

THE
MERCERSBURG REVIEW.

JULY, 1867.

ART. I.—THE APOSTOLIC COMMISSION.

BY REV. S. N. CALLENDER, A. M., GREENCASTLE, PA.

“I am come that they might have life.”—(John x. 10.) By this and similar utterances in the word of God, we are taught the ultimate design of Christ’s mission into the world. This comprehends vastly more than that conception which sees no deeper meaning in His incarnation, than a suitable adaptation to His work, as the Teacher of the children of men, and the Atoner for their sins. Such a view involves a low and inadequate conception of the nature of sin and its terrible consequences. It would seem to regard Adam, as he stood in Eden before the fall, as in the enjoyment of all the franchises of his being originally included in the mind of his Creator; as being already a participant in the grace of life, for which he was then but a candidate, to be enjoyed only, in the event of his free self-determination admitting him unto the wonderfully mysterious Sacrament of the Tree of Life; that his relations to the surroundings in the midst of which he was placed, were in no other way affected by his sin, than simply having incurred the divine displeasure, he thereby made himself obnoxious to punishment; and that to restore him in full to his normal relations to God, to himself, and to the whole order of nature around him, required only that this penalty should be endured, either in his own person or in the person of a Mediator. Sin, for it,

Hence, most properly this question, in the same form exactly, is repeated to the candidate for Confirmation. The Liturgy would be Pelagian in its teachings were it omitted in either case.

ART. VII.—ARIANISM.

BY J. W. NEVIN, D.D., PRESIDENT OF FRANKLIN AND MARSHALL COLLEGE,
LANCASTER, PA.

A heresy of the Fourth Century, which, by denying the proper Divinity of Christ, struck at the doctrine of the Holy Trinity, and for a time threatened to overthrow the foundations of the Christian faith; although in the end it served only to bring out clearly the true sense of this doctrine as it had been previously involved in the consciousness of the Church, and caused it to become thus the corner-stone of all positive Catholic theology in subsequent ages. It derives its name from Arius, a presbyter of Alexandria, who was the immediate occasion of its breaking out at this place, and afterwards spreading into the East; but its real cause and origin are to be sought in the theological life of the Christian world, as it then stood, under a deeper and far more comprehensive view. The Christian consciousness had very soon come to an apprehension of the Divine nature of Christ; there was no difficulty felt in declaring Him to be God, without qualification or reserve. Then came, however, the question of his hypostatical independence, the relation which his higher nature was to be regarded as holding to the absolute being of God. Sabellianism, at first view, seemed to make the greatest possible account of Christ's Divinity, by destroying all distinction between it and the being of God universally considered. It saw in Him an incarnation, not of any secondary or derived Divine existence, but of the absolute God himself. To the Christian consciousness, however, this was felt to involve a relapse into Ebionitism, which made the Divine in Christ to be a mere outside qualification of His human person, and overthrew the significance of it entirely for the pur-

poses of the world's redemption. It became thus a reigning object, with the third century particularly, to assert, over against this false tendency, the real *personality* of Christ's higher nature; the hypostatic difference of the Son from the Father; and in the prosecution of this purpose, it may be admitted, less stress was laid at times than before, on the assertion of their common Divinity. In these circumstances it became the great problem of the fourth century, to bring into harmonious doctrinal union here the two sides of the truth in regard to Christ's Divine nature, which had been asserted previously only in a separate way, and one always more or less at the cost of the other; while both were felt, at the same time, to be grounded with equal certainty in the Christian faith itself. The solution of the problem lay, of course, between Sabellianism on the one hand, and such a subordination of the Son to the Father on the other hand, as might amount to an exclusion of the first from the Godhead altogether. The Arian controversy represents to us the process through which the mighty movement, big with the interests of Christianity for all following time, was carried forward to its proper completion.

The rise of Arianism was favored by the prevalence of the theological view, which, in the Eastern Church especially, had come to look upon the Divinity of the Son as holding, in one form or another, a certain subordination, in the constitution of the Trinity, to the Divinity of the Father. Those who had this view, joined with it generally an explicit acknowledgment of His being God in the proper sense of the term; they only thought it necessary to maintain in this way the idea of His full personal distinction from the Father. But in opposition to this there was now developed an anti-subordination tendency also, as it may be called, which saw in this view of Christ's distinction from the Father, peril only to the idea of His equality with the Father, and which was ready, therefore, to set its face vigorously against all such thinking, wherever it might come in its way.

