

Thesis/Hypothesis

The Trinity as part of Christian doctrine stemmed from the Council of Nicaea and the Nicene Creed that was implemented across the Byzantine Empire by Constantine.

Sources/limitations of study

Primary and secondary:

In researching the topic of the Council of Nicaea, there was a plethora of secondary sources to choose from. As a result, I was able to use sources by authors of academic and reputational excellence. It was very difficult to find primary sources but the secondary sources I used had many quotes and explanations of the primary sources from the fourth century.

Primary Sources:

All the sources I used quoted and referenced primary sources regarding the theology of Marcellus, Arius, and Alexander. However, when I looked up the sources from which the quotes were taken, I found other secondary sources. The topic has been so extensively researched that many authors used the accepted scholarly opinion on certain matters in their arguments instead of researching the primary sources themselves before making the argument. The other issue is that the primary sources are not in English, as they are from the Byzantine area so scholars have to rely on translations.

One of the examples of where a secondary source is quoted for a primary source quotation is Dowling, Maurice James, Marcellus of Ancyra: Problems of Christology and the Doctrine of the Trinity diss. (Queen's University, Belfast, 1987). Ayres uses this in his bibliography in reference to a primary source of Marcellus' quotation.

For all scriptural references found in my research, I used the King James Version of the Holy Bible as my reference.

Secondary Sources:

Alfoldi, Andrew. Trans: Mattingly, Harold. The Conversion of Constantine and Pagan Rome. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1948.

According to his forward, Alfoldi tried to focus on the struggle between the religious traditions of Rome and the leaders of the Christian movement. Alfoldi based his research in primary sources of the Byzantine time period. His sources include church sources as well as modern secular sources.

Ayres, Lewis. U. Oxford: University Press, 2004.

Dr. Lewis Ayres is a Catholic theologian and is a professor of Catholic Theology at the Durham University. He is the head of the Durham Center for Catholic Studies and has written many professional articles as well as his books on theology. The bulk of his research is in Trinitarian theology, especially within the fourth century.

Bernard, David, K. The History of Christian Doctrine. Missouri: Aflame Press, 1996

Bernard is the superintendent of the United Pentecostal Church as well as the president of the Urshan Graduate School of Theology. He has a master of theology from the University of

South Africa and is currently a doctoral candidate of the University. He has written many books about theology and the Trinity in respect to church history and scripture.

Greek Orthodox Archdiocese of America: Liturgical Texts.

http://www.goarch.org/en/chapel/liturgical_texts/creed.asp. Greek Orthodox Archdiocese of America, 2010. Retrieved 22 February, 2010.

Greek Orthodox Archdiocese of America: Liturgical Texts.

http://www.goarch.org/en/chapel/liturgical_texts/ordination-bishop-gr.asp
Greek Orthodox Archdiocese of America, 2010. Retrieved 22 February, 2010.

L'Huillier, Archibishop Peter. The Church of the Ancient Councils. New York: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1996.

The text was originally written as a L'Huillier's doctoral thesis in Canon Law for the Theological Academy of Moscow (L'Huillier, XI). L'Huillier is of the Orthodox faith and lectured at places such as the Three Hierarchs Seminary, Catholic University, and St. Vladimir's Seminary. He is a specialist in Orthodox Canon Law and is sought after as an expert in the area.

Missale Romanum. <http://www.musicasacra.com/pdf/missale62.pdf>. Church music association of America, 2010. Retrieved 22 February, 2010.

Rowse, A. L. ed. Constantine and the Conversion of Europe. London: The English University Press, 1948.

Rowse wrote the book in an attempt to bring History to the general public. Rowse used a mixture of church history books and secular history texts for sources. In addition to this text, Rowse wrote approximately 100 books in his career as well as many professional articles. During his lifetime he was recognized as a brilliant author and lecturer of history.

Smith, Frank E. The Roman Empire CE 150. <http://www.fsmitha.com/h1/map19rm.htm>. Retrieved 22 February, 2010.

