

Emperor Constantine and the theology of Christianity from his autocracy to the Second Ecumenical Council

El emperador Constantino y la teología de la Cristiandad desde su autocracia hasta el Segundo Concilio Ecuménico

Eirini ARTEMI

National and Capodistrian University of Athens

eartemi@theol.uoa.gr

Recibido: 15/08/2014

Aceptado: 25/10/2014

Abstract: Since his autocracy to his death, Constantine the Great helped the Christianity to be the main religion to all over the empire. This period of time many heresies appeared. They put the unity of Christianity and its teaching in a great danger. Educated people as Arius, Apollinarius, Marcellus, Eunomius and Macedonius tried to explain the nature of God, His actions and His names according to human relationships, their thoughts and their beliefs. The result was a catastrophe, because new heresies were introduced to the Empire. Orthodox Fathers, as Athanasius the Great and Cappadocian Fathers tried to disprove the heresies with success. Upon to these fathers teaching, the First and the Second Ecumenical Councils managed to base their doctrines and to preserve the true teaching and doctrines of Christianity.

Keywords: Christianity, heresy, arianism, St. Athanasius, Constantine the Great, Ecumenical Council.

Resumen: Desde su autocracia a su muerte, Constantino el Grande ayudó al cristianismo a ser la principal religión de todo el imperio. Durante este período de tiempo aparecieron muchas herejías. Ellas pusieron en gran peligro la unidad del cristianismo y su enseñanza. Las personas educadas como Arrio, Apolinar, Marcelo, Eunomio y Macedonio trataron de explicar la naturaleza de Dios, sus acciones y sus nombres de acuerdo a las relaciones humanas, a sus pensamientos y a sus creencias. El resultado fue una catástrofe, porque nuevas herejías se introdujeron en el Imperio. Padres ortodoxos, como Atanasio el Grande y los Padres capadocios trataron de refutar con éxito las herejías. Con la enseñanza de estos Padres, el Primero y el Segundo Concilios Ecuménicos lograron basar sus doctrinas y preservar la verdadera enseñanza y las doctrinas del cristianismo.

Palabras clave: Cristianismo, herejía, arrianismo, San Atanasio, Constantino el Grande, Concilio Ecuménico.

1. Sumario: Introduction: Constantine the Great and his turning to Christianity. 2. Arianism's teaching and the Nicene Council. 3. Athanasius' theology. 4. Constantine's death and his successors. 5. The new heresies which led to the Second Ecumenical Council. 6. Conclusions. Sources and Bibliography.

* * *

2. Introduction: Constantine the Great and his turning to Christianity

C. Flavius Valerius Constantinus was born at Naissus, Nis in Serbia. He was the son of Constantius Chlorus, who later became Roman Emperor, and St.

Helena, a woman of humble extraction but remarkable character and unusual ability¹. Helena was a daughter of an inn keeper. The date of his birth is not certain, being given between 274 and 288. Constantine I or Saint Constantine, was the Roman Emperor since 306 to 337. Well known for being the first Roman emperor to convert to Christianity, Constantine issued the Edict of Milan in 313, which proclaimed religious tolerance of all religions throughout the empire². Today, some historians support that there was no official Edict but only Licinius' and Constantinus' decisions about the religion³.

The Edict did not only protect Christians from religious persecution, but all religions, allowing anyone to worship whichever deity they chose. A similar edict had been issued in 311 by Galerius, then senior emperor of the Tetrarchy; Galerius' edict granted Christians the right to practice their religion without causing any troubles « Ut denuo sint Christiani et conventicula sua component, ita ut ne quid contra disciplinam agant», but did not restore any property to them⁴. On the contrary, the Edict of Milan consisted of many clauses which stated that all confiscated churches would be returned as well as other provisions for previously persecuted Christians⁵. Neither Constantine nor Licinius proclaimed Christianity as official religion⁶.