A strenuous representative of this feeling we have in the person of Alexander, Bishop of Alexandria in Egypt; under whom

the presbyter, Arius, is first introduced to our notice. A long, lean, pale, earnest-looking man, we are told, with a thick head of hair, not kept in the best order; a man of rather pleasing address, and as it would seem, of somewhat various learning, although his knowledge was more superficial than deep. He is represented also as being something of a poet; but this can have been only in a very outward mechanical way; his nature certainly was not of the poetical sort. A Lybian by birth, he yet owed his theological training to the East; more particularly it appears to Lucian of Antioch, whose subordination views he adopted, and tried to introduce subsequently at Alexandria. Here, however, the opposite way of thinking was now predominant, although there was still great fear also of Sabellianism. After Alexander became bishop, it soon appeared that the two men stood seriously apart in their theological opinions with regard to this great subject. The difference came out fully in a diocesan convention held by the bishop, in which he took occasion, with reference no doubt to the questionable teaching of Arius, to set forth his own doctrine of the Trinity, insisting particularly on the necessity of maintaining the Divine nature in the distinction of the Divine persons. Arius hereupon accused Alexander of holding the heresy of Sabellius, and argued from the idea of generation that there was a time when the Son was not (*ἦν, ὅτε οὐκ ἦν ὁ υἱὸς*). He denied thus that he was eternal in the same sense with the Father, and maintained likewise that his generation did not flow necessarily from the being of God, (which would involve, he thought, a Sabellian consequence,) but was to be regarded as flowing in a free way from God's will. The production of the Son in this way he held to be out of nothing (*ἐξ οὐκ ὄντων*), and not out of God, while he placed him at the same time above all creatures, represented him to be without change, and gave him an intermediate position between God and the world, making him to be, through the indwelling fulness of God, the fountain of the whole creation in every lower view. These latter points, however, borrowed from the Christian thinking of the time, he found himself forced afterwards to give up, as not agreeing logically with his main posi-

tion. In denying to the Son all participation in the actual being of God, he could attribute to him only a time existence, in virtue of which, then, it was necessary to conceive of him as subject to change (*τρῆπτὸς καὶ ἀλλοιωτὸς τῆν φύσιν, ὡς καὶ πάντα τὰ λογικά*), as imperfect in knowledge, and as capable even of falling into sin.

The convention gave judgment against Arius, but this did not end the controversy. He had his party, and spared no pains to strengthen it. Alexander wrote against him in vain; there was danger of a schism in the Church. Finally, a council was called, consisting of about one hundred bishops, which excommunicated him and all his adherents (a. 321). He now left Egypt, and betook himself to the East, where he had reason to expect his views would meet with more favor. Letters were addressed by him to the Oriental bishops, especially to Eusebius of Nicomedia, bespeaking their sympathy, and assuring them that they themselves had been condemned along with him in Egypt. Alexander, at the same time, sent a circular to the Eastern Church, giving information of what had been done in his case. Arius went first to Palestine, and afterwards to Nicomedia, finding every where more kindly reception than he had met with in Egypt. Here he wrote his *Thalia*, a few fragments of which have been preserved, and also some songs, designed to guard his doctrine among the people. Eusebius tried to bring about a reconciliation between him and his bishop; the question was not so important, he thought, but that a little yielding on both sides might make room for its satisfactory settlement. The Asiatic bishops generally looked at the matter in the same way, and used their influence, on different occasions, to have Arius restored to his office. Their reigning view of the doctrine of the Trinity at this time, has its best representative perhaps in Eusebius of Cesarea. He occupied in the main the Origenistic standpoint, insisted on the subordination of the Son to the Father, made the generation of the Son to be an act of God's will, and held it to be in this view before all time, but not strictly eternal. He did not like, indeed, the proposition of Arius: "There was a time when the Son was not;" and shrank

generally from his way of sundering Him who is called the express image of the Father from the Father Himself. Still for his thinking the idea of the Godhead was complete in the Father—and it appeared to him Sabellian error to suppose that the Father might pass over His own proper being to the Son. From this standpoint he sought to restore peace between Alexander and Arius. Relying on the good offices of his Eastern friends, Arius himself seems now also to have returned again to Alexandria. But there was no reconciliation. The controversy went forward in Egypt as before.

