History & Theology – Church History

Class 2: **Constantine, Councils, and Creeds (313-451)**

## **Main Point:**

* Through a series of challenges to biblical doctrine, churches would confirm the Bible’s teaching on the Trinity and the Person of Christ.

##

## **Class Goals:**

* Explain the circumstances that led to Christianity’s favored status in the Roman Empire
* Distinguish between the Council of Nicea and Council of Constantinople and their contributions to the Nicene Creed
* Contrast the errors of Adoptionism, Modalism, and Arianism with orthodox belief
* Explain the difference between *homoousios and homoiousios*
* Demonstrate how the Hypostatic Union defies both Apollinarianism and Nestorianism

# Introduction

We ended last week discussing Polycarp and the nature of many persecutions Christians faced in the first centuries following Jesus’ ascension.

You’ll remember from last week, that the Roman Empire was in decline and various forms of persecution by Roman Emperors were in an attempt to cleanse their society from this godless or seditious sect known as Christians. (Citation - Chadwick). Many were motivated to restore Rome to its former glory, and they saw these Christians as being unwilling to give proper allegiance to Rome and its Emperor.

Nevertheless, we saw that Jesus’ words were true “you will be delivered before kings for my name's sake.” Yet, despite all this regional persecution, the gospel spread. The forces that aimed to oppose Christianity aided the spread of the good news.

But something that also grew during these early centuries was error or false teaching. The rise of false teaching is observed in the pages of scripture and, sadly, it grew through times of persecution. At times, persecution gave occasion for new forms of unbelief. These occasions would spark new controversies in the life of the church as Christian belief made its way through the Roman empire. These circumstances surround our discussion in today’s class where we’ll consider Emperor Constantine and three Ecumenical Councils.

We refer to an Ecumenical Council as a gathering of Christian leaders from the whole Christian world to discuss matters of doctrine and practice.[[1]](#footnote-0) The Eastern Orthodox, Roman Catholic, and Protestant churches all recognize the confessions of the first four ecumenical councils.[[2]](#footnote-1)

This morning, we’ll consider what happened as Christians moved from persecuted to favored in the Roman Empire. We’ll also examine what opportunities and challenges Christians faced with their new status and in what ways Christian belief was clarified and defined against heresy as Jesus continued to build his church according to his promise.

# Constantine and Imperial Christianity

## Constantine’s “Vision” and Victory (312)

From the beginnings of the church through the early 300s, Christians faced persecution that at times was quite severe.[[3]](#footnote-2) And as we heard last week, the persecution ebbed and flowed based on location and emperor. Changes were on the horizon for Christian.

To better control the fledgling empire, its territories were divided into regions with an emperor appointed over each region (citation). Sometimes these would go well (example) and other times they wouldn’t (example). Often this would result in dueling emperors or emperors who wouldn’t recognize the legitimacy of another. Such was the case between two emperors Maxentius and Constantine.

From 306 to 312, Maxentius ruled the part of the Empire that spans modern day Italy through North Africa. He was known as a prolific builder and he worked to restore the city of Rome to its former fame and power.[[4]](#footnote-3) However, in 312 - Constantine and Maxentius vied for control over Western parts of the Roman Empire.[[5]](#footnote-4) Constantine crossed the Alps heading toward Rome in hopes of defeating Maxentius, who was in Rome.[[6]](#footnote-5)

What’s notable for our purposes, is in the prelude to a defining battle between Constantine and Maxentius, Constantine experienced some type of sign or dream that he interpreted as a message from the Christian God saying that “in this sign you will conquer”, referring to the sign of the Cross.[[7]](#footnote-6) Later, on October 28, 312, the six year anniversary of Maxentius ascension[[8]](#footnote-7) - Constantine and Maxentius met at the Milvian Bridge that crossed the Tiber River into the northern part of the city of Rome.[[9]](#footnote-8) There, Constantine soundly defeated Maxentius for control over a large swath of the Roman Empire.[[10]](#footnote-9) Constantine credited his important victory to the Christian God and decided to embrace Christianity.[[11]](#footnote-10)