In 324, after the defeat of Licinius and his death, Constantine's autocracy began. The insight and acumen of his character led him to take two important decisions, which changed the history of the Roman Empire until then. His first decision was the adoption of Christianity as the official religion of the Byzantine state and the second was the transfer of the capital of the Empire from Rome to a new city. It was built on the site of ancient Byzantium and its name was Constantinople. This city was the new capital of the Empire, New Rome⁷.

Since 320 Constantine was constantly supporting Christianity by financial aid and benefits or tax relief to Christian Church. After the recognition of Christianity as *religio licita*, Constantine the Great conferred the civil *audentia episcopalis* on the bishop. Thereby the bishop judged not only in virtue of his

¹ cf C. Herbermann & G.Grupp "Constantine the Great" [...]

² cf A. Christophilopoulou, [...]132.

³ Ibid.

⁴ Lactantius, *De mortibus persecutorum*, XXXIV, 4.

⁵ Eusebius of Caesarea, *Church History*, I, 5.2-14. Lactantius, *De mortibus persecutorum* XLVIII.

⁶ cf P. P. Ioannou, [...].

⁷ Hermias Sozomenos Philostorgius, *Ecclesiastical History*, II, 3, p. 51: «... God appeared to him (Constantine) by night, and commanded him to seek another spot. Led by hand of God, he arrived at Byzantium in Thrace, beyond Chalcedon in Bithynia, and here he was desired to build his city and to render it worthy of the name of Constantine. In obedience to the words of God, he therefore enlarged the city formerly called Byzantium... He named it New Rome and Constantinople, and constituted it the imperial capital for all...»

spiritual authority but also on the strength of imperial authority⁸. Although, Constantine was defending and supporting the Christian religion, he was baptized Christian before he died. Typically he remained as *Pontifex Maximus* for political reasons and for maintaining peace and harmony in relations between pagans and Christians⁹. Many historians¹⁰ believe that Constantine helped Christianity by political expediency. They argue that the triumph of the victory of Christianity had been already taken place in the East long before the autocracy of Constantine. The conversion of Constantine to Christianity began –according to Eusebius’ history¹¹— with the vision of Constantine, before the battle against Maxentius, and Constantine’s prayer to God of Christians. Eusebius attributed the description to the vision not only to focus on which was the reason for the conversion of Constantine to Christianity, but in order to saw that the new emperor had the blessing of the Triune God of Christians. On this perspective, the political theology was founded on.¹²

Constantine brought about many changes in the empire: i) Crucifixion was abolished, ii) infanticide –the killing of unwanted infants— was abolished, iii) the practice of slavery was discouraged and many slaves were set free, iv) the gladiatorial games were suppressed, although they were not yet completely eliminated, v) Christian men were chosen as emperor’s advisers, vi) the Church was made tax-exempt, vii) the first day of the week, Sunday, was set aside as a sacred day of worship. Sunday was made an official Roman holiday so that more people could attend church¹³.

It is supported that Constantine embraced Christian Church not only for theological reasons but also for political. As a politician he understood the increasing importance of the Christian minority into private and public life. The fact that Christianity became his religion and his children’s shows that

⁸ «If proceedings were to be taken before the bishop, the agreement of both sides was requisite (see Codex Justinianus 1.4.7 from the year 398 and Codex Theodosianus 1.27.2 from the year 408). By *Novellae* 79 and 83, Emperor Justinian placed the clergy and monks under episcopal jurisdiction in civil affairs. According to *Novella* 86.2, the bishop, upon rejection of the state judge, was to decide the case in conjunction with the rejected judge. This administrative activity of the bishop in civil law as a justice of the peace can be distinguished only with difficulty from his purely ecclesiastical disciplinary function», <http://ccdlib.libraries.claremont.edu/cdm/singleitem/collection/cce/id/278/rec/20> (2012)

⁹ cf J. Karagiannopoulos, [...]75.

¹⁰ The Burckhardt presents Constantine as a clever and too ambitious emperor, who sacrificed everything to satisfy his thirst for power. (J. Burckhardt, [...] .326. The German theologian Adolph Harnack supports the same, in his book "The diadosis of Christianity during the first three centuries." (English transl. of J. Moffatt, 1904).