In the meantime, the Emperor Constantine had it in his mind to make a visit to that country; but hearing of the theological commotions which were at work there, he considered it prudent to have them out of the way before he undertook the journey, and for this purpose sent his court bishop, Hosius, in advance, with a letter to Alexander and Arius, exhorting them to become reconciled. In this letter, reflecting of course the judgment of the Asiatic bishops, he treats the subject of their quarrel as one of very little importance, and sees no reason why it should be allowed to disturb their Christian fellowship, and break up the peace of the Church. It was not long, however, till his eyes were opened by the course of events, and by the representations probably of Hosius, to see that the question involved for the whole Church a great deal more than he had at first supposed. Finally, the only proper remedy for the case seemed to be the calling of a general council, where the bishops of the whole Christian world should be invited to come together, and take part in settling what was felt to have become a vital difficulty for the universal Church. This First Oecumenical Council, as it is called, met at Nice in the year 325. It was composed of three hundred and eighteen bishops, mainly Oriental. Here, as all the world knows, Arius and his party were met with overwhelming defeat. Very few of the bishops, not more than twenty-two, it is said, were found to agree in full with his views. The rest might not all have been prepared to go with Alexander at every point, but when it came to the main question in controversy—the participation of the Son in the essence of the

Father—they could not hesitate on which side to cast their vote. Their Christian consciousness was stronger for them here than all speculative difficulties. A confession of Arian sound, drawn up by Eusebius of Nicomedia, was rejected with horror, and in place of it was adopted that great bulwark of the Christian faith, the *Nicene Creed*, as it has been since known—strengthened by the addition to its first draught of the term *ὁμοούσιος*, to cut off all possible ambiguous apprehension. Here we have a real dogmatic movement in the Christian world; what lay in the faith of the Church previously was now brought to doctrinal expression as it had never been before. From this time on, the relation of the Son to the Father must be held to be one of full equality as well as full distinction. He is “begotten of the Father before all worlds, God of God, Light of Light, very God of very God; begotten, not made; of *one substance* (*ὁμοούσιος*) with the Father, by whom all things were made.” So much has been settled and fixed for us by this ever memorable confession of Nice.

Among those who showed themselves particularly active in favor of the formula, stood conspicuous the youthful Athanasius, now deacon of the Alexandrian Church, who already gave signs of the herculean strength, which he was destined to put forth in its defence in subsequent years. Arius and two other bishops who refused to sign the confession, were excluded from the communion of the Church, and banished into Illyrium. All writings of Arius must be given up to be burned on pain of death; and his followers were stigmatized (at the same time) with the name of Porphyrians, that is, enemies of Christianity. The confession was a vast victory in favor of the truth. It soon appeared, however, that it was not sufficient of itself to bring to an end the theological controversy out of which it grew. The Asiatic bishops awaited only for a favorable opportunity to take ground against the term *ὁμοούσιος*. At first the Emperor showed a disposition to maintain rigorously the authority of the council. The orthodox cause might be said to be strengthened also, when Athanasius, the soul of the movement, was made bishop of Alexandria, in the room of Alexander, who had died soon after

his return from Nice. Gradually, however, a change took place in the condition of affairs. The Emperor was surrounded continually with those who were not favorable to the doctrine of the essential equality of the Son with the Father, but took pains rather to represent the whole controversy as an empty logomachy. Constantine was always very dependent, in theological matters, upon his nearest advisers. It was easy to persuade him that personal passion had been much concerned in what he had regarded heretofore as a sincere zeal for Christianity. Finally, he invited Arius to come to the court, promising to send him back again to Alexandria. At the same time, Eusebius of Nicomedia, and Theognis of Nice, who had been previously banished to Gaul on account of their sympathy with the Arian cause, were permitted now also to return and resume their places. Eusebius set himself to work immediately to overthrow the Homoousians in Asia, singling out first for this purpose Eustathius of Antioch, a zealous defender of the Nicene symbol. A number of anti-Nicene bishops, through his influence, were brought together in Antioch, and here deposed Eustathius from his office, on the charge of Sabellianism. In opposition to the will of his own congregation, Paullinus of Tyre was now named bishop of Antioch. There was still, however, a party of Eustathians in the place, who kept up their separate meetings. The same charge of Sabellianism, brought against Asklepas, bishop of Gaza, and Eutropius, bishop of Adrianople, served as a pretext for depriving them also of their offices. Encouraged by such successes, the anti-Nicene party turned their attention next to Athanasius himself. Backed by a letter from Eusebius, Arius had applied personally in Alexandria to be restored to his office as Presbyter. This Athanasius had refused, maintaining his position subsequently with great firmness against the Emperor himself, and insisted that a heretic, deposed as Arius had been by the authority of the Synod, could not be restored again to church communion without similar authority. New complaints, brought against the bishop by the Meletians, who stood in intimate connection with the Arian faction at Alexandria, induced the Emperor to summon him to his