## The Edict of Milan (313) and Toleration for Christianity

### The Edict of Milan

Around a year after Constantine’s victory, in 313 Constantine and the Eastern emperor Licinius made a proclamation, known to history as the *Edict of Milan,* that granted toleration for Christians in the West and the East of the Empire.[[12]](#footnote-11)

 Here’s what one historian says about this declaration, “The letter is noteworthy in several respects. For one thing it deals not only with Christianity but with all forms of religious worship practiced in the empire. To assure ‘reverence for the divinity,’ Licinius wrote, ‘we grant both to Christians and to all men the freedom to follow whatever religion each one wished.’ Second, it goes beyond toleration and adumbrates in a few phrases a new understanding of religious freedom. Each person should be granted the freedom "*to give his mind to the religion which he felt was most fitting to himself? Because the supreme divinity is to be served with a ‘free mind,’ the worship of God cannot be coerced; it must be an act of the will and arise out of genuine devotion and piety*.”[[13]](#footnote-12)

Wilken continues, “The philosophical underpinnings of this decree can be found in a Christian author by the name of Lactantius. In his defense of Christianity he had argued that Christianity should be tolerated not because there are many ways to God, the conventional defense of religious toleration. Rather Lactantius believed that coercion is inimical to the nature of religion. *He offered a theological rationale for religious freedom rooted in the nature of God.* Religion has to do with love of God and purity of mind, neither of which can be imposed or coerced. ‘Why should a god love a person who does not feel love in return?’ he asks. Religion must be ‘voluntary.’ ‘Nothing’ he writes, ‘requires freedom of the will as religion? *This understanding came to shape later Western ideas of religious freedom.*’”[[14]](#footnote-13)

### Results of the Edict of Milan

It’s difficult to overstate the importance of the Edict of Milan. As a result, Christianity moved from a persecuted sect to a favored religion.[[15]](#footnote-14) An edict by emperors owed much of its logic to a Christian writer. And, it was not long after that in 381, The Roman Emperor Theodosius I declared Christianity the official religion of the Roman Empire[[16]](#footnote-15)

What would Christians make of this new, celebrated status? Certainly, we can sympathize with Christian of that time who would’ve celebrated such a favored status. Many saw it as a great blessing of God and fruits from their labors in evangelism. As we will see, there were several benefits of this change.[[17]](#footnote-16) But it would also present new challenges. How well did the emperor understand Christian belief? How did Christian practice accord with the affairs of the Roman state? These all were relevant questions amid Christianity’s new status in Rome. As Robert Wilken says,

“For the ancient Greeks and Romans, religion was an affair of rituals and practices, not doctrine. Christians, however, not only believed *in* God, they also believed *that* God had created the world, that human beings are made in the image of God, that Christ, the divine son, had become man, suffered, died, and rose from the dead, that at the end of time there would be a general resurrection. In other words, they claimed that certain things were true, and these truths required precise language to say clearly and unambiguously what was meant.”[[18]](#footnote-17)

Through these circumstances, orthodoxy would be clarified for churches but other lines would be blurred.

Before we move on, are there any questions about Constantine’s ascent or the Edict of Milan?

In matters of doctrine, Christians had always focused on right belief. The Bible gives us formulaic language to speak about God. Consider 1 Corinthians 8:6, “There is one God, the Father, from whom are all things and for whom we exist, and one Lord, Jesus Christ, through whom are all things and through whom we exist.” Yet, in most cultures and contexts, fundamental Christian beliefs are challenged. Many have found it necessary to publish measured language to clarify and confirm what the Bible teaches, and to reject what the Bible does not teach.[[19]](#footnote-18) We’ll now consider the three most consequential Ecumenical Councils that produced three creeds Christians around the world affirm today.[[20]](#footnote-19)

As we do consider this. In a 2016 survey, 71% of American evangelicals agreed with the statement that “Jesus is the first and greatest being created by God.”[[21]](#footnote-20) Are American evangelicals believing something new? Or, has the church dealt with this belief before? This belief -- God created Jesus -- was the first issue that prompted an Ecumenical Council.

