

~~between~~ ence between the east and the west, as far as the theological problems at this time were concerned. That in the east the people were very interested in the understanding, the details, of the relation of Christ to ~~the~~ the Father and a desire to go into matters, which perhaps, we don't have the intelligence to understand, certainly we don't have the data to understand. And they became very heated over these matters. Whereas in the west, the tendency was simply to take the great outstanding facts of the Scripture on these particular points, and not to be so interested in trying to find a complete explanation of them. And in the west there was more of an attitude, what does the Bible say, well, let's stand on that without trying ~~necessarily~~ necessarily to have it more fully explained. The Bible says that Jesus is God, the Bible says that He is man, the Bible says that there is one God. Well, they were satisfied with that, many of them, without looking further. But ~~they~~ if they looked into Arianism a little bit they could easily see that according to Arianism there was one God, the Father, Jesus Christ you may call God, but according to Arianism He is a created Being and then He created the Holy Spirit. And so you do not have a true deity of Jesus, even if they call Him God and say that He created the world ~~and~~ and came before all things.

So that in the east there was more of an attitude on the part of the bishops of taking sides on this point, and it so happened that Constantius, who was emperor of the east for so many years, before he ~~and~~ became emperor of the whole empire, was the one who took the stand for Arianism while the man in the west did not take that similar stand. Now that might have been partly because Constantius was influenced by the Arian bishops there in the east. During the years that he ruled the whole empire by himself, he would ~~find~~ try to make semi-Arianism supreme all through the empire. And he had council after council and ~~a~~ effort after effort to do it. Now it so happens that in the subsequent years, that we are now looking at, there was a similar situation. There was an emperor in the ^{east} ~~west~~ who reigned from 364 to 379, a period of fifteen years, who gave his support to Arianism. His name was Valens. I do not think that he is nearly as important as Constantius. He is not as important