Van Dam, Raymond. The Roman Revolution of Constantine. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007.

Van Dam is a professor within the departments of Classical Studies and the Near Eastern Studies at the University of Michigan. He teaches classes on the Roman empire, late antiquity, early Christianity, medieval history, and byzantine history (Van Dam, ix). He is also the director of the Greek and Roman History department. He has several publications regarding Roman history including *Becoming Christian: The Conversion of Roman Cappadocia* (2003) and *Kingdom of Snow: Roman Rule and Greek Culture in Cappadocia* (2002).

The sources that I used were from a variety of standpoints. Some were written by Catholic theologians, one from a Protestant theologian and some were secular. There were a number of viewpoints found within my research and most had primary sources as evidence.

Argument/Discussion/evidence

The Trinity, the idea that there are three divine persons in the one God, was first introduced during the Council of Nicaea through bishop Alexander's theology and Constantine's introduction of the 'homoousious' concept. Christianity was originally monotheistic, that is, believing in one God. Christianity originally came from Judaism, which is also monotheistic. Judaism is based off of the Old Testament of the Bible which has only one God mentioned. The New Testament, which was completed circa 100, has the introduction of Jesus Christ, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, also called the Holy Spirit. The Father, Son and Holy Ghost are discussed extensively in the New Testament but there are no statements in regards to how they are related to one another; the word and concept of the Trinity are neither mentioned in Scripture.

First century sources

The religious writers of the first century did not mention the concept of the Trinity either. The surviving evidence we have to analyze includes a letter to the church at Corinth by Clement of Rome (Bernard, 22), the bishop of Rome in the 90's, a letter written to the Philippians c. 100 by Polycarp, bishop of Smyrna, seven letters written by Ignatius, bishop of Antioch c. 110, and the Shepherd, a popular book written by Hermas c. 140-145 (Bernard, 23).

These writers did, however, use phrases such as "the inseparable Spirit", "the Lord our God", "Father" and "our God" in referring to Jesus Christ. Jesus is not shown as a separate entity or personality from God the Father, but rather as a manifestation of God in the flesh (Pent 25). The type of language used in the writings did not go against the idea of the Trinity because the concept had not yet been introduced.

Map of the Roman Empire showing Nicaea, the location of the Council of Nicaea



Council of Nicaea

The Council of Nicaea was a council of bishops, priests, and deacons convened by Constantine to restore the doctrinal rift that was beginning within the empire. It was the first general council since the Apostolic Council of Jerusalem which allowed and regulated Gentiles, non-Jews, to join the church. The council convened May 20, 325. Constantine had taken control of the Empire in 324, taking over the Western part from Lucinius.

Constantine's new Empire, however, was being threatened by an uprising of a supposed heresy. The source of contention, according to most scholars, was mainly between Arius, a priest, and Alexander, the bishop of Alexandria (Bernard, 90). Alexander was Arius' bishop and the rift was started when Arius brought forth an alternate doctrine and refused to stand down when confronted by his superior.

Unfortunately, to know what actually happened in that room at the council of Nicaea is impossible. The only writings we have concerning the actual debates are the letter Eusebius of Caesarea wrote to his church after the council and a brief account of the opening debates from Eustathius, the bishop of Antioch. We also have an account by Athanasius which was written 25 years after the council as well as letters written two years after the council by Eusebius of Nicomedia and Theognius of Nicaea. (Rowse, 152). There are no minutes of the debates that show the types of discussions happening or who was orchestrating the debates (Bernard, 21).

From the writings that we do have, and in looking at the results of the Council of Nicaea, scholars have found that the debates were led primarily by Constantine with the goal of empirical unity in the forefront of his mind. There were political issues affecting the doctrinal decisions and the pressure of appeasing the emperor affected many of the bishops in their decision to accept the concept of homoousious.

The Council of Nicaea was the first of the church councils to be convened where a Politian, Constantine, had a say in the doctrine that was being discussed. At the end of the council, a proclamation was made in which Constantine made mandatory for the citizens of the empire. This proclamation, or creed, promulgated June 19, 325, was the first creed to be made mandatory that was not simply Scripture (Bernard, 91).

