

Title	On the rehabilitation of Arius
Sub Title	
Author	近山, 金次(Chikayama, Kinji)
Publisher	三田史学会
Publication year	1964
Jtitle	史学 (The historical science). Vol.37, No.2 (1964. 8) ,p.1- 2
JaLC DOI	
Abstract	
Notes	Abstract
Genre	
URL	https://koara.lib.keio.ac.jp/xoonips/modules/xoonips/detail.php?koara_id=AN00100104-19640800-0127

慶應義塾大学学術情報リポジトリ(KOARA)に掲載されているコンテンツの著作権は、それぞれの著作者、学会または出版社/発行者に帰属し、その権利は著作権法によって保護されています。引用にあたっては、著作権法を遵守してご利用ください。

The copyrights of content available on the KeiO Associated Repository of Academic resources (KOARA) belong to the respective authors, academic societies, or publishers/issuers, and these rights are protected by the Japanese Copyright Act. When quoting the content, please follow the Japanese copyright act.

On the rehabilitation of Arius

by Kinji Chikayama

Generally recognized is the fact that the attack against the Creed of Nicaea was not direct nor frank. It had been the strenuous work of Eusebius of Nicomedia. Emperor Constantin the Great seems to have been responsible for its vicissitudes. In fact, he summoned the first oecumenical council, but he failed too in his work, having ordered to rehabilitate Arius into the church. After all, he had been a Roman Emperor, quite regardless of any theological controversy and seemingly an arrogant Pontifex Maximus all his life.

Eusebius of Nicomedia and his followers began to make a long detour in which they pursued two things in a parallel way, to upset the leaders of the Nicæan Creed by rehabilitating Arius thoroughly with his partisans, and to break to pieces the Alexandrian reputation in banishing its bishop, Athanasius.

(1) The Eusebians (so called Eusebius' followers) tried to accuse Alexandrian bishop, that he was elected too young and the electors were somewhat coerced by the people. But their attempt was fruitless (Epist. heort., chronicon, P. G. XXVI, col. 1352; Socrates, H. E. I, 23).

(2) They demanded Alexandrian bishop to receive Arius into the church, but the bishop answered that he could not accept the heresiarch excommunicated in the Oecumenical council. The imperial enjoinder in this case was frustrated too (Athanasius, Apologia contra arianos, LIX-LX).

(3) At the end of 331, the Alexandrian bishop was summoned to Nicomedia on account of the Meletian conspiracy and retained there for a while in a sort of captivity but he succeeded at length in vindicating himself (op. cit., LXI-LXII).

(4) The Meletian tumult at Alexandria induced its bishop to attend the Tyrian council, Jul.-Sept. 335. Dissatisfied with the council, Athanasius went to Constantinople to meet the Great Emperor. In his absence, the Tyrian council proclaimed his banishment and deposition. On the other hand, the bishop was exiled to the west by the Great Emperor. So the Alexandrian reputation was diminished.

(5) Arius was already admitted in the Empire but the Alexandrian church refused decisively to receive him and even showed their rough hostility. Then he was summoned to Constantinople by the Great Emperor who questioned Arius again about his faith.

Suddenly, Arius met his death in the street (Athanasius, Ep. ad Episcopos Aegypti et Libyae; De morte Arii).

(6) In 337 (May 22), the Great Emperor died at Nicomedia, having received his baptism in the hand of Eusebius. Nothing authorizes to say that the Great Emperor abandoned the Nicæan Creed. Nevertheless it is a clear fact that he could not understand the importance of this creed.

We should not say without reserve that the Christian Ages began with Constantine the Great.

The Transformation of English Feudalism in the Early Thirteenth Century

by Keiichiro Morioka

In this brief article, the writer on the analysis of some articles of Magna Carta, intended to make clear how the English Feudalism changed in its structure from its beginnings to this time. Special attentions were paid to the following.

1. The process through which the lords was losing the power of control over their vassals.
2. Some characteristics of Baronial Revolt which lead to the promulgation of Magna Carta.
3. The new tendency in the legal and political thought in this period which played an important role in the making of Magna Carta.