

a compromise will be effected between the homoousian and the homoiousian parties. It essentially amounted to the latter accepting the doctrine of the former but with a softening in terminology. The position of the more extreme Aetians became untenable and obviously moved more and more from the center of the issue. Thus as the logical outgrowth of Arianism became more clear, the center of the church moved from it and the scattered wings of the community were enabled to bring themselves together. It is a fascinating account of movements among people and their goals. But it spawned nearly fifty years of strife for the church...all of which did not really help in achieving the goals for which Christianity is committed.

IV.2.a Church
Struggles: The
Great Councils.

The First Council of Constantinople, 381

Constantinople

The issue confronting this council is known as Appollinarianism...and I often misspell it so you may want to look it up! The council was convened in 381 at the call of Theodosius and was a much smaller gathering in form and apparently never had the constitutional aim of being ecumenical...although in fact it was just that although no western fathers were there...their interest and expressions were there. The problem in the theology of Appollinaris was almost totally an eastern problem but the creed developed to express the orthodox opinion has been received as one of the strong creeds of the church and is regarded as a universal Christian symbol. The spiritual direction of the council was given largely by the Cappadocian fathers with Gregory of Nazianzus chairing the sessions. It is noteworthy in church history that this council is remembered for the devotion and piety of the members more than for its survival or party in-fighting or territorial disputes.

The issue

Appollinaris (Apollinaris, also Appollinarius, etc.) the Younger had served as bishop of Laodicea but was removed from office in 375 due to his teachings on the person of Christ. He seems to have been born about 310 and his writings, like those of Arius, are found mostly in the quotes of those writing against him. But there is enough to allow us to get a grip on his teaching. Reacting to the Arian problem he asserted that Christ was fully God but not essentially human. His conclusion was