Monarchians

The monarchians were most documented within the 2nd and 3rd centuries and were most prominent through Rome and Asia. Their beliefs likened that of the surviving sources of the writers of the first century. They believed in the unity of God and taught that the Son and Holy Spirit are modes of the Father's being. The three labels are manifestations of one God; they do not exist independently (Ayres, 68).

Marcellus of Ancyra

Marcellus, the bishop of Ancyra, is the last documented monarchian leader. He differed from the monarchians in that he believed the Son was co-eternal with the Father (Ayres, 68).

However, in most of his doctrines he followed the monarchian model; he was wholeheartedly concerned with the maintaining of the unity of God. Marcellus believed the Son was eternally in the Father; he disagreed with other theological leaders who believed the Son was eternal but was distinct from the Father.

Marcellus uses scriptural evidence to back up his belief-the same scripture that the non-monotheists used to show the distinct beings of God (Ayres, 65). The scripture in question is John 1:1 which states "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God." Marcellus argues the unity of God with the following:

By saying, 'in the beginning was the Word,' he shows that the Word was in the Father as a power...By saying, 'and the Word was with God,' he teaches that the Word was with God as an [or 'in'] energy...And by saying that the Word was God he teaches that one should not divide the Godhead since the Word is in him and he is in the Word. For he says, "The Father is in me and I am in the Father" (Ayres, 64).

Marcellus also uses Gen 1:26 to back up his belief of the oneness of God: And God said, Let us make man in our image, after our likeness: and let them have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over the cattle, and over all the earth, and over every creeping thing that creepeth upon the earth. He argues that the word "us" in this verse implies that the Son was present at this time with the Father, before the beginning of creation. This would make it impossible for the Son to be "created" as the Arians believed.

Marcellus is unique within the major players in the Council in that denies that the title "Son" can be used before incarnation, the moment where the Son of God was manifested into

flesh. This would insinuate that the Son cannot be called Son before He is made flesh, because, before that time He is one with God; He is God (Ayres, 65). He explains this concept by saying "If our consideration were of the Spirit only, then the Word would rightly appear to be one and the same with [or 'in'] God; but if the addition of the flesh be considered, then it seems that the Godhead expanded in energy alone, so that it is rightly [said to be] a monad which is indeed undivided" (Ayres, 66)

He emphasizes that even though the Son comes forth in flesh, the monad of God is undivided (Ayres, 66). Marcellus discusses this point yet again through using 1Cor 15:28: And when all things shall be subdued unto him, then shall the Son also himself be subject unto him that put all things under him, that God may be all in all. Marcellus argues that Christ as flesh had a specific purpose on Earth, and once that purpose has been fulfilled after the judgement, He will return from his 'going forth' and God will be "all in all", or One. This does not mean that the Son no longer exists; He remains with God as he is in God (Ayres, 66).

Alexander of Alexandria

Alexander of Alexandria was the bishop of Alexandria, the major opponent to Arianism. Alexander's theology is found in "Letter to Alexander of Byzantium" (Ayres, 46). He was taught by Theognastus (Ayres, 46) (LOOK UP). Arius, the creator of the Arian movement, was in a priest position; he was under Alexander's authority. Alexander's doctrine was a major contributor of the eventual accepted doctrine of the Council of Nicaea: the Nicene Creed.

Alexander attacks the Arian notion that the Son was created by the Father by arguing the Son's eternal relationship with the Father. It is within the doctrine of Alexander that there is a shift into seeing the relationship of the Father and the Son as separate identities (Van Dam 262). He is quoted saying:

Always God, always Son; at once God, at once Son; the Son coexists with God without generation, always-begotten, ungenerated-created; God does not precede the Son either by a thought or by some instant [of time]; always God, always Son, the Son [is] from God himself (Van Dam, 262).

In this statement, Alexander is arguing the coordination, coexistence and the separate identities of God (Van Dam, 262). However, there are also numerous accounts where he writes that the relationship between the Father and Son is so complex only God can understand it (Ayres, 41).