# Theology of the Trinity: One God in Three Persons

## Council of Nicea (325) - Is Jesus God?

The early church grappled with two biblical truths: 1) The belief in one God (monotheism), and 2) the belief in Jesus’ divinity. On these two matters, early churches faced an apparent problem. How is there one God and yet the Father and Son are God? Over time multiple explanations emerged. And, now, with the favored status of Christianity we discussed earlier, these views would be circulated widely and several churches and sometimes entire regions of the Roman empire would align themselves with various views. Adoptionism, Modalism, and Arianism each tried to offer a solution to this question.

### Adoptionism

Adoptionism is the belief that Mary gave birth to Jesus of Nazareth as a mere man and only later in life – either at his baptism or at his resurrection – did God adopt Jesus as the divine Son of God. Early church father Hippolytus (d. ca. 235) summarized this belief of others:

“Jesus was a (mere) man, born of a virgin, according to the counsel of the Father. After he had lived indiscriminately with all men and had become preeminently religious, he subsequently – at his baptism in the Jordan River – received Christ.”[[22]](#footnote-21)

What are some problems with this belief?[[23]](#footnote-22) It reduces Jesus to a mere human, leaving original sin unaddressed. Because of this, Jesus cannot be our substitute.

### Modalism[[24]](#footnote-23)

Modalism is the belief that the Father, Son, and Spirit amounted to three different names or modes for the same God. Again, Hippolytus (d. ca. 235) summarized this belief professed by Callistus:

“And he maintains that the Father is not one person while the Son is another, but that they are one and the same.... And he affirms that the Spirit, which became incarnate in the virgin, is not different from the Father, but is one and the same.”[[25]](#footnote-24)

The popular analogy of fire, ice, and steam as three forms of water is Modalist. It argues for 3 states of being or manifestations of one substance. It fails to adequately distinguish between Father, Son, and Spirit. Instead, modalism holds that God had different modes of appearing. It fails to account for the eternal existence of God as Father, Son, and Spirit.

As it fails to account for the three persons in God, modalism implies that God the Father suffered on the cross a view known as Patripassianism. Further, modalism fails to account for the interaction between Father, Son, and Spirit. For these reasons and more modalism is a serious heresy, and is still present today in so-called denominations such as Oneness Pentecostalism.[[26]](#footnote-25)

### Arianism

The controversy over Arianism was perhaps the greatest theological controversy in the history of Christianity.[[27]](#footnote-26) Named after one of its early proponents, Arius, Arianism holds that “there was a time when the Son did not exist” meaning that Jesus constituted a creature of God.[[28]](#footnote-27) In a letter to Eusebius, Bishop of Nicomedia, Arius writes:

“what we say and think we both have taught and continue to teach; that the Son is not unbegotten, nor part of the unbegotten in any way, nor is he derived from any substance; but that by his own will and counsel he existed before times and ages fully God, only-begotten, unchangeable.”

“And before he was begotten or created or appointed or established, he did not exist; for he was not unbegotten. We are persecuted because we say that the Son has a beginning, but God is without beginning. For that reason we are persecuted, and because we say that he is from what is not. And this we say because he is neither part of God nor derived from any substance. For this we are persecuted; the rest you know.”[[29]](#footnote-28)

Later at a gathering of bishops, it’s reported that Arius said:

“If the Father begat the Son, he that was begotten had a beginning of existence; hence it is clear that there was [a time] when[[30]](#footnote-29) the Son was not. It follows then of necessity that he had existence from the non-existent.”[[31]](#footnote-30)

Additionally, Arius is reputed to have taught[[32]](#footnote-31):

“The Word of God was not from eternity, but was made out of nothing..... Wherefore there was a time when he did not exist, inasmuch as the Son is a creature and a work... He is neither like the Father as it regards his essence.”[[33]](#footnote-32)

As one who opposed Arius’ teaching, Athanasius in *De synodis 16* cited Arius as having written:

“He is not eternal or co-eternal to the Father, nor is he without beginning as the Father is, nor does he possess a being parallel to the Father’s.”[[34]](#footnote-33)