¹¹ cf V. Vasiliev, [...] footnote. 4, 71. - Eusebius of Caesarea, *Ecclesiastical History*, IX, 9.2. A select library of Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church, edition P. Schaff, H. Wace, 2nd ser., I, 363.

¹² VI. Fidas, [...] 327.

¹³ Eusebius of Caesarea, *Constantine’s Life*, III, 18,13,25, 28 etc Eusebius of Caesarea, *Ecclesiastical History*, X, 5-7.

Constantine wasn't guided by political motives only. He was guided by religious fervor too.

2. Arianism's teaching and the Nicene Council

In 320, an enemy for Christian religion appeared. It was the heresy of Arianism. Arianism developed around 320 in Alexandria of Egypt, concerning the person of Christ, and is named after Arius of Alexander. It was the greatest of heresies within the early church that developed a significant following. Constantine should have found the solution to this ecclesiastical problem, which as a great problem for the Empire's unity. The reign of Constantine established a precedent for the position of the emperor as having some influence within the religious discussions going on within the Catholic Church of that time and the dispute over Arianism. Constantine himself disliked the risks to societal stability that religious disputes and controversies brought with them, preferring where possible to establish an orthodoxy. The emperor saw it as his duty to ensure that God was properly worshiped in his empire, and that what proper worship consisted would be determined by the Church.

Arius, a priest from Libya, was proved one of the most dangerous enemies of Christianity. Arius rejected the Origenistic theory of one and the same divine essence broadening down, as it were, so as to subsist at different, hierarchically graded levels. Consequently he refused to accept the idea that Logos occupies an intermediate position, in the sense that Logos is a second divine principle perfectly reflecting the transcendent Father and transmitting to the world of creatures the image by which alone the Father can be known and described¹⁴. On Arius' point of view, it was impossible that there is no other God than Father. The Father alone is God. The Logos or Son, Arius maintained, was a created being, formed out of nothing by the Father before the universe was made. He therefore said that there was a time when the Son had not existed. According to Arius, the Son was the first and greatest of all that God had created; He was closer to God than all others, and the rest of creation related to God through the Son (for instance, God had created everything else through Christ). By developing this arch-heresy, Arius thought he was defending the fundamental truth that there is only one God, monotheism. A belief in the full deity of Christ, he supposed, would mean the Father and Son were two separate Gods, which contradicted the many statements of the Bible about God's oneness. Arius was also unhappy with Origen's idea that there could be 'degrees' or 'grades' of divinity, with the Son being slightly less divine than the Father: this became known after the Nicene Council as semi-Arianism. Arius argued that since the Father is clearly God, it follows that the Son could not be God; so He must be a created being.

Arius was influenced by Jewish monotheism and the philosophical concept of transcendence and by the absolute property of God, the cosmological dyalistic perceptions and especially by the teaching of Philo about the

¹⁴ cf H. Cunliffe- Jones & B. Drewery (ed.), [...] 94

«created» Logos, through whom God created the world¹⁵. Generally, using Greek terms, Arianism denied that the Son is of one essence, nature, or substance with God; He is not consubstantial —*homoousios*— with the Father, and therefore not like Him, or equal in dignity, or co-eternal, or within the real sphere of Deity. The Logos which St. John exalts is an attribute, Reason, belonging to the Divine nature, not a person distinct from another, and therefore is a Son merely in figure of speech. These consequences follow upon the principle which Arius maintains in his letter to Eusebius of Nicomedia, that the Son «is no part of the Ingenerate». Hence the Arian sectaries who reasoned logically were styled Anomoeans: they said that the Son was «unlike» the Father. And they defined God as simply the Unoriginate. They are also termed the Exucontians (*ex ouk onton*), because they held the creation of the Son to be out of nothing¹⁶.