Alexander is different from Marcellus in that he believes the Son is not God; he is only like God. He says the Son is a mediator between God and creation and the Son is not subordinate to God the Father as Arius believes. Alexander argues that the Son has all the characteristics of the Father and is identical in His image. However, the major difference in his doctrine is that the Son is not unbegotten like the Father (Ayres, 44). This changing of the Son's status makes a huge chasm in the unity of God. If the Son is no longer unbegotten as is the Father, the Son becomes a different divinity than the Father.

Alexander's immediate successor, Athanasius, shared in his beliefs and was a major contributor to the spreading of Alexander's doctrine following the Council of Nicaea. Athanasius is blatant in his writings regarding the derivative nature of the Son. He explains "for the Father is ever Father and could never become Son, so the Son is ever Son and could never become

Father” (Ayres, 46). This quote barefacedly goes against the idea that there is one God; it distinguishes two different entities that could never become one. This idea that the Son cannot become the Father permeates the Trinitarian belief system and was advocated greatly by Athanasius following the Council of Nicaea.

Arius

Arius, a priest, denied the eternity and divinity of Jesus. His bishop, Alexander of Alexandria was his main opponent in these anti-scriptural claims. Arius was condemned by a council led by Alexander with 100 bishops from Egypt and Libya in attendance. Arius ignored the decision and continued spreading his doctrinal schism throughout Alexandria. Once the schism came to a head in the council of Nicaea, many in attendance were set on making the Trinitarian doctrine secure in order to debunk Arius and his doctrine (L’Huillier, 17).

Arius’ theology is contained within the Thalia which seems to have circulated only as far as Alexandria. The rest of his popularity seems to have stemmed from Athanasius’ quotations. (Ayres, 56) Arius’ ideas seem to stem from Lucian and his students whom studied from him in Antioch. Very little of what Lucian actually taught survives but based on the writings of his students, scholars have assumed he taught the three hypostases that Arius argues as well as a subordinate Son of God. Other Lucianists include Arius’ followers Eusebius of Caesarea and Eusebius of Nicodemia. (Ayres, 57) Arius pushed the doctrine of the subordination of the Son to the Father. Arius believed that Christ is the mediator between the Father and creation. He believed in three hypostases, or beings, that have different levels of glory and status; he believed the Holy Ghost was also subordinate to the Father. However, there are more accounts recorded insisting the subordination of the Son to the Father. Arius describes his doctrine of the three separate and unequal divinities in the following:

“The one without beginning established the Son as the beginning of all creatures...He [the Son] possesses nothing proper to God, in the real sense of propriety, for he is not equal to God, nor yet is he of the same substance...there exists a Trinity in unequal glories, for their subsistencies are not mixed with each other...The Father is other than the Son in substance because he is without beginning ...By God’s will the Son is such as he is, by God’s will he is as great as he is, from [the time] when, since the very moment when he took his subsistence from God; Mighty God as he is, he sings praises of the Higher One with only partial adequacy. ..” (Ayres, 55)

Arius sees Christ exists as part of creation as part of the Father’s will. Even though the Son is not as divine as the Father, some of the characteristics of the Father are in the Son because of their close relation. The Son is not eternal and as a result He is potentially changeable; only the Father is unchangeable (Ayres, 55). Arius argues this potential changeability of the Son with 1 Tim 6:16: Who only hath immortality, dwelling in the light which no man can approach unto; whom no man hath seen, nor can see: to whom be honour and power everlasting. Amen.

In addition, Arius sees the Son as a reflection of the Father (Ayres, 55). He refers to Heb 1:3: Who being the brightness of his glory, and the express image of his person, and upholding all things by the word of his power, when he had by himself purged our sins, sat down on the right hand of the Majesty on high. One of Arius’ followers, Eusebius of Nicomedia, strongly

claims this reflective status of the Son taking it one step further: [There is] one, the unoriginated, and one produced by him truly and not from his substance, not participating at all in the unoriginated nature no in his substance, but produced as altogether different in his nature and in his power, being in complete likeness of disposition and power to him who made him..." (Ayres, 53). He argues that the Son is "altogether different in his nature and in his power" promulgating the idea that the Son is a different entity than God the Father.