court in Nicomedia. Here he made such an impression upon the Emperor, that he wrote a letter commending him to the Church at Alexandria as a man of God, and censuring their divisions and strifes. As, however, all manner of strange accusations continued to be preferred against Athanasius, Constantine appointed a council at Cesarea (333) to inquire into the case. In view of the fact that Eusebius of Cesarea was to preside over this ecclesiastical court, Athanasius did not make his appearance. In the year 335 a new council was ordered to come together at Tyre, where the Emperor threatened to bring Athanasius by force, should he again refuse to attend. Athanasius appeared at Tyre; but the charges against him, for the most part, resulted in nothing. It was then resolved to send a commission to Egypt, for the purpose of examining matters on the spot. The members of this commission were declared enemies of Athanasius, on whose report afterwards the council of Tyre deposed Athanasius from his office, and subjected him to a sentence of excommunication. Athanasius appealed from such a body to the Emperor himself, and made a journey to him personally at Constantinople. Constantine, however, after some show of new inquiry into the case, suffered himself to be carried away with the general prejudice against Athanasius; and, finally, for the sake of peace and rest, sent him into banishment at Treves (336). Nothing seemed to stand now in the way of the restoration of Arius. He returned accordingly to Alexandria, after having been received again into church communion at Jerusalem; but the people of Alexandria were too much devoted to their bishop, to endure the presence of the heretic without serious excitement and commotion. This led the Emperor to call him to Constantinople. Here he was required now to draw up a new confession of his faith, which he managed to do in Scriptural terms mainly, on which he could put his own sense. He used the farther precaution of making him solemnly swear that he held no other faith, and then issued an order to Alexander, the bishop of Constantinople, that he should publicly admit Arius the next day (Sunday) to the communion of his church. The bishop expostulated in vain; and

then, in his extremity, had recourse to God in earnest prayer. That same evening Arius perished suddenly and miserably, by the bursting out of his bowels in a privy. It seemed a Divine interposition; and the bishop considered it his duty to render thanks to God for it publicly in the church.

Constantine died a. 337. Under his sons, Athanasius was allowed to return to Alexandria. The influence of the court, however, was soon determined against the Nicene Synod. Eusebius of Nicomedia succeeded in making himself bishop of Constantinople, renewed his charges against Athanasius, and went so far even as to have a rival bishop appointed for the Arian party in Alexandria. Athanasius, to defend himself, called together a large council of Egyptian bishops (340), and made it an object especially to win to his side the judgment of Julius, the bishop of Rome, with whom also the anti-Nicene party were endeavoring to make interest. In the year 341 a council was held at Antioch, consisting of ninety bishops. Here several confessions were brought forward, in which the teaching of Arius was disapproved, and the generation of the Son from the Father affirmed as being before all time, without any mention of their essential equality. Athanasius was declared by the same Synod to be still deposed, as having resumed his office without regular authority. A certain Gregory of Cappadocia was then elected bishop of Alexandria, and sent to take possession of the see with an armed force, a task he was not able to accomplish without some shedding of blood. Athanasius escaped by flight, and appeared afterward at the synod held by Julius in Rome in the year 342, where he was formally sustained. None of the anti-Nicene party were in attendance. Julius communicated to them the results of the synod, which they took in very bad part, threatening to exclude him from church fellowship if he refused to acknowledge their decrees. The party sought now to gain the western Emperor Constans, sending a special embassy to Gaul for the purpose, but without effect. A new synod was held at Antioch in 345, where another longer confession of faith was produced, affirming the generation of the Son from the essence of the Father before all

