3rd TheolCon The Theology International Conference

PROCEEDINGS OF THE INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE ON THEOLOGY, RELIGION, CULTURE, AND HUMANITIES
Vol. 2, No. 2, December 2025 (257-272)

Exploration about Beliefs of God through Cordiality of the Good Samaritan Parable and *Homoousios* of Nicaea Council

Xalastinus Jasper Hanta [a,1], Samuel Pella [b]
[a,b] *Faculty of Theology, Sanata Dharma University, Indonesia*

[1] Corresponding Email: xalastinusjasperhanta@gmail.com
DOI: https://doi.org/10.24071/tic.v2i2.12141

Abstract

Discussing the Parable of the Good Samaritan, one of the main themes that can be discussed is the theology of cordiality "his heart was moved with compassion". This cordiality is revealed from the actions of the Good Samaritan figure. He helped a victim who needed a helping hand of compassion. Insinuatingly, the actions of the good Samaritan were driven by his cordiality. In the context of the Council of Nicaea, the beliefs about God are summarized in homoousios. The beliefs about God in Jesus are as follows: God who is one in essence and God who is in cordial with human being. This article will discuss the beliefs or spirituality derived from a combined analysis of the cordiality of the Good Samaritan and the concept of homoousios in the Council of Nicaea. The author uses historical-critical analysis and hermeneutic methods. These methods were carried out using library research. From the cordial actions of the Good Samaritan and the concept of homoousios, the author finds concepts and relevancies: Almighty God transcends the limits of human being; but also, Almighty God become human being and moves humans to do cordial acts of love specifically for the marginalized and suffering.

Keywords

Cordiality, Good Samaritan, homoousios, Nicaea Council, Beliefs of God

INRODUCTION

Cordiality and *Homoousios* are two themes discussed in this writing. Cordiality comes from the Latin word '*cor*' which means heart. The understanding of cordiality is taken from the parable of the good Samaritan. This Samaritan has a "heart". The actions of the good Samaritan became Jesus' answer to a scribe on how to be a fellow human being. The scribe asked about who is called a fellow human being. However, Jesus answered him with the parable of the good Samaritan. Jesus then turned to ask the scribe, from the priest, the Levite, and the Samaritan, who is a fellow human being to the victim of the robbery. This shows that Jesus changed the scribe's perspective from the question of who deserves to be called a fellow human being to being a fellow

human being as done by the good Samaritan. In the view of cordiality, the actions of the good Samaritan show an inner disposition as well as a real act of love itself. Cordiality also shows that the inner disposition and acts of love carried out by humans come from God Himself. The Father who sent Jesus into the world to redeem mankind from sin and save mankind is God's work that shows cordiality for mankind.

This understanding of cordiality relates to the concept of *homoousios* in the Council of Nicaea. Etymologically, *homoousios* means the same essence. This theme is one of the topics discussed in the Council of Nicaea. *Homoousios* is used to explain the relationship between Jesus and the Father. Jesus has the same essence as God. Although He has the same essence as God, Jesus, who is the Son, emptied Himself and came into the world, becoming the same as mankind. Jesus became human because of God's abundant love for mankind and to save mankind from the power of sin. These two concepts will be the center of discussion throughout this writing.

RESEARCH METHODS

This paper uses literature study research on the history of both the Bible and the history of the Church. Research on the parable of the good Samaritan uses a historical critical method, especially related to the identity of the Samaritan and his social background. Meanwhile, related to *homoousios*, the method used also uses literature research related to the history and meaning of *homoousios*. This concept, namely the cordiality of the good Samaritan and the meaning of homoousios in the Council of Nicaea, is then combined and sought for common ground with a hermeneutic approach. The goal is to find common ground to collaborate with the meaning of these two themes to produce a more comprehensive idea.

DISCUSSION

The Meaning of Cordiality and The Parable of The Good Samaritan

The Meaning of Cordiality in Theology

Cordiality is one of the interesting themes in the understanding of theology. Cordiality in the English Dictionary written by Martin Manser and Nigel Turton, cordial comes from the Latin root word 'cor' which means heart.[1] Cordial literally means hospitality, kindness or warmth. These two authors then explain that to give a

[1] Martin Manser dan Nigel Turton, "Student's English Dictionary," dalam *Cordial* (United Kingdom: North Parade Publishing, 1987).

warm welcome is to welcome them in a warm and friendly way. Strictly speaking, this action must show a truly deep feeling because cordial comes from the Latin word 'cor' which means heart.