Eusebius of Caesarea

During the Council of Nicaea, Constantine requested Eusebius of Caesarea, an Arian, propose a Creed to the Council. He felt Eusebius was a moderate theologian and would be an appropriate compromise between the two sides of debate and argument. Eusebius displayed the traditional baptismal creed of Caesarea. It was from this creed, quoted below, that the Nicene Creed eventually stems (Jones, 158).

"As we have received from the bishops who preceded us, both in our first instruction and when we received baptism, and as we have learned from the divine Scriptures, and as we believed and taught in the office of priest, and also in that of bishop, so believing also at the time present, we report to you our faith, as follows:

"We believe in One God, the Father Almighty, the Maker of all things visible and invisible. And in One Lord Jesus Christ, the Word of God, God from God, Light from Light, Life from Life, only-begotten Son, first-born of all creation, begotten from the Father before all the ages, by Whom also all things were made, Who for our salvation was made flesh and lived among men, and suffered, and rose again the third day, and ascended to the Father, and will come again in glory to judge the living and the dead. And we believe also in One Holy Spirit:

"Believing each of these to be and to exist, the Father truly Father, and the Son truly Son, and the Holy Ghost truly Holy Ghost, as also our Lord, sending forth His own disciples to preach said, 'Go teach all nations, baptising them in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.' Concerning whom we confidently affirm that so we hold, and so we think, and so we have held long ago, and we maintain this faith unto death, anathematising every godless heresy." (Jones, 159)

This Creed brought many Trinitarian ideals into the Council. Within the Second paragraph, there is an obvious separation of the Father and the Son, Jesus Christ, and the Holy Spirit. Within the third paragraph, the creed cites the only verse in the New Testament in which the baptismal method is broken into the three manifestations of God: Matt 28:19 "Go ye therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost". By using this verse to explain baptismal doctrine after explaining the triune Godhead, the authors of the creed strongly lead the reader into Trinitarian acceptance instead of using one of the other verses regarding baptism which reference baptizing in the name of Jesus. An example of such a verse could be Acts 2:38: Then Peter said unto them, Repent, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost. The alternate verses would show the unity of God instead of leading towards a Trinitarian doctrine. According to monotheistic doctrine, God is implied within the name of Jesus in baptism because God is actually in the manifestation of Jesus.

The language within the creed still allowed for Arian doctrine within it. As a result, the Arian movement could still continue with their schism if this was the creed to be accepted by the Council. The anti-Arians wanted the language changed to something that would not coincide with the Arian doctrine. For example, the Son could be described as “the True Power and Image of the Father” or “in all things exactly like the Father” (Jones, 160).

Constantine

It was at this point during the council that Constantine suggested the word “homoousious” to describe the relation of the Father and the Son (Jones, 161). Constantine suggests that the word homoousious, or homoousion, means no division within the essence of the Father and that His power was unaltered. The word was combatting against the idea that the Son was subordinate to God the Father; Constantine explained that the Son was not of creation; he was only of the Father’s substance (Jones, 164).

This word was new to the debate; it had not been used by either Arius or Alexander in their doctrine. The Arians did not like the introduction of this word because it went against their idea of the subordination of the Son. Some non-Arians also had a problem with this terminology (Jones, 161). Before the Council, the word was popular in the west, made known by Pope Dionysius. Constantine heard the word from his adviser, Hosius, a Spanish bishop, and thought the word would appease both sides of the debate. After the word was accepted by the council, somewhat begrudgingly, they began to rewrite the creed with phrases like “of one essence with the Father” and “begotten of the Father” (Jones, 162).