For political reasons, however, unity and harmony were necessary; and in 325 the Emperor convened the first Ecumenical Council at Nicaea to settle the Arian controversy. Constantine couldn't understand the doctrinal differences, so he tried to appease the theological opponents. Constantine could not penetrate into the deeper meaning of the «birth of the Son». For this reason, he urged Arius and Alexander to coexist peacefully despite their different teachings about the Triune God. The great theological danger was exposed to the risk Emperor by Hosius, bishop of Cordoba. Hosius appealed Constantine to convene a Council, in order to resolve this theological conflict. Constantine believed that the condemnation of Arianism would bring the desired peace within the empire, so he wrote to the bishops

the devil will no longer have any power against us, since all that which he had malignantly devised for our destruction has been entirely overthrown from the foundations. The splendor of truth has dissipated at the command of God those dissensions, schisms, tumults and so to speak, deadly poisons of discord. Wherefore we all worship one true God, and believe that he is. But in order that this might be done, by divine admonition I assembled at the city of Nicaea most of the bishops; with whom I myself also, who am but one of you, and who rejoice exceedingly in being your fellow-servant, undertook the investigation of the truth¹⁷.

The evolution of things, however, denied the hopes of Constantine and the condemnation of Arianism was unable to give a definitive end to the theological disputes that had erupted within the Christian Church and by extension within the Empire. In the First Ecumenical Council, Arianism was condemned. The Council formulated a creed which, although it was revised at the Council of Constantinople in 381-382, has become known as the Nicene

¹⁵ St. Papadopoulos, [...], 114.

¹⁶ W. Barry. «Arianism.» [...]

¹⁷ Socrates, *Ecclesiastic History*, I, 9.

Creed. The Creed rejected Arius' doctrine that the Son is not true God but a creature, that He was not begotten of the substance of the Father but was made from nothing, that He was not eternal but rather that "there was a time when He did not exist." What was affirmed, it was a belief in one God, the Father almighty, creator of all things; and in one Lord Jesus Christ, through whom all things were made and who is the Son of God, the only-begotten of the Father, born of the substance of the Father, true God from true God, begotten not created, consubstantial with the Father and in the Holy Spirit. The Holy Spirit is merely mentioned together with the Son and the Father, to indicate belief in the Triad of Father and Son and Holy Spirit, but He is given no further attention. All the conciliar stress was on the Son, His status, and His relation to the Father. Somewhat surprisingly the Council still used the words *ousia* and *hypostasis* as synonyms. Several points stand out. The Council Fathers did not use the term *Logos* for Christ, but the more evangelical word Son. So the Creed affirmed the *homoousion* and the doctrine of consubstantiality. A major role at the council was played by Athanasius, Bishop Alexander's deacon, secretary, and, ultimately, successor. Arius was condemned, but Arianism would cause trouble to the empire for many years after the Council. A few years later, Constantine changed his attitude to Arius and his teaching, which was the cause for his conflict with Athanasius.

3. Athanasius' theology

It is referred that Athanasius had a very important role into Nicene Council. His theology was the base for the Creed of the Council. Athanasius was teaching that there isn't any analogy between God and the beings. In *Contra Gentiles*, Athanasius was discussing the means by which God can be known. These are mainly two, the soul and nature. God may be known through the human soul, for "although God Himself is above all, the road which leads to Him is not far, nor even outside ourselves, but is within us, and it is possible to find it by ourselves¹⁸." It is also possible to know God not only through person's soul but through the creation. The order of the universe shows not only that there is a God but also that he is one. For Athanasius, the Word of God who rules the world is the living Logos of God, that is, the Word who is God himself¹⁹.

Also Athanasius underlined that Logos of God became man in order to give us the chance to become God²⁰. Athanasius's theology was soteriological. The core of Athanasius's doctrine of redemption is that only God himself can save mankind. If the salvation that we need is really a new creation, only the Creator can bring it. This requires the Savior Logos to be God, for only God can grant an existence similar to his. Athanasius explained that the death was a great

¹⁸ Athanasius of Alexandria, *Contra Gentiles*, 30,1.