Arius taught that God the Father created the Son. He held there was a time when the Son did not exist, and that the Son was subordinate to the Father.[[35]](#footnote-34) Amidst such teaching, Arius and his followers sought to maintain monotheism.[[36]](#footnote-35) Arius, also, proved to be very persuasive. Historians say that Arius was an exceptional marketer. He set his theology to song and it’s said half of Alexandria was singing “There was a time when the Son was not.”[[37]](#footnote-36)

What are the implications of Arianism? By arguing the Son was a created being, the Son is not truly God. Worshiping Jesus, then, is idolatry (as Athanasius agrues) as a being God created is worshiped rather than God himself.[[38]](#footnote-37) It results in Polytheism if both the Father and Son are held to be God but distinct beings or essences two gods are worshiped as opposed to one. Arianism unwarily divides and subordinates the Father and Son. It’s worth noting these inconsistencies of Arianism are still present today in Jehovah’s Witnesses.[[39]](#footnote-38)

### The Council Convenes

With such teachings spreading among churches throughout the empire, Emperor Constantine saw the intense theological dispute as a source of political disunity in the Empire.[[40]](#footnote-39) Constantine called the church together for a council at the city of Nicea (near modern day Istanbul, Turkey).[[41]](#footnote-40) The council was composed of around 250 bishops.[[42]](#footnote-41)

### Confession & Theology of Nicea

Debate and discussion would take months. But ultimately the first Nicean Creed would be constructed against all three of the heresies we’ve mentioned, but its primary target would be Arianism as it has the largest following amongst the Roman empire. The Nicene Creed (325) contains three articles of faith as well as four explicit condemnations of Arian views:[[43]](#footnote-42)

“[1st article] We believe in one God, the Father, the almighty, the maker of all things seen and unseen.

[2nd article] And [we believe] in one Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of God; begotten from the Father; only-begotten – that is, from the substance of the Father; God from God; light from light; true God from true God; begotten not made; being of one substance with the Father; through whom all things in heaven and on earth came into being; who on account of us human beings and our salvation came down and took flesh, becoming a human being; He suffered and rose again on the third day, ascended into the heavens; And will come again to judge both the living and the dead.

[3rd article] And [we believe] in the Holy Spirit.

[Four Condemnations:] As for those who say that [1st] “there was [a time] when he was not”, and [2nd] “before being born, he was not,” and [3rd] “he came into existence out of nothing,” or [4th] who declare that the Son of God is of a different substance or nature, or is subject to alteration or change – the catholic and apostolic church condemns them.”[[44]](#footnote-43)

We can see the heresies of Adoptionism and Modalism rejected. The various heresies of Arianism were clearly and repeatedly condemned. As if the three articles weren’t clear enough, the four condemnations all aimed at Arianism.

Positively the Nicene Creed asserts that Jesus Christ, the eternal Son, is of the same substance as the Father—both are God. The Greek word here is *homoousios* is translated “of the *same* substance.” This term was used instead of *homoiousios* meaning “of *like* substance.”[[45]](#footnote-44)By exercising such care and attention, the creed affirms that divine person of Jesus Christ eternally existed, meaning he was not made. Further it affirms that this eternally existent Son took on flesh in the incarnation.

As with all sound creeds and confessions, Nicea did not invent the doctrine that Jesus was God. Christians believed this well before Nicea.[[46]](#footnote-45)

## Council of Constantinople (381)

### Arianism Grows

The influence of Arianism didn’t subside after this first council. Though officially the Nicene consensus of 325 remained unquestioned. Debates about Arianism continued. A major challenge stemmed from the different language groups in the Roman Empire. The Latin speaking West was often at odds with the Greek speaking East. This is one reason councils took so long to form and deliberate. It took time to understand what was behind any one issue and it took more time to have nuanced discussions.[[47]](#footnote-46) All this was further complicated by Constantine who in 332, Constantine restored Arius as a bishop.[[48]](#footnote-47)