time, without any notice still, however, of their consubstantial unity. No account was made of this by the Western Church, and the two emperors were petitioned, accordingly, to take measures for settling the controversy between the East and the West by a general council. This was called to meet at Sardica, in Illyrium, in the year 347. The whole measure, however, proved a disastrous failure. The Anti-nicene party hearing that Athanasius, Marcellus, and Paul of Constantinople were already treated as brethren by the Western bishops, insisted that they should first of all be kept out of the assembly until there might be a full and fair examination of their case. Not being able to carry this point, they withdrew in a body to Philippopolis, and held there a synod of their own. The bishops at Sardica confirmed the Nicene Creed, and declared the depositions of Athanasius, Marcellus, Asklepas of Gaza, and so on, to be invalid, whilst on the other hand the opposers of the Nicene Creed, Gregory of Alexandria, Basil of Ancyra, Acacius of Cesarea, and Stephen of Antioch, were excommunicated. At Philippopolis the heads of the Nicene party fell under the same censure. This was the end of all church fellowship between the two parties. An effort was now made to have Athanasius restored to his see by the help of the secular power, which, in the end, proved successful, through the influence of Constans on his brother Constantius. Gregory of Alexandria had been previously killed in a popular tumult, and the regular bishop was now received again by the people (349) with boundless jubilation. The administration of his diocese was carried on subsequently with great energy and effect, which only drew upon him, however, new hatred and opposition in the East.

After the death of Constans, the Orientals directed their assaults first against the Sabellian, Marcellus, and his disciple, Photinus of Sirmium. In a council at Sirmium in 351, Photinus was deposed from his office. Finding themselves favored by the political changes of the time, they now turned their attention again to Athanasius. They prevailed at first in making Liberius, the new bishop of Rome, doubtful of his cause; and

then, in a synod at Arles (353) succeeded in bringing all the members, the delegates of the Roman bishop among them, to unite in pronouncing against him a new sentence of deposition. This step roused the orthodox bishops of the West, particularly Lucifer of Cagliari, Eusebius of Vercelli, and Liberius of Rome, through whose influence, then, the emperor was moved to order a new Synod at Milan in the year 355. In this council three hundred bishops are said to have been present, mainly from the West. The favor of the emperor, however, gave the advantage to the Anti-nicene party. No authority was allowed to the Nicene Creed; the members were required even to subscribe an Anti-nicene edict of the Emperor. The meetings were first held in the church, but were transferred afterward to the palace of the Emperor, that they might be more entirely beyond the reach of the common people, who were known to be in strong sympathy with the orthodox cause. Here, finally, all who refused to consent to the deposition of Athanasius were themselves deprived of their dignities. This fortune fell upon Eusebius of Vercelli, Lucifer of Cagliari, Hosius of Cordova, and at last on Liberius also, the bishop of Rome, who only became in this way, however, missionaries abroad for the doctrine of the Catholic Church. Felix, who took part in the proceedings at Milan, was named bishop of Rome instead of Liberius; but the Church there could not be brought to show him any favor.

The Imperial Commission, sent to remove Athanasius, proceeded at first very cautiously. There was reason to fear that the Egyptian people would resist the measure with violence. Only with the help of armed soldiers at last was the attempt made to seize his person, and then not without force and shedding of blood. Athanasius, who carried himself with great courage through the occasion, sought refuge finally, among the Anchorites of the desert, where he employed his leisure in writing against the doctrines of the party to which he stood opposed. That party, in a synod at Antioch, had named George of Cappadocia, a notoriously unworthy man, as bishop of Alexandria. He was installed in that see (356) by force of arms,

and ruled it afterward with a rod of iron. The Anti-nicene party triumphed in this way over the Nicene symbol by means of the secular power; its victory, however, only paved the way for its subsequent dissolution, through the falling assunder of the different views that were comprehended in it, which had been held together thus far, only by their common opposition to the Nicene Creed.

Arianism was the occasion of the vast theological agitation which was now felt throughout the Christian world. It had led to the Council of Nice, and called forth the Nicene Creed; and in this way it might be said to have made room for all the questioning and controversy, through which the symbol was required to pass afterwards, before it became established with full authority as the only true and proper expression of the universal Christian faith. It was, however, but a small part of the opposition to the Nicene symbol that could be said to stand on strictly Arian ground; and this again was by no means united in its opinions. Some, like the worldly-minded bishops Ursacius and Valens, contented themselves with a blind acquiescence in the views of Arius, and a mere negative rejection of the Nicene points of faith, while others felt themselves impelled to carry out their own system in a more positive and explicit way. Conspicuous among these appear the names of Aetius and Eunomius, from whom the party came to be designated as Aetians and Eunomians; while they were called, also, sometimes Anomoeans, from their insisting so strenuously that the Son was not of one substance (*ἀνομοιος*) with the Father. These zealous teachers, Eunomius in particular, had much to say of the absolute simplicity of the Divine nature, the being of God conceived of in the most abstract way, which made it impossible, they contended, that his substance could be conveyed by any generation to another; the Son could not be, therefore, absolutely like the Father, but must be regarded as the production of the Father's will out of nothing, though endowed with power to create the world, and exalted thus far above all other creatures. Such was the thinking and reasoning of the strict Arians. Over against these stood the far larger party of the