¹⁹ Johnson, J.F Saint Athanasius, *Advanced Information Elwell Evangelical Dictionary*, <http://mb-soft.com/believe/txo/athanas.htm> (2012)

²⁰ Athanasius of Alexandria, *Contra Gentiles*, 40,54.

problem for the salvation of man. He urged the law of death, which followed from the Transgression, prevailed upon us, and from it there was no escape. The thing that was happening was in truth both monstrous and unfitting. It would, of course, have been unthinkable that God should go back upon His word and that man, having transgressed, should not die; but it was equally monstrous that beings which once had shared the nature of the Word should perish and turn back again into non-existence through corruption²¹. In Athanasius' mind Christology is relevant to Redemption

.Athanasius underlined that Son of God is eternal. He is not a being, because He is God and for this reason he has the same nature with God Father. In his teaching, the theology is «perfect» and «real» only as glory and word about One and Triune God²². Athanasius supported that his theology wasn't anything new, but he was following the theology of Apostles. In the centre of the teaching of Church is the holly Trinity. The three persons of God are not the different three appearances of the same God, but every person is whole God. Every person is *homoousios* to each other.

4. Constantine' s death and his successors

Constantine, though he tried to bring peace to the empire, and was sometimes defending the Orthodox and the Arians once, did not succeed. The emperor died dressed in white on May 22, 337. A few months ago, he had received baptism and had been officially a member of the Church of Christ. After the death of Constantine, his sons became emperors. The three sons acquired the title of Augustus and divided among themselves the administration of the Empire. Constantine II took the Gaul, Britain and Spain, Constans took Italy, Africa and Illyricum, and Constantius took the entire East. In 340 Constantine II was killed in a battle against his brother Constans. The latter is killed by Maxentius, a pretender to the throne, in 350. These two Augusts were in favour of the First Ecumenical Synod in Nicaea. After the death of the brothers, Constantius became the master of the Empire.

Constantius was an able and conscientious leader and at the same time he was defender of Arianism. His willingness to impose the teaching of Arius across the Empire was the cause of his confliction with the Patriarch of Alexandria, Athanasius. The patriarch was exiled, and Constantius proclaimed Arianism as religion of the empire in the Synod of Sirmium and Rimini in 359. Temporary Arianism seemed to have won the duel against Orthodoxy, but it was not the end.

After Constantius' deaths Julian the Apostate entered Constantinople as sole emperor and, despite his rejection of Christianity, his first political act was to preside over Constantius' Christian burial, escorting the body to the Church of the Apostles, where it was placed alongside that of Constantine. This act was a demonstration of his lawful right to the throne. Julian's personal religion was

²¹ Athanasius of Alexandria, *On the Incarnation*, 6,2.

²² Athanasius of Alexandria, *Contra Arianos*, 1,18

both pagan and philosophical; he viewed the traditional myths as allegories, in which the ancient gods were aspects of a philosophical divinity. In his time, Christians were persecuted. Julian died in 363 and the act of the reliving of the ancient religion died with him.

Meanwhile, other heretics, Macedonius, Marcellus, Eunomius and Apollinarius appeared. They, somewhat like Arius, were misinterpreting Church's teaching on the Holy Spirit, the humanity and deity of Christ and the triadological dogma. The theology of Christianity was in danger for one more time.

5. The new heresies which led to the Second Ecumenical Council

After the end of the First Ecumenical Council, some other heresies appeared, which misunderstood not only the Trinitarian doctrine, but also the Christological and Pneumatological one. The fathers of these heresies were Macedonius, Marcellus, Eunomius and Apollinarius.

Macedonius I was the bishop of Constantinople during the mid-fourth century. He was an Arian, and with the support of Emperor Constantius II, the Semi-Arian party was able to install him as the bishop of Constantinople. Macedonius had been appointed Bishop of Constantinople after the deposition and subsequent murder of Paul (a Nicene), but was himself in turn deposed by the Synod of Constantinople in 360 A.D.²³. Macedonius had the temerity to teach blasphemously of the Holy Spirit. He distorted the apostolic teaching concerning the Holy Spirit. He denied the Divinity of the Holy Spirit in the Trinity. He supported the concept that the Holy Spirit was a creation of the Son, and a servant of the Father and the Son. Macedonius, found followers of himself among former Arians and Semi-Arians.