The understanding of cordiality has also begun to be discussed in theology. Thomas Dailey, a Pastoral theologian from the University de la Sales[2] discusses this cordiality in the spirit of Francis of Sales to improve a relationship. The two keywords of Cordiality are Jesus and Love. The human heart is created by God who is Love itself which is essentially good and always oriented originally towards love.[3] However, because it is stained by sin, the human heart must be purified by making Jesus Christ live in its heart. The heart of Jesus must change the human heart. Thomas Watson argues that although sinful humans feel guilty and unworthy of mercy, God has an inexhaustible storehouse of mercy.[4] Moreover, God will not only give mercy but also grace. Therefore, humans are called to respond to this grace.

Cordiality is a topic that is also discussed specifically in Salesian spirituality which is related to the approach to human relationships. In this case cordiality refers to two things, namely the disposition of the heart and actions towards others.[5] Cordiality is a value that expresses the conviction of the human heart. Therefore, in Salesian spirituality, the heart is understood not just as the center of emotions but as the core of the human being. In human relations, the inner disposition and cordial actions shape the approach to each relationship and provide the key to how humans improve their own human relations.

The Parable of the Good Samaritan and Explorations in the Theology of Cordiality

The parable of the Good Samaritan is one of the parables found in the Gospel of Luke. This parable was raised by Jesus in response to a question from a scribe who asked about the first and foremost law. The first and foremost commandment is to love God and others.

[2] Fr Thomas Dailey, "Thomas F. Dailey, OSFS," n.d., 1.

[3] Thomas Dailey, "Cordiality as a Salesian Approach to Healing Relationships," Indian Journal of Spirituality 35, no. 1 (March 2022): 1.

[4] Thomas Watson, "A Divine Cordial, or, The Transcendent Priviledge of Those That Love God and Are Savingly Called...," Thomas Parkhurst, 1809, 6.

[5] Dailey, "Cordiality as a Salesian Approach to Healing Relationships," 4.

The Identity of the Samaritans in the Old and New Testaments

The Samaritans were a group of people in the kingdom of Israel who lived and originated from the city of Samaria. The Old Testament of the Holy Scriptures records the beginning of the formation of the city of Samaria for the first time. The city of Samaria was first built as a new capital in 870 BC by King Omri who ruled the Northern kingdom (cf. 1 Kings 16:24). King Omri built the city of Samaria after successfully establishing a good dynasty and surviving from the period 882-845 BC.

In the Old Testament, the identity of the Samaritan is described in several descriptions. In the book of the Prophet Isaiah, Samaria is mentioned as the capital of the Northern Kingdom as the territory of the tribe of Ephraim (cf. Isa. 7:9).[6] The tribe of Ephraim is one of the twelve tribes of Israel. The tribe of Ephraim has a highly respected position in the tribes of Israel.[7] One of the reasons is because Ephraim has a larger number of members than the other tribes. In the population census, men aged twenty years and over who could go to war numbered 40,500 (cf. Num. 1:19-43).

In addition to the number of members, the tribe of Ephraim also had large cities in its settlement area. In addition to the city of Samaria, the tribe of Ephraim had other large cities such as Shechem and Gilgal.[8] After the Kingdom of Israel split into the kingdoms of Israel and Judah, the tribe of Ephraim became the representation of the Northern Kingdom. According to SJ Shultz, for two centuries, the Northern Kingdom was often referred to as the kingdom of Ephraim because it emerged from the reflection of the fact that this tribe was the strongest opposition to the kingdom of Judah.[9] Of the large cities in the territory occupied by the tribe of Ephraim, Samaria was made the capital of the Northern Kingdom by King Omri.

Apart from being the center of the kingdom, the city of Samaria was also the place where several kings of the kingdom of Israel were buried. King Omri, the founder of the city of Samaria, was buried in this city of Samaria.[10]Apart from Omri,

[6] Pontas Surya Fernandes. "Tinjauan Historis terhadap Eksistensi dan Perkembangan Efraim." *Logon Zeos: Jurnal Teologi, Sosial dan Budaya* 4 (2021), 62.

[7] Pontas Surya Fernandes, 59.

[8] Pontas Surya Fernandes, 62.

[9] S.J. Schultz, "Ephraim," dalam MC. Tenney (ed.), *The Zondervan Pictoral Encyclopedia of the Bible,* 2:333.

[10] Pontas Surya Fernandes. "Tinjauan Historis terhadap Eksistensi dan Perkembangan Efraim." 61

one of the Kings buried in Samaria was King Joash.[11] Previously, Joash also ruled as king over Israel in Samaria.

"Then Omri rested with his ancestors and was buried in Samaria; after Joash rested with his ancestors, Jeroboam sat on his father's throne. And Joash was buried in Samaria next to the king of Israel." (1 Kings 16:28; 2 Kings 13:13).