The term homoousious, however, holds the concept that the Father, Son and the Holy Ghost are co-equally God, not that they are all one God. This suggestion in the Council of Nicaea was the first major record of the concept of the Trinity in a substantial way. Constantine also says that “He [the Son] was not before He was begotten” which insinuates that the Son was, in a way, conceived and was not always eternal as part of the Father, the same God (Jones, 165).

At this point in his life, Constantine was more interested in unity within his empire than theological correctness. When he introduced homoousious to the council, it was impossible for the Arians to accept. As a result, the followers of Alexander, the majority, were somewhat in favour of the new language, although many believed it was not scripturally correct (Jones, 165). Constantine’s theological neutrality became more obvious after the council. He wavered in his anti-Arian beliefs and befriended Arius and Eusebius of Caesarea after having exiled them during the Council of Nicaea. Van Dam states “Because Constantine’s overriding concern had been unity in the empire, his initial reaction to hearing about the controversy had been simply to try to match a single perspective on God with harmony in the empire” (Van Dam, 273)

Constantine may have decided to side with Anti-Arians because he was hostile toward Eusebius of Nicomedia, a follower of Arius. Eusebius had befriended Lucinius who had once been in power over the Balkans. Eusebius openly supported Arius and he thought that the bishop, Lucinius, should have a powerful position in regards to ecclesiastical affairs. Eusebius was quite entangled within the political sphere of Lucinius. When Constantine overtook the Balkans, Eusebius’ political loyalties may have had a part in Constantine’s rejection of Eusebius’ religious standing at the Council of Nicaea (Van Dam, 274).

Eusebius of Nicomedia was exiled shortly following the Council of Nicaea which further

points to this possible political rift between Constantine and Eusebius. He was accused of spying on Constantine and helping Lucinius by recruiting armed men to go against Constantine. A few years later, Constantine allowed Eusebius back as a bishop and the council let him back in as well. It was Eusebius who baptized the emperor on his deathbed in 337 (Van Dam, 274).

Constantine's presence also had an effect on free discussions within the council because he pushed so hard for unity among the members, bringing up certain points for discussion.

Stakes went up in defining orthodoxy because the churchmen were also fighting for the emperor's patronage (Van Dam, 262) Eusebius of Caesarea, who initially agreed with Arianism, joined the emperor in his proposition of homoousios and he benefitted greatly from it. He received 50 Bibles scribed and was offered the job of bishop of Antioch from the emperor. He altered his theological terminology in order to stay on the emperor's good side (Van Dam, 278). The high stakes is easily identified when looking at Secundus of Ptolemais and Theonas of Marmarice, two bishops who could not bring themselves to sign the creed out of doctrinal conviction. The council had the excommunicated and the emperor deported them out of Egypt (Jones, 165).

Constantine's overwhelming pressure within the council and his introduction of homoousios in order to find a middle ground severely skewed the council doctrinally. The bishop's intimidation mixed with a desire to rid the council of Arianism resulted in many voting for a creed that they felt was not doctrinally correct. After its acceptance, the creed was made law by Constantine and anyone who stepped out against the creed was punishable by death, thus pushing forth this politically influenced doctrine among the entire empire.

Nicene Creed

The Nicene Creed was developed during the Council of Nicaea based on the discussions led by Constantine. It contains the Trinitarian concepts introduced to the council from Eusebius of Caesarea's Creed and Constantine's term homoousios. The Creed was originally created in Greek, then Latin and later was translated into English. The translations are as follows.

Greek

Πιστεύω εἰς ἓνα Θεόν, Πατέρα, Παντοκράτορα, ποιητὴν οὐρανοῦ καὶ γῆς, ᾠρατὴν τε πάντων καὶ ἀοράτων.

Καὶ εἰς ἓνα Κύριον Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν, τὸν Υἱὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ τὸν μονογενῆ, τὸν ἐκ τοῦ Πατρὸς γεννηθέντα πρὸ πάντων τῶν αἰώνων·

φῶς ἐκ φωτός, Θεὸν ἀληθινὸν ἐκ Θεοῦ ἀληθινοῦ, γεννηθέντα οὐ ποιηθέντα, ὁμοούσιον τῷ Πατρί, δι' οὗ τὰ πάντα ἐγένετο.