Marcellus, bishop of Ancyra, was one of the bishops who opposed Arius. He was teaching that Christ did not preexist his birth, and his kingdom would end. Marcellus stressed absolute monotheism, taking the Nicene *homoousion* as *tautousion*, or “numerically identical in essence”. God, for Marcellus, is a Monad; in technical language, he insisted on one *ousia*, one *hypostasis*, and one *prosôpon* in God. The Monad may be called “God” and “Lord”, but not “Father”. The Word exists eternally, as the dynamic element in the Godhead, but it is identical with the Monad; from all eternity it reposed in God, and was not spoken until creation. Marcellus understood the Trinity in a strictly economic sense. It was in connection with creation and redemption that an expansion “*platysmos*” of the Monad into a Dyad, and then into a Triad, took place. Marcellus underlined the three economies. The first is at the moment of creation, when the Word proceeded from the Father, without becoming a distinct *hypostasis*, and created the world. The second economy was the Incarnation: when the Word became man, it also became Son. Before the

²³ J.F. Bethune – Baker, [...], 212,213. Socrates Scholasticus underlined that "the exploits of Macedonius on behalf of Christianity, consisted of murders, battles, incarcerations, and civil wars" *Socrates Scholasticus, History Ecclesiastic, II, 38*

Incarnation, the Word had no other name but Word; after the Incarnation, it or the Incarnate received all the other titles of Christ such as Way, Life, Resurrection, and many others. The third economy was the expansion of the Godhead into a Triad, which took place on Easter night with the sending of the Holy Spirit²⁴. It is only then that the Spirit is distinguished from the Word. Since the expansion of the Monad into a Triad existed for the economy, or the order of redemption, it was not eternal. At the end, Marcellus believed, the Word and the Spirit would return into the Godhead, and God would again be an absolute Monad²⁵.

Another founder of a new heresy, Apollinarius appeared. He put at risk the unity of the Church. Apollinarius of Laodice taught that Jesus could not have had a human mind; rather, that Jesus Christ had a human body and lower soul —the seat of the emotions— but a divine mind²⁶. Apollinarius' rejection that Christ had a human mind was considered an over-reaction to Arianism and its teaching that Christ was not divine. If Christ took only the human flesh and not the mind, he could save the human beings from sins and death. Apollinarius tried to combine the teaching of the Incarnation and the teaching of Aristotle and Democritus. Apollinarius supported that from two things, one thing could not appear. In order to explain his thought, he insisted that the unity of the two natures gave two persons and not one Christ. According to Apollinarius' view Christ had one nature and one thought, "willing"²⁷.

In the end, the last «creator» of a heresy was Eunomius. He taught the Son is a being drawn forth from nothing by the will of the Father, yet superior to all Creation in as much as He alone was created by the One God to be the Creator of the world. The term *Agennesia* perfectly expressed the Divine Essence as the Unbegotten, God is an absolutely simple being. The Father is *agenetos*, the Son *gennetos*, so there must be diversity of substance. If it is allowed the use of *agennesia* to be a Divine attribute, the simplicity of God excludes all multiplicity of attributes. So the term *agennesia* is the unique feature which is advantageous to the Divine nature, the only one therefore essential to Him. In other words, God is essentially incapable of being begotten. The one God, unbegotten and without beginning, *agenetos* and *anarchos*, could not communicate His own substance, nor beget even a consubstantial Son. The Father and the Son have no essential resemblance, *kat ousian*, but at most a moral resemblance. Son does not share in the incommunicable Divine Essence (*ousia*), but he does partake in the communicable Divine creative power (*energeia*), and it is that partaking which constitutes the Son's Divinity and establishes Him, as regards creation, in the position of Creator —as the

²⁴ Jn 20, 22

²⁵ Cf St. Papadopoulos, [...] 347, 348.