Samaria was also the temporary residence of the Prophet Elisha. In Samaria, the Prophet Elisha and all the residents of the city of Samaria were surrounded by troops from Aram. This siege starved the city's inhabitants (cf. 1 Kings 6:25-29).

The Old Testament also describes the nature of the inhabitants of the city of Samaria. They are described as having negative qualities. One of them is the depiction of King Omri as the founder of the city of Samaria. He ruled the Northern kingdom for twelve years, but did what was evil in the eyes of God. In fact, he committed crimes more than any of his predecessors (cf. 1 Kings 16:25).

Some prophets also depict some negative traits of the Samaritans. The prophets were for a long time considered as centers of idolatry because the Samaritans built temples to the god Baal.[12] Specifically, the prophet Isaiah describes the people of Samaria as arrogant and haughty. Ezekiel also mentions that the people of Samaria have evil traits because they do some abominable deeds. One of these abominable deeds can be identified in the book of Amos. The prophet Amos describes that the people of Samaria live in a strong and rampant practice of idolatry. [13] The characteristics described by these prophets of Israel show that the character inherent in the identity of the Samaritans was a character that was contrary to the will of the God of Israel.

The Samaritan identity established in the Old Testament also has an influence in the New Testament. The New Testament, especially the Gospels, also show stereotypes or negative views of Jews towards Samaritans. In the story of Jesus who sent the twelve apostles, for example, Jesus said that the apostles should not follow the path of the Gentiles, or enter the city of Samaria (cf. Matt. 10:5). This picture shown by the evangelist Matthew reflects the bad relationship between the Judeans and the

[11] Yonatan Alex Arifianto. "An Historical Analysis of Horizontal Conflict between Jews and Samaritan." 35.

[12] Yohanes Sukendar. "Perjalanan Iman Wanita Samaria (Yoh 4:1-2), *Sapa-Jurnal Kateketik dan Pastoral* 4 (1) 2019, 15.

[13] Yonatan Alex Arifianto. "An Historical Analysis of Horizontal Conflict between Jews and Samaritans." 35.

Samaritans.[14] The same example is also found in the story of the Samaritan woman who met Jesus at the edge of the well. The Samaritan woman was surprised by Jesus' actions as a Judean who asked the Samaritan woman to give Him a drink (cf. John 4:9).

The Evangelist Luke also realized the bitter situation of the relationship between the Samaritans and the Judeans. In chapter 9, Jesus himself experienced how the Samaritans treated Him and His disciples who were going to Jerusalem badly (cf. Luke 9:53). Faced with this situation, James and John wanted to ask for fire to come down from heaven to destroy the Samaritan village (cf. Luke 9:54). The stories in this Gospel can be a picture of how the relationship between the Samaritans and the Judeans was not good. In fact, because of this negative relationship and stereotype, the Judeans were reluctant to have relations with the Samaritans and vice versa.

The Identity of the Samaritans from the Perspective of the Samaritans Themselves and the Perspective of the Jews

Before looking at the Judean view of Samaritan identity, it is important to note the Samaritan perspective on their identity in general. One of these fundamental aspects is their origin. In the Samaritan perspective itself, they assert that they are descended from the many Israelites who were left in 722 BCE.[15] At that time, the Assyrian King, Sargon II, destroyed the northern kingdom of Israel and exiled most of the population in the cities of Samaria to Assyria. On this basis, they preferred to identify themselves as Israelites, pure descendants of Ephraim, because they came from the remaining Israelites.[16]

On the one hand, the Israelites, outside the Samaritan group, have a different view. In viewing the origin of the Samaritans, the southern Israelites or Judeans generally consider the Samaritans not to be pure descendants of the Israelites.[17] They considered the Samaritans to be Israelites descended from Ephraim and Manasseh who had mixed blood with people from Babylon, Kuthah, Avva, Hamath, and

[14] Philip F. Esler, "Jesus and The Reduction of Intergroup Conflict: The Parable of The Good Samaritan In the Light of Social Identity Theory," 332.

[15] Philip F. Esler, 329.

[16] Alan D. Crown. "Redating the Schism Between the Judaens and the Samaritans," *The Jewish Quarterly Review* Vol 82, No. ½ (Jul-Okt 1991), 18.

[17] Yonatan Alex Arifianto, "Deskripsi Sejarah Konflik Horizontal Orang Yahudi dan Samaria." *Pasca: Jurnal Teologi dan Pendidikan Agama Kristen* Volume 16, Nomor 1, Mei 2020, 34.