Through the influence of Eusebius of Nicomedia and others in proximity to the court, Arius’s teaching was viewed more favorably in parts of the Empire. Arius even appealed successfully to Eusebius to help silence dissenters.[[49]](#footnote-48)

Constantine died in 337. He planned for the empire to be ruled again as a tetrarchy. But the army refused to comply with Constantine’s wishes resulting in Constantine’s three sons taking parts of the empire amid controversy. They struggled to relate to one another, and this political turmoil resulted in ecclesiastical confusion.[[50]](#footnote-49)

Emperor Constantine’s son and successor in the East, Constantius strongly advocated for the *homoiousios* positionand this movement grew dramatically.[[51]](#footnote-50) Through his and Eusebius’s influence, it’s Possible that most of the Roman Empire could have settled on *homoiousios* and not *homoousios.*

Athanasius, an ardent defender of 325 Nicaean orthodoxy, was exiled five times for a total of 17 years after the Council of Nicaea due to his support of *homoousios.*[[52]](#footnote-51) The swell of Arian theology after Nicea grew so strong some later coined the phrase *Athanasius Contra Mundum* (Athanasius against the world).[[53]](#footnote-52) In his exile, Athanasius was able to cultivate support for the Nicene formula in the West.[[54]](#footnote-53) As Athanasius’s influence grew, things would change in the East with the death of Eusebius of Nicomedia (now Constantinople). Some bishops would take a more conciliatory view and work for an end to the conflict. However, the empire was still divided. Constantius ruling the East while his brother, Constans, gained sole authority of the western provinces in 340. Debate among bishops would continue, but Athanasius’s defense would steadily gain ground in the East.

The emperor of the East that followed Constantius in 361 sought to bring a pagan revival. But his reign was short and he died in 363. Two emperors later from 364 to 378, the East was ruled by Valens who showed favoritism to Arianism. But by this time in the churches the “tide was running in the direction of the Nicene cause.”[[55]](#footnote-54) Respect for Athanasius’ view had grown, and it was time for him to pass the mantle to the Cappadocian Fathers who would further explicate Nicene orthodoxy (Basil bishop of Caesarea, Gregory Nazianzen, and Gregory bishop of Nyssa).

### Doctrine of the Holy Spirit

Among the growth of Arianism after the council of Nicea. Another view had gained ground as well. That of the *Pneumatomachi* or “Spirit Fighters.” These teachers denied that the Holy Spirit was God.[[56]](#footnote-55) So in addition to stomping out the fires of Arianism, the Cappadocians would also argue for the deity of the Spirit.[[57]](#footnote-56)

### Convening the Council

After a decades of tumult among emperors and uncertainty for orthodox Christian belief throughout the empire, the tide was running steadily toward Nicene orthodoxy, and all that was lacking was an emperor in the East to call the council. Theodosius I, who like Constantine before became sole emperor of the Empire, called the council to Constantinople (modern day Istanbul).[[58]](#footnote-57)

### Confession & Theology of Constantinople

The creed at Constantinople further clarified the 325 creed. As it’s view as confirming the work of the prior council this creed written 56 years after the first is often referred to as the Nicene Creed:[[59]](#footnote-58)

“We believe in one God, the Father Almighty, Maker of heaven and earth, and of all things visible and invisible.

And in one Lord Jesus Christ, the only-begotten Son of God, begotten of the Father before all worlds, Light of Light, very God of very God, begotten, not made, being of one substance with the Father; by whom all things were made; who for us men, and for our salvation, came down from heaven, and was incarnate by the Holy Ghost of the Virgin Mary, and was made man; he was crucified for us under Pontius Pilate, and suffered, and was buried, and the third day he rose again, according to the Scriptures, and ascended into heaven, and sitteth on the right hand of the Father; from thence he shall come again, with glory, to judge the quick and the dead; whose kingdom shall have no end.

And in the Holy Ghost, the Lord and Giver of life, who proceedeth from the Father[[60]](#footnote-59), who with the Father and the Son together is worshiped and glorified, who spake by the prophets. In one holy catholic and apostolic Church; we acknowledge one baptism for the remission of sins; we look for the resurrection of the dead, and the life of the world to come. Amen.”[[61]](#footnote-60)

As we can see, this adopted creed affirmed the Nicene orthodoxy of 325 while aiming to improve upon its consensus. The heresy of Arianism again rejected.[[62]](#footnote-61) And it affirmed that the Holy Spirit is to be worshiped with the Father & Son—He is God—Rejecting the heresy of the *Pneumatomachi*.

So, what lessons can we draw from this early controversy? The ascendency of Christianity in the Roman empire led to greater acceptance for Christian belief while also magnifying problems with churches. It’s difficult to determine the motives of emperors in promoting various strands of Christian belief or various heresies. However, what remains from these conflicts is an enduring statement of Christian belief. Building on the formulaic language of the Bible and the work of early pastors, we have a statement of Christian orthodoxy that’s been affirmed for centuries. Ours is the same faith and, in many ways, we owe this historical certainty to the toleration and celebration of Christianity in the late Roman empire.

# Theology of Christ: One Person, Two Natures

## Council of Chalcedon (451) - How is Jesus Both God and Man?[[63]](#footnote-62)

With the Nicene Creed adopted by most churches in the Empire the question turned to the person of Christ. How is Jesus both God and man? Nicaea affirmed that Jesus was God. Now the question was, “how is Jesus also man?”

As the case with Arianism, so too became the case with arguing for Jesus’ humanity. Rival schools of thought emerged. As bishops and churches sought to clarify the faith. What emerged in this controversy were two different ways of thinking about how Jesus was both God and man. Two schools of thought emerged associated with two cities in the Roman Empire. To put matters simply, the Alexandrians emphasized Jesus’ divinity and the unity of the divine nature of Christ. The Antiochenes emphasized Jesus’ humanity and distinction of human and divine natures of Christ.

Both as we will see had their attendant difficulties.

### Alexandria (Emphasize Unity)

 The Alexandrian school emphasizes the unity of the divine and human nature in Jesus. But one strand of thought emerged amongst the Alexandrians that would pose problems. Named after Apollinarius of Laodicea, Apollonarianism holds that Jesus had one nature with a divine mind and human body (i.e. no human mind).[[64]](#footnote-63) The tendencies for the Apollinarians were to emphasize Jesus divinity over his humanity. The problem that followed was if Jesus wasn’t fully human then how could he redeem mankind? As famously articulated by Gregory of Nazianzan: “What has not been assumed has not been healed, but what is united to the Godhead is also saved”[[65]](#footnote-64)

### Antioch (Emphasize Distinction)

On the other hand, the Antiochene school of thought emphasized the distinctions between human and divine natures in Jesus. Within this school, Nestorianism emerged. It’s adherents argued that Jesus had two separate and distinct natures: human and divine.[[66]](#footnote-65) This system of thought was named after Nestorius, Bishop of Constantinople.[[67]](#footnote-66) Yet, many emphasized these distinctions so much that it essentially treated Jesus as two separate people.

Nestorius vehemently rejected calling Mary *Theotokos* (mother of God) and instead insisted on calling her *Christokos* (mother of Christ) emphasizing the distinction of Jesus’ human and divine natures.[[68]](#footnote-67) Here, Nestorius saw *Theotokos* as implying either Arianism (the Son is a creature born of a woman) or Apollinarianism (the manhood of Jesus was completed by the presence of the word)[[69]](#footnote-68)

However, in response to Nestorius and his objections over *theotokos*, Cyril said, “If Mary is not, strictly speaking the Mother of God, then the one who was born from her is not, strictly speaking, God.”[[70]](#footnote-69) Though not discussed in detail here, Nestorianism was condemned at the Council of Ephesus in 431.[[71]](#footnote-70)

### Convening the Council

In these intervening years after the Council of Constantinople and before the Council of Chalcedon, debates would grow among churches. Now, 80 years after Nicene orthodoxy was settled at Constantinople, a new Council was called in 481 and was attended by about 500 bishops.[[72]](#footnote-71)

### Confession & Theology Explained - Hypostatic Union

The confession from Council of Chalcedon (451) reads,[[73]](#footnote-72)

“Following the holy fathers, we confess with one voice that the one and only Son, our Lord Jesus Christ, is perfect in Godhead and perfect in manhood, truly God and truly man, and that he has a rational soul and a body. He is of one substance [*homoousios*] with the Father as God, he is of one substance [*homoousios*] with us as man. He is like us in all things except sin. He was begotten of His Father before the ages as God, but in these last days and for our salvation he was born of Mary the virgin, the *theotokos*, as man. This one and the same Christ, Son, Lord, Only-begotten is made known in two natures [which exist] without confusion, without change, without division, without separation. The distinction of the natures is in no way taken away by their union, but rather the distinctive properties of each nature are preserved. [Both natures] unite into one person and one hypostasis [that is, substance]. They are not separated or divided into two persons but [they form] one and the same Son, Only-begotten, God, Word, Lord Jesus Christ, just as the prophets of old [have spoken] concerning him as the Lord Jesus Christ himself has taught us and as the creed of the fathers has delivered to us.”[[74]](#footnote-73)

Here, Apollinarianism and Nestorianism are rejected as heresy. The *Hypostatic Union* is explained and affirmed. The Hypostatic Union is the joining of the divine and the human natures in the one person of Jesus.[[75]](#footnote-74) What this means is that the person of Jesus has two complete natures—one truly human and one truly divine. Yet, Jesus is not two persons. He is one person.

In Jesus’ earthly ministry, we observe the unity of these two natures in Jesus’ person and work. What is true of one nature is true of the person. Jesus was tired according to human nature. Jesus raised Lazarus to life according to his divine nature.

Consider, what are the dangers of reducing Jesus’ humanity? If Jesus isn’t truly human he can’t be a human substitute and he can’t be humanity’s representative. On the other hand, consider the dangers of reducing Jesus’ divinity. He is not a perfect divine sacrifice. Apart from his divine nature he can’t fully satisfy the wrath of God.

The Council of Chalcedon marked one of the first great splits within Christianity.[[76]](#footnote-75) Unlike the Nicene Creed that would be affirmed by a majority of the Christian world by 381. The Chalcedonian controversy would last for more than two hundred years.[[77]](#footnote-76) Egyptian Copts, Syrian and Ethiopian Orthodox, and some other traditions rejected the doctrine of Chalcedon.[[78]](#footnote-77) That is, they rejected *Hypostatic Union* as described by the Chalcedonian Creed.

# Conclusion

Confessions play an important role in the church. They articulate a shared understanding of what the Bible teaches. They set boundaries for right and wrong doctrine. They demonstrate points of continuity with saints before us. They show that the doctrines of the Trinity and Nature of Jesus have eternal consequences.

The Nicene Creeds affirm the Bible teaching on the doctrine of the Trinity. There is one God eternally existent as three persons. The Bible doesn’t teach Adoptionism, which teaches Father adopted Son as God. Nor does the Bible teach Modalism, which teaches Father, Son, and Spirit three modes. And the Bible rejects Arianism, which teaches Jesus created by God. We affirm that Jesus is *homoousios* (of the same substance) with the Father. The divine person of Jesus eternally existed, and was not created

The Chalcedonian Creed helps define our doctrine of Christ. With it we hold that Jesus is truly God and truly man in one person. The Bible is not Apollinarian, which teaches Jesus had one nature with a divine mind and human body. Nor does it teach Nestorianism, which hold Jesus had two separate and distinct natures: human and divine. Instead, the Bible affirms the *Hypostatic Union*, the joining of the divine and the human in the one person of Jesus. And further, it means Jesus can really represent God to men and men to God (Hebrews 2:14-17).

As we’ve seen, the road to establishing these doctrines was full of drama and intrigue—but through it, God was caring for His church. Surely from this period in the history of the church we can see the enduring significance of Jesus’ words. He builds his church, and the gates of hell did not prevail against it. Doctrine was clarified and this significance of Jesus’ incarnation defended. By such efforts and through such circumstances hope for the world was extended and Jesus built his church.
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