Semi-arians, or Homoiousians, sometimes called also Eusebians, from their distinguishing representative, Eusebius of Cesarea, an unsteady fluctuating party, which felt itself pressed continually between the Arian and Nicene schemes of thought, without the power of finding any firm middle ground of its own on which to stand. Their significance was more ecclesiastical than dogmatic. They contributed in truth but little to the movement of theological thought. Their concern all the time was to maintain the distinction between the Father and the Son, which they supposed must fall away, if both were allowed to be of one substance. They would have it, therefore, that the Son was of *like* substance with the Father (*ὁμοούσιος*). Athanasius argued against them that likeness or unlikeness could not be predicated of substance, but only of attributes; that in the case of substance, we could only speak of sameness or the reverse. By the strict Arians, on the other hand, it was held up to them that mere likeness of substance here amounted necessarily to difference of substance, and so drew after it inevitably all that was embraced in the Arian view. Finding itself thus hard pushed on both sides, the party was led more and more through the force of its religious instincts, to disown Arianism and make common cause with the Nicene faith, until, finally, having become reconciled to it at all points, it ceased to exist altogether. Indeed, Semi-nicene, rather than Semi-arian, would seem to have been the proper title for the party from the first.

Under the leadership of Aetius and Eunomius, the strict Arians endeavored to carry things forward in a way that proved highly unsatisfactory in different quarters, to their Semi-arian allies. Aetius had distinguished himself all along for his intemperate zeal against the holders of the orthodox faith. In 349 we find him laboring to have them sundered from the Arian communion in Antioch. Forced to leave that place, he meets us again at the Council of Sirmium, 351, where his extreme views were opposed by the Semi-arian bishops, Basil of Ancyra and Eustathius of Sebaste. Four years after this, he is actively at work in Alexandria, trying to build up the Arian cause there, under the auspices of the new bishop, George of Cappadocia.

Here he fell in with Eunomius, and the two together became from this time on the life and soul of the party. In the year 357, the Emperor Constantius made his first visit to Rome, and to please the people there promised them, among other things, the return of their bishop, if only he would sign the condemnation of Athanasius. The same year a new synod was held at Sirmium, where a formula was adopted, through the influence particularly of Ursacius and Valens, according to which, for the sake of peace among all parties, no farther use was to be made of the terms *οὐσία*, *ὁμοούσιος* and *ὁμοιοούσιος* in teaching or preaching, while, nevertheless, the subordination of the Son to the Father, and the generation of the Son from the Father, were to be acknowledged and affirmed as facts transcending all knowledge. The aged bishop, Hosius, was induced to sign this formula, along with the condemnation of Athanasius; and, having done so, recovered his see, but died the following year. Liberius also yielded, and on the same terms became once more bishop of Rome, having deserted apparently the cause of the great and good Athanasius, for that of his foes. It appeared now, however, that the Semi-arians were not disposed to acquiesce in this doubtful compromise; the more especially so when it was found that the strict Arians looked upon it as a great triumph for their cause, and on the strength of it allowed themselves to take high airs against their opponents. Particularly was this case in the diocese of Antioch, where the leaders of the party began to put out of office such as refused to conform to their views. This led to a Semi-arian council at Ancyra, which issued a declaration, insisting on the necessity of maintaining the relation of *like* substance between the Father and the Son, and at the same time sent a special delegation to the emperor at Sirmium, to let him know that the late form of concord had failed to secure peace, and was used by the Arians only as an occasion for persecution. The emperor was induced to order another convention of bishops at Sirmium (358); and here now a new confession was adopted, rejecting the formula of the previous year, and settling the term "like substance" as the only rule of right belief in the