Sepharvaim, which were areas occupied by the King of Assyria.[18] People from these areas were sent to the Samaritan cities to replace the Israelites who had been exiled to Assyria. Thus, for centuries the Judeans treated the Samaritans as a hated non-Jewish group and were given a negative stereotype. This negative stereotype also persisted into the New Testament era. The story of the parable of the good Samaritan is inseparable from the nuances of the negative views of the Israelites in general towards non-Jews including the Samaritans.

The Cordiality of the Good Samaritan

The parable of the Good Samaritan has a meaning that breaks down the identification of Samaritans for the Jews of his time. In the previous section, we saw that Samaritans had a negative stereotype among the Jewish community in both the Old and New Testaments. However, in this parable, Jesus shows a positive action carried out by the Good Samaritan. The action of the Good Samaritan goes beyond the negative stereotype of him in the community.

The parable of the good Samaritan is based on a conversation between the scribe and Jesus. In the conversation, the scribe asked Jesus about the theme of the "first and greatest commandment" for the Jewish people. Jesus answered that the first and greatest commandment is to love God with all one's heart and to love one's fellow human beings as oneself. This parable itself reveals Jesus' answer about who is my fellow human being. From this parable, Jesus shifted the understanding of the Jews from the categorization of who can be called a fellow human being to humans who move to become fellow human beings for others.

This theme of the first and foremost law is found in the other Synoptic Gospels, namely Mark and Matthew. However, Luke's Gospel has a distinctiveness that is not found in the two Synoptic Gospels. The distinctiveness of Luke's Gospel is the additional question from the scribe to Jesus about fellow human beings.[19] The uniqueness of this question about fellow human beings is certainly very important and meaningful, namely that loving God is closely related to loving others. In addition, there is an element of social identity that underlies the question of the scribe to Jesus regarding who a neighbor is so that it is directly related to the relationship of the Jews

[18]John P. Meyer, "The Historical Jesus and the Historical Samaritans: What Can Be Said?" *Biblica* Vol. 2 (2002), 204-205.

[19] Ian A. McFarland. "Who Is My Neighbor?: The Good Samaritan as A Source For Theological Anthropology" *Modern Theology* 17:1 January 2001, 59.

with the social context at that time. Jesus answered the scribe's question with the parable of the good Samaritan.[20] This meaning of fellow human beings shows that the actions of the Samaritan show two dimensions, namely the transcendental dimension of divinity and humanity. In the transcendental dimension, the Samaritan whose heart despite all the limitations of his social identity becomes an extension of God's hand helps this victim. His actions in helping this victim show an inner disposition that implies that he becomes a fellow human being for the victim who is marginalized in the middle of the road.

Homosious Exploration in the Council of Nicaea

A Glimpse into the Council of Nicaea

Homoousios is an important word in Christian theological debate, especially when used at the Council of Nicaea (325). The Council of Nicaea used the word *homoousios* to emphasize that God and Jesus are of the same essence or have the same nature.[21] Jesus is truly God and truly man. This affirmation was also to counter the Arianists who said that Jesus was more than just human, but not fully divine. This view became controversial because it considered Jesus not to be of one essence with the Father. To end this controversy, Emperor Constantine held the Council of Nicaea which resulted in the formulation of the word *homoousios* (one essence) in the creed. In the creed or better known as the Nicene confession of faith, the formulation that was accepted was that Jesus is of one essence (*homoousios*) with God.

Hoomosious at the Council of Nicaea

Homoousios comes from Greek which consists of two words, namely *homo* (same or identical) and *ousia* (essence or nature). Literally *homoousios* means the same nature or has the same essence.[22] The word *homoousios* was used by the Gnostics before it was adopted by the Council of Nicaea. The Gnostic use of the word *homoousios* refers to the identity of substance between the producing and the produced, the identity of substance between things produced from the same

[20] Robert L. Plummer. "Parables in the Gospels: History of Interpretation and Hermeneutical Guidelines," *SBJT* 13.3 (2009), 5.

[21] Pier Franco Beatrice, "The Word 'Homoousios' from Hellenism to Christianity," *Church History* 71, no. 2 (June 2002): 243, https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009640700095688.

[22] Jakob Pieter Douwe Groen, *Terpanggil untuk Mengakui Iman: Pembimbing ke dalam Dokumen-Dokumen Pengakuan Gereja* (Jakarta: BPK Gunung Mulia, 2012), 72.

substance. In the Gnostic texts the word *homoousios* does not refer to the special relationship between the Father and the Son as formulated in the Council of Nicaea.[23] According to Tertullian, the Gnostic view of substance is more appropriate using the word consