature

Homoiousians (Basil of Ancyra and George of Laodicea and followers)
rejected homoousion and tautoousion but held that the Son
was similar to the father in all things including his ~~ousia~~ ousia

Homoians Acacius and his followers: enough to say that the
Son is ~~similixxtaxttxxKax~~ the Image of the Father scdm scripturas
excluded ousia omoousion omoiousion

Lucian of Antioch (ob 312 martyr) founder of Antiochene exegetical
school, teacher of Arius and other early Arians, said to have
been subordinationist and for some time to have been out of the church
Altaner 242

Arius priest at Alexandria, head of / Alexandria's exegetical school,
a disciple of Lucian, attacked the doctrine of his bishop,
Alexander of Alexandria, was excommunicated by a synod at
Alexandria in 318, . He continued to propagate his views and to
to seek the support of other bishops, and this resulted
in his condemnation in a synod at Antioch in 325 and again that
same year at Nicea. He died in 336. Altaner 310 f.

His literary remains are few: a letter of Eusebius of Nicomedia about 318; a profession of faith in the form of a letter of sent to Alexander of Alex about 320; a profession of faith made to Constantine the Emperor towards the end of 327; fragments of popular writings named Thalia; a few other recently discovered items on which see Altaner 310 f.

Profession of Faith, 320, DDT 64

Whence one infers and Arius and his friends wished to get away from all metaphors and all anthropomorphisms, to acknowledge the Father as ungenerated, without a beginning, eternal, to contend that the son since he had a beginning was not ungenerated nor eternal but some supreme creature brought into being by the Father's will, neither made of matter nor a part of God and in that sense ex non extantibus (ex ouk onton) / AW III 7 f

Alexander of Alexandria to all catholic bishops, ca 319 MG 18 573 AB

God was not always father; there was a ~~time~~ then when God was not a Father; there was not ~~w~~ always a Word of God; for God who is made one who did not exist out of the non-existent, and so there was a then when the Word was not. The Son is something created and something made; he is not similar in substance to the Father; he is not the Father's true and natural word; nor is he his true wisdom; he is just one of the things created and made.

By an abuse is he named the word and wisdom of the Father, since he was made by God's own word and by the wisdom that is in God, by which God made all other things and also the son. Wherefore he can be changed and swayed as all rational beings. The Word is outside and other and removed from the substance of God. For the Father is unutterable to the Son, who does not know the Father perfectly or accurately, nor does he perfectly see him. Indeed the Son does not even know his own substance as it is. For he was made for our sake that God might use him as an instrument in creating us; nor would he have existed had God not wished to create us....

Arianism

3
18 ✓

Eusebius bp Nicomedia, skilled at the imperial court, a friend of Arius, a fellow disciple of Lucian, ob 341=42, Altaner 311 Letter to Paulinus bp of Tyre ca 320-21

We have never heard my lord of two infinites (ingenita) or of one divided into two, nor do we teach or believe that God has undergone any bodily change. There is but one ungenerable, and another from him truly generated, but not from his substance, quite apart from the ungenerable nature, and not emerging from his substance...

Eusebius bp Caesarea ob 339

A man of great culture and learning, author of Ecclesiastical history and of the Praeparatio evangelica, also of Contra Marcellum and De ecclesiastic theologia, heir of Origenist thought, very conservative, a laudatory friend of the emperor, rejected both Arius' doctrine ex ouk onton, ex non extantibus and the doctrine of Nicea on consubstantiality as Sabellian At the beginning of the Arian controversy he held only a minor and indeed suspect position, but later he and his successor Acacius became the leaders of eastern conservative bishops Altaner 263-271

Before the council of Nicea in his Praep Evang IV 3 he wrote The Son is generated. At no time did he not exist and later come into being, sed before all time he was and came forth and was with the Father. He is not ~~unbegotten~~ unbegotten but begotten and only begotten from the unbegotten Father. He was produced not by division or section or separation from the Father's substance, but surpassing all speech or thought he was born before all time from the Father's ineffable and incomprehensible will

About 318 in a letter to Euphration he explained:

The Father is distinct from the son and greater than the Son Jn14 28 The Father is the one true God (Jn 17 3) the Son is God Jn 1 1) and the image of the one true God (Jn Col 1 15). There is one God, and there is one mediator of God and man, the man Jesus Christ (1 Tim 2 5). Whence Father and Son did not exist simultaneously but the Father existed before the Son. Had they existed simultaneously, how could it be that the Father is Father and the Son is Son, that the Father is first and the Son is second, that the Father is unbegotten and the Son is ~~begotten~~ only begotten; either both would be unbegotten or both begotten

In the synod at Antioch, 325, he was suspected and warned. He took part in the council at Nicea, and signed the decree, which in a long letter he explained to the faithful of his diocese. Ex substantia Patris means ex Patre but not part of Father's substance natum non factum: factum refers to the origin of creatures from the Father through the Son; the origin of the Son is quite different; the mode of his generation is ineffable consubstantial does not mean that the Son is from the Father in a bodily fashion, or by a division of his substance, nor by section, ~~not~~ or by any passion or change or alteration of paternal substance or power; but the Son in every way is similar to the Father and to him alone; and he does not arise from any other hypostasis or substance

De ecclesiastica theologia reveals his originist leanings DDT 68 Asterius sophist and orator, a disciple of Lucian, wrote homilies, commentaries ~~on~~ on the psalm, and the Syntagma.

Attacked by Marcellus of Ancyra, he was defended by Eusebius and his successor Acacius. Ob post 341. Altaner 311 f.

Acacius, ep. Caesarea, ob. 366. He consecrated St Cyril bp of Jerusalem. Augmented the library at Caesarea. Was the leader of the Homoeans in the synod at Seleucia in Isauria, 359.

Epiphanius reports him as claiming that the spiritual image of being itself (autoousia) also is being itself and the spiritual image of will itself also is will itself.

Marcellus of Ancyra, ob ca 374, took part in Nicea, was a friend of Athanasius, about 336 he was deposed by the Arians on the charge of Sabellianism, but was received in Rome by Pope Julius to whom he made a profession of faith in 341. He and his disciple Photinus were condemned in Constantinople I (DS 151). Fragments of Marcellus were collected and published by Klosterman in the appendix to the works of Eusebius Contra Marcellum et De eccl. theol. Fragments reveal Marcellus systematic both in exegesis and in speculation. NT statements about Xt are divided into those referring to the Only begotten (the divine word) and those referring to the First begotten (the word incarnate); all texts that the Arians interpreted in subordinationist fashion, Marcellus referred to the First begotten, eg Filius Dei, Imago Dei invisibilis; in contrast the divine word is just word; any mention of an eternal Son is understood in terms of the predestination of the Incarnate Word. Nor are Sabellian elements

lacking. The Word is in God from eternity, but when the world is to be created he goes forth from God as a productive principle. In this fashion the indivisible monad is extended, and at the final consummation he will return into God and resume the status possessed from eternity.

Photinus, from Ancyra in Galatia, bp of Sirmium, disciple of Marcellus, is described by Epiphanius (Haer. 71, 1.2) as going beyond Paul of Samosata. He denied that the Son was eternal. He did not even exist until he was conceived of the Holy Shost by the Vitgin Mary; and so he concluded that the Spirit is greater than the Son. He admitted an eternal Logos in the Father, but he conceived on the analogy of reason in man. He denied that the eternal lgoos was a son.

Councils and Creeds

- 341 Antioch. Four formulae. Hahn #153-56; Athan, De syn #22-25
- 343 Serdica: no formula proposed; stick to Nicea
Philippopolis, seceding Orientals, Hahn #158, Hilary #34
- 345 Formula prolixior, presents emperor with a creed
Hahn #159; Athan #26;
- 351 Sirmium first synod DS 139 f; Hahn #160; Athan #27
- 357 Sirmium second synod; formula called blasphemy of Sirmium
by Hilary of Poitiers; Hahn #161; Hixlary # 11 /MG 67 1152
- 358 Sirmium third synod; renovantur antiqua symbola; Sozomenos IV 15
- 359 Sirmium fourth formula, imperial preparation of a council to be
signed by both West and East May 22
- July 12 Rimini 400 Western bpp assambled; 80 among them Arians
accepted the prop;osed formula; the rest reject it and
reaffirm Nicea; they excommunicate four of the imperial court
bpp V lens Ursacius Germinius Gaius; send a deputation of ten
bpp to the emperor
- Oct 10 Nicea in Thrace: deputation forced to retract excommunication
and to sign an ambiguous formula; Hahn #164; Theodoret II 16
MG 82 1049
Rimini: On the return of the deputation, the bpp confused
and deceived submit to the emperor. Jerome exclaimed:
Ingemuit totus orābis et arianum se xesse miratus est
- Sept 27-30 Seleucia in Isauria, eastern bpp meet, Homoeousiani
renew the second formula of 341; the followers of Acacius
want their own formula (imgago scdm scripturas) Hahn #165
Athen # 29

Constantinople both factions send deputies to the emperor. They are told to sign an ambiguous formula or else go into exile. Hahn # 17; Athan # 30

Content of these Synodal Decrees

Reveals the perplexity of a Church that had been adoring Christ the Lord for some centuries and undergoing torture and death rather than proclaiming the Roman emperor as Kurios, when confronted with the challenge of completing traditional symbolic thought with post-systematic thinking:

- ** either X^t really and truly was God or else he was not. That X^t was (1) Son, (2) Only begotten, (3) ~~Be~~ God (4) through whom all things, was affirmed in the four formulas at Antioch, at Philipopolis, in the longer formula, in the first and fourth at Sirmium, at Nice in Thrace, Seleucia in Isauria, and at Constantinople. The second formula at Sirmium taught that X^t was Son, born, generated, that there was one God of all, that the son was manifestly less than the Father, that none the less he was God from God, our Lord and God.

There was considerable resistance to technical terms:

Second Sirmium excluded ousia homoousion homoeousion substantia

Fourth Sirmium excluded ousia, asserted Filium similem quoad omnia

Acaciani at Seleucia in Isauria excluded homoousion homoeousion, anathematized anomoion; docent Filium P similem scdm apostolum

Nicea in Thrace excluded ousia, affirm Filius P similis scdm script

Constantinople excluded ousia substantia, taught S similar to F scdm?

Earlier synods just omitted homoousion

Many condemned Arius Marcellus Photinus, excluded ditheism and thriteism, asserted that no one but the Father (and Son) knew the generation of the Son, affirmed the distinction of the Son from the Father.

- ** If X^t was God, either he was distinct from the Father or identical with him

Point of Eunomius, answered by Gregory of Nazianzus in his five theological orations (Does Son mean, name, a substance or a quality? It names a relation, a skhesis). Altaner 345-51.

Fuller answer in Gregory of Nyssa (Altaner 353, 357): various works against Eunomius, especially brief treatise Ad Ablabium accounting for the difference between the relations of Son and of the Spirit to the Father.