case. All must now sign this; among others, Ursacius and Valens, who excused themselves for their having rejected the *ὁμοούσιος* before, by saying they had considered it to be of one meaning with *ὁμοούσιος*. Liberius, too, had to sign. After this, we find the Arians in trouble. They had incurred the anger of the emperor, as disturbers of the peace; many leaders among them lost their places; about seventy were sent into exile. Finally, a fourth confession was produced at Sirmium, avoiding the word *ὁσία*, but declaring the Son to be like the Father in all things (*ὅμοιος κατὰ πάντα*), according to the Scriptures. This now Constantius proposed to have established, by means of a General Council, as an end of all strife. It was settled at last, however, that instead of a General Council two different synods should be held, one for the East and another for the West. The Western bishops met at Rimini, about four hundred in number; among them, perhaps, eighty holding Arian views. The last Semi-arian formula, approved by the Emperor, was laid before them, but the majority would hear of nothing but the Nicene symbol, and proceeded to depose the Arians, Ursacius, Valens, and others, from their office. Ten of their number were sent as a delegation to the emperor, but the Arians were before them, and the emperor kept them at a distance. Finally they were ordered to Nice in Thrace; and here a Semi-arian confession was offered them to sign, to which in the end, through weariness and fear, they reluctantly set their names. Almost all the bishops assembled at Rimini were brought afterwards to do the same thing. This was in the year 359. Somewhat later in the same year, the Oriental bishops assembled at Seleucia in Isauria—one hundred and five Semi-arians, forty strict Arians, and some ten or twelve confessors of the Nicene faith. Among these last was the celebrated Hilary, Bishop of Poitiers, whom the emperor himself had ordered from his banishment in Phrygia expressly to attend this synod. Here it came at once to an active struggle between the Arians and the Semi-arians. At the head of the Arians stood Acacius of Cesarea, the successor of Eusebius. The Semi-arians succeeded in requiring subscription to a form, which served to

bring Acacius and his party to the point of acknowledging finally that the likeness of the Son to the Father was held by them to be moral only, (in the will and not in the substance), whereupon they were summarily ejected from their places. Both sides sent embassies to the emperor; but here again the Arians were ahead of their adversaries, and Acacius managed for a time to secure his favor. But this did not last. The undisguised sentiments of the Arians, as they were brought to his view in one of their published works, excited his strong displeasure; and when it turned out that Aetius had written it, he was banished into Phrygia. Still the Semi-arians were not sustained in their distinctive position; and the Arians, in this way, might be said to have been left masters of the field.

In a council held at Constantinople, in the year 300, the heads of the Semi-arian party, Basil of Ancyra, Eustathius of Sebaste, and Macedonius of Constantinople, were deposed, to make room for Arian successors. Eudoxius became, in this way, bishop of Constantinople. With all its success, however, the party found it necessary to keep its real views more or less out of sight. Eunomius, made bishop of Cyzicum for his Arianism, lost his bishopric again in a short time, for preaching Arianism in too free a way. A council in Antioch, in 361, proposed to strike from the Church creeds all expressions referring the likeness of the Son to the Father, but the measure was not carried through. It seemed too bold to be safe.

Under Julian, the successor of Constantius (361), permission was granted to all banished bishops to return to their places. This first made room for the orthodox doctrine to raise its head again in the West. Hilary of Poitiers had a synod convened in Paris, where confession was made once more of the Nicene Creed. In Alexandria, the Arian bishop, George, was killed in the midst of a popular tumult. Athanasius now returned to his see, and endeavored with gentleness to bring about a general restoration of order and peace; on the plan of allowing all to retain their places who would sign the Nicene symbol, even if they had been led previously through weakness to subscribe to Arian formulas; so as to exclude from office only

the active leaders of the party. This moderation was condemned by Lucifer of Cagliari, and gave rise to a particular party who took their title from his name.

In the year 364, Valens became emperor of the East; a weak and cruel prince, who lent himself entirely to the Arian, cause, and tried to put down all opposition to it by active persecution. This had the effect of disposing the Semi-arians, still more than before to look favorably toward the Nicene doctrine, as being perhaps after all the only ground on which the heresy could be successfully withstood. A powerful influence was exerted now also in the same direction by the great church teachers, Gregory of Nazianzum, Basil of Neo-Cesarea, and Gregory of Nyssa, who vigorously maintained the Athanasian faith, and labored to bring the Oriental Church into union with the West. Finally a deputation was sent to the Roman bishop, Liberius, declaring the willingness of the East to accept the *ὁμολογιας*. Letters from Western bishops consenting to a renewal of fellowship were presented in return at the council of Tyana, in 367. There were still some voices against the pacification; but the course of events silenced them more and more; till the triumph of orthodoxy became in the end full and complete. In the mean time, the Arian persecutions under Valens went on with great severity, filling the whole Eastern Church with dismay, and exciting no small sympathy in the West. All sorts of violence were exercised, in thrusting Catholics out of office, and in putting Arians into their place. These persecutions lasted till the death of Valens in 378. Under his successor, Gratian, there was general toleration. Theodosius the Great finally turned the power of the State against the Arians. He issued an order (380), requiring his subjects to hold the same faith with the bishops of Rome and Alexandria, on pain of being regarded and treated as heretics. This, of course, gave the State churches everywhere to orthodox incumbents, and forced the Arians to hold their religious assemblies outside the cities. In the year 381 the second Œcumenical council was held at Constantinople; which solemnly reaffirmed the Nicene Creed, extending the oneness of God's es-