²⁶ Ibid. 348.

²⁷ Apollinarius of Laodicea, *De fide et incarnatione contra adversarios*. Cf H. Lietzmann, *Apollinarius von Laodicea und seine Schule*, 1, Tübingen 1904, 193-203.

principle of paternity in God is not the *ousia* but the *energeia*— the sense in which the term *Son of God* may be used is clear²⁸.

All these erroneous teachings were “defaced” by the teaching of Cappadocian Father. Basilus of Caesarea insisted that the names of God define the God’s energies and not His “*ousia*”, His being²⁹. The divine nature “*ousia*” is unknown and inaccessible to anyone except the God Himself. The name of Father indicates the relationship between He and His Son. The same is for the name of Son, for the adjectives *agennetos* and *gennetos*³⁰. The different divine actions, idioms make the God known to us³¹. Basilus told God has one nature “*ousia*”, but three *hypostases*. There is one God with three persons. Therefore the Spirit is not inferior to the Father and the Son. He is God, too, and He has the same nature with the other two persons of the Diety³². Gregorius of Nazianzus supported the every person of the Triune God has His own way of being. The Father is *agennetos*, the Son is *gennetos* and the Holy Spirit is proceeding only from the Father eternally and in a specific time He is given by the Son (through Son)³³. Gregory, in order to defend Apollinarius’ teaching, supported that the Enfleshed Logos had body, soul and mind. He was God and Human together. In the end Gregory of Nyssa agreed to the other fathers.

The Cappadocian Fathers’ theology was the dogmatical base of the Second Ecumenical Council of Constantinople in 381.

The Council condemned Macedonius’ teaching and defined the doctrine of the Holy Trinity. The Council decreed that there was one God in three persons “*hypostases*”: Father, Son and Holy Spirit. Marcellus’ and Apollinarius’ teaching were condemned too.

6. Conclusions

We dealt with this period from the autocracy of Constantine to the second Ecumenical Council because it is basically the foundation of the early period of the Byzantine Empire. The new Empire was “characterized” by teaching Christianity. Around the new religion developed various doctrinal issues which undermined not only the unity of the Church but the unity of the Empire too.

The Emperors, sometimes, had dynamic and powerful personalities and sometimes were incompetent and subservient to the Commissioners scheming advisers, starring in the solution of theological issues, trying to achieve solutions that will bring peace to Byzantium. Their actions are not always

²⁸ Myers, E. (1909). [...]

²⁹ Basilus of Caesarea, *Against Eunomius*, 1, 12-13 and 2, 31.

³⁰ Ibid. 1, 14-15.

³¹ Ibid. 1, 14 and 2, 28.

³² Basilus of Caesarea, *Epistle* 125, 1.

³³ Gregory of Nazianzus, *Homily*, 31, 9.

effective, sometimes rising up many reactions. The emperor who made Christianity, the base of the Empire, was Constantine the Great.

Sources and Bibliography

1. Primary sources

- APOLLINARIUS OF LAODICEA, *De fide et incarnatione contra adversarios*, H. LIETZMANN, *Apollinaris von Laodicea und seine Schule*, 1, Tübingen 1904, 193-203
- ATHANASIUS OF ALEXANDRIA, *Contra Gentiles*
- ATHANASIUS OF ALEXANDRIA, *On the Incarnation*
- BASILIIUS OF CAESAREA, *Against Eunomius*.
- BASILIIUS OF CAESAREA, *Epistle 125*
- EUSEBIUS OF CAESAREA, *Ecclesiastic History*
- EUSEBIUS OF CAESAREA, *Constantine's Life*
- HERMIAS SOZOMENOS PHILOSTORGIUS, *Ecclesiastical History, Comprising A History Of The Church, A.D. 324 To A.D. 440* (1855), Kessinger publishing, 2004
- LACTANTIUS, *De mortibus persecutorum*,