Τὸν δι' ἡμῶς τοῦς ἄνθρώπους καὶ διὰ τὴν ἡμετέραν σωτηρίαν κατελθόντα ἐκ τῶν οὐρανῶν καὶ σαρκωθέντα

ἐκ Πνεύματος ἁγίου καὶ Μαρίας τῆς Παρθένου καὶ ἑνανθρωπήσαντα.

Σταυρωθέντα τε ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν ὑπὸ Ποντίου Πιλάτου, καὶ παθόντα καὶ ταφέντα.

Καὶ ἀναστάντα τῷ τρίτῳ ἡμέρᾳ κατὰ τῆς Γραφάς.

Καὶ ἀνελθόντα εἰς τοὺς οὐρανοὺς καὶ καθεζόμενον ἐκ δεξιῶν τοῦ Πατρὸς.

Καὶ πάλιν ἐρχόμενον μετὰ δόξης κρῖναι ζῶντας καὶ νεκρούς, ὃ τῆς βασιλείας οὐκ ἔσται τέλος.

Καὶ εἰς τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον, τὸ κύριον, τὸ ζωοποιόν, τὸ ἐκ τοῦ Πατρὸς ἐκπορευόμενον,

τὸ σὺν Πατρὶ καὶ Υἱῶ συμπροσκυνούμενον καὶ συνδοξαζόμενον,
τὸ λαλῆσαν διὰ τῶν προφητῶν.
Εἰς μίαν, ὁγίαν, Καθολικὴν καὶ Ἀποστολικὴν Ἐκκλησίαν.
Ὁμολογῶ ἓν βάπτισμα εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν.
Προσδοκῶ ἡνάστασιν νεκρῶν.
Καὶ ζωὴν τοῦ μέλλοντος αἰῶνος.
Ἀμήν.

Latin

Credo in unum Deum,
Patrem omnipotentem,
Factorem cæli et terræ,
Visibilem omnium et invisibilem.
Et in unum Dominum Iesum Christum,
Filium Dei Unigenitum,
Et ex Patre natum ante omnia sæcula.
Deum de Deo, lumen de lumine, Deum verum de Deo vero,
Genitum, non factum, consubstantialē Patri:
Per quem omnia facta sunt.
Qui propter nos homines et propter nostram salutem
Descendit de cælis.
Et incarnatus est de Spiritu Sancto
Ex Mariā Virgine, et homo factus est.
Crucifixus etiam pro nobis sub Pōntio Pilāto;
Passus, et sepultus est,
Et resurrexit tertia die, secundum Scripturas,
Et ascendit in cælum, sedet ad dexteram Patris.
Et iterum venturus est cum gloria,
Iudicare vivos et mortuos,
Cuius regni non erit finis.
Et in Spiritum Sanctum, Dominum et vivificantem:
Qui ex Patre Filioque procedit.
Qui cum Patre et Filio simul adoratur et conglorificatur:
Qui locutus est per prophetas.
Et unam, sanctam, catholicam et apostolicam Ecclesiam.
Confiteor unum baptisma in remissionem peccatorum.
Et expecto resurrectionem mortuorum,
Et vitam venturi sæculi. Amen.

English

Many different versions of the English translation of the Nicene Creed are in circulation in various church denominations. The version that is mostly commonly used in America is as follows.

We believe in one God,
the Father, the Almighty
maker of heaven and earth,
of all that is seen and unseen.

We believe in one Lord, Jesus Christ,
the only Son of God,
eternally begotten of the Father,
God from God, Light from Light,
true God from true God,
begotten, not made,
one in Being with the Father.
Through him all things were made.
For us men and for our salvation
he came down from heaven
by the power of the Holy Spirit
he was born of the Virgin Mary, and became man.
For our sake he was crucified under Pontius Pilate;
he suffered, died, and was buried.
On the third day he rose again
in fulfillment of the Scriptures;
he ascended into heaven
and is seated at the right hand of the Father.
He will come again in glory to judge the living and the dead,
and his kingdom will have no end.

We believe in the Holy Spirit, the Lord, the giver of Life,
who proceeds from the Father and the Son.
With the Father and the Son he is worshiped and glorified.
He has spoken through the Prophets.
We believe in one holy catholic and apostolic Church.
We acknowledge one baptism for the forgiveness of sins.
We look for the resurrection of the dead,
and the life of the world to come. Amen.

Within the Nicene Creed, as with Eusebius' baptismal creed of Caesarea, there is an obvious distinction between the Father, Son and Holy Spirit as being separate beings within the Godhead. Each figure of the Trinity is set in its own paragraph like structure and is discussed separately. The Son of God is described as "eternally begotten of the Father", which insinuates He is not God; He is eternal *with* God. When the Holy Spirit is discussed, the creed says He "proceeds from the Father and Son", insinuating that He is separate from them, not one and the same. This is reiterated with the phrase "With the Father and the Son he is worshipped and glorified", showing a separation of the Godhead into a Trinity of divine beings.

Other Trinitarian themes

The concept of the Trinity may also have been introduced to the Council of Nicaea

because of the issues of the time period. There was a history of tetrarchic theology within the empire that identified emperors with pagan gods; it was commonplace to have equal power figures within one geographical area. When Constantine became the one emperor over the Eastern and Western empire this idea of tetrarchical power came back into discussions. Constantine was identified with God which sparked more discussions about the role of God as the Father and the Son. (Van Dam, 268) The arguments regarding Father and Son relationship could be seen as arguments about the emperor. (Van Dam, 269) In addition, Constantine had the council in Nicaea which was covered in reminders of the tetrarchic times. For example, the mythological founder of Nicaea was Hercules, a deity of the tetrarchy. In addition, the physical room in which the council was held was built by a Tetrarch emperor and was filled with tetrarchic symbols (Van Dam, 270).

Relation/significance for contemporary society or education

The Council of Nicaea and its implications on the Christian and secular world is significant to education and society as a whole. The fundamental doctrines of Christianity were changed through political influence and those changes spread through to modern Christian beliefs. This idea that knowledge can be constructed through non-academic forces of the past should be consequential in the minds of teachers as they are doing research or imparting 'knowledge' to their students. It begs the question of what is knowledge and who decides what is to be taken as fact. Although the case of Constantine in the Council of Nicaea is somewhat obvious, other issues or topics that teachers research may have more subtle biases that need to be watched for.

Some educators believe that since it is somewhat impossible to prove certain facts are facts, especially in regards to History, relativism should be used to some extent in teaching students. This is the idea that nothing is absolute and what might be true for one person may be untrue for another. I think a middle ground should be taken between relativism and acceptance of any source as knowledge. Teachers should be careful in what sources they use for their information, choosing credible sources and students should be taught within the framework of what our modern society considers knowledge. However students should be given the understanding that knowledge is sometimes refuted and that all sources have some biases.

As for modern society, the idea that the Council of Nicaea changed church history is extremely significant. A change in doctrine that is universally accepted and expected by authority figures pressures and affects the belief systems of a multitude of people. A doctrine that is widely accepted and pushed on a population will infiltrate into the society and thought patterns of citizens until it becomes a social norm. The doctrines accepted in the Nicene Creed permeate most churches in the modern West.

The study of the Council of Nicaea also shows the continuity and change within History, which is important in the study of history. The doctrines of the 4th century church had schisms since the beginning of the 1st century. There was some sense of continuity within the Monarchians leading up to Marcellus of Ancyra regarding the unity of the Godhead. There were also leaders such as Alexander of Alexandria, and Novation and Lactantius of the West, who strayed from the original doctrines while keeping some of the ideas. And there were the leaders

such as Arius who strayed to the opposite spectrum of the doctrine. The Council was the moment in time where the mix of continuity and change came to a head in an attempt to reverse the schisms caused by the various changes in doctrine throughout history.