sence at the same time to the Holy Ghost. This was followed in subsequent years, during the reign of Theodosius, with new and more rigorous laws against the Arians. All tended now to deprive their cause of credit and strength; while they were weakened also by divisions among themselves. We hear still of occasional movements among them, for a time, in opposition to the reigning faith; but under the next emperor, Arcadius, they disappeared historically from the Roman empire altogether. The heresy had run its course, and lost its interest now in new questions and controversies which arose to agitate the Christian world in its place.

Long after this, however, Arianism maintained its ground among the Germanic tribes on the outside of the Roman empire. It seemed to be for them a sort of transition stage from Paganism to full Christianity. The entire nation of the Ostrogoths continued to profess the Arian faith, till the time of their destruction in 555; without any persecution, however, of Catholics. The Visigoths showed themselves more intolerant in the exercise of the same faith but finally, in a church council held at Toledo 589, were induced by their king Reccared to adopt the Nicene confession. The Arian Vandals after their conquest of Africa under Genseric 429 inflicted a severe persecution upon the Catholics; which came to an end only with the destruction of the Vandal kingdom by Belisarius in the year 534. The Suevi in Spain passed over to Arianism in the middle of the fifth century, in consequence probably of their connection with the Visigoths; one hundred years later, about 558, they were converted under king Theodemir to the orthodox religion. The Burgundians also who were heathen when they came in to Gaul (417), very soon after made a profession of Arianism (440). Arian ministers, now that the heresy had been driven out of the Roman empire, endeavored to prepare here a favorable soil for their doctrine. The neighborhood of the Visigoths also worked probably in the same direction. Among this people Aristus of Vienne exerted himself actively in favor of Catholicism, and succeeded in winning to it Sigismund, the son of king Gundobad; with whose accession to the government

then (517) the Catholic Church became established in Burgundy. The Arian doctrine held its place longest of all among the Longobards. They came as Arians 568 into Italy, with hostile feeling toward Catholics; but after the Bavarian princess Theudelinda became the wife of king Antharis the Catholic faith gained entrance also among them, and under her son Adelwald the use of the churches was again allowed to the Catholics. The conversion however, was not complete; a reaction followed, and we find an Arian again upon the throne. Still Catholicism could not be again suppressed; in all the cities there was a Catholic together with an Arian bishop. Under Luitprand (†744) the Catholic Church was established at last in full power. Thus after centuries Arianism died out altogether in these countries; probably, however, not without leaving behind it an influence, which made itself felt on the same ground at a later period, in other forms of variation from, and opposition to, the doctrines of the Roman Church.

Sources for the history of Arianism; The church-historians, *Socrates*, *Sozomen*, *Theodoret* (Catholic), and *Philostorgius* (Arian); the church-fathers, *Athanasius*, *Basil*, *Gregory of Nazianzum*, *Gregory of Nyssa*, *Epiphanius*, *Chrysostom*, *Hilary of Poitiers*, &c. Of the work of Arius entitled *Thalia*, only some fragments are preserved by Athanasius. Among later works on the subject may be mentioned, in addition to modern church-histories generally: *Maimbourg's* History of Arianism; *J. A. Starz*, Versuch einer Gesch. des Arian.; *Whitaker's* Origin of Arianism; *Walch*, Historie der Ketzereien; *Newman's* Arians of the Fourth Century; *T. G. Hassenkamp*, Historia Arianae Controversiae; *Möhler*, Athanasius der Grosse und seine Zeit, 1827; *Baur*, Geschichte der Lehre von der Dreieinigkeit, 1841-43; *G. A. Meier*, die Lehre von der Dreieinigkeit in ihrer historischen Entwicklung, 1844; *J. A. Dorner*, Entwicklungsgeschichte der Lehre von der Person Christi in den ersten vier Jahrhunderten, 1845; *Albert de Broglie*, L'Église et l'Empire Romain au IV siècle, 1856.