2. Bibliography

- ARTEMI, E., «One physis of the God Word sesarkomeni α). Apollinarius' teaching, β)Cyril's of Alexandria teaching, *Ecclesiastic Faros* ΟΔ (2003), 293 – 304
- ARTEMI, E., «The religious policy of the Byzantine Emperors from the First to the Fourth Ecumenical Council», *Ecclesiastic Faros* ΟΣΤ (2005), 121- 163.
- ARTEMI, E., «The Enfleshed Birth of the Word», *Antiairetiko Egolpio* (2009) http://egolpion.com/gennhsh_yiou.el.aspx.
- ARTEMI, E., «Arius' heresy and the First Ecumenical Council» *Antiairetiko Egolpio* (2009) http://egolpion.com/airesh_areiou.el.aspx.
- ARTEMI, E., Ересь Ария и I Вселенский собор, *Ирина Артеми*, <http://apologet.spb.ru/chranenie-dogmata-v-tserkvi/eres-ariya-i-i-vselenskiy-sobor.html>. (2011)
- ARTEMI, E., «Apollinarius' heresy and the Second Ecumenical Council» <http://www.impantokratoros.gr/eirhnh-artemi-apolinariios.el.aspx>. (2011)
- AYRES, L., *Nicaea and Its Legacy*, 2004, Oxford: Oxford University Press 2004
- BARRY, W., «Arianism.» In *The Catholic Encyclopedia* New York: Robert Appleton Company. (1907). Retrieved April 23, 2012 from New Advent: <http://www.newadvent.org/cathen/01707c.htm>
- BETHUNE-BAKER, J.F., *Christian Doctrine to the time of the Council of Chalcedon*, London: Methuen 1903, 212,213
- CAPONE, Al., “La polemica apollinarista alla fine del IV secolo: la lettera di Gregorio di Nissa a Teofilo di Alessandria”, in *Gregory of Nyssa: The*

- Minor Treatises on Trinitarian Theology and Apollinarism. Proceedings of the 11th International Colloquium on Gregory of Nyssa (Tübingen, 17–20 September 2008), ed. By V.H. Drecoll, M. Berghaus, Leiden - Boston 2011, 499–517
- CUNLIFFE-HUBERT, J. & BENJAMIN, Dr. (ed.), *A History of Christian Doctrine*, Edinburgh: T&T Clark Ltd: 1978
- CHRISTOPHILOPOULOU, A., *Byzantine History*, A ' 324- 610, Thessaloniki: Vantias ²1996.
- DAVIS, L.D., *The First Seven Ecumenical Councils (325-787): Their History and Theology*. Collegeville, Minn.: Liturgical Press, 1983.
- FIDAS, VI., *Ecclesiastic History*, Athens 1992.
- HERBERMANN, C. & GRUPP, G., “Constantine the Great” *In The Catholic Encyclopedia*. New York: Robert Appleton Company. (1908) Retrieved April 20, 2012 from New Advent: <http://www.newadvent.org/cathen/04295c.htm>
- KARAGIANNOPOULOS, J., *Byzantine State*, Thessaloniki: Vantias ⁴1996.
- KELLY, J.N.D., *The Nicene Crisis in Early Christian Doctrines*, New York 1978,
- KELLY, J.N.D., *The Creed of Nicea in Early Christian Creeds*, New York 1982.
- IOANNOU, P.P., *La législation impériale et la christianisation de l' empire romain (311-476)*, *Orientalia Christiana Analecta* 192, Roma 1972.
- MYERS, E., (1909). Eunomianism. In *The Catholic Encyclopedia*. New York: Robert Appleton Company. Retrieved April 26, 2012 from New Advent: <http://www.newadvent.org/cathen/05605a.htm> (2012)
- PAPADOPOULOS, St., *Patrologia II*, Athens 1990.
- WILLIAMS, R., *Arius: Heresy and Tradition*, Darton: Longman & Todd Ltd, 1987.

Internet

<http://ccdl.libraries.claremont.edu/cdm/singleitem/collection/cce/id/278/rec/20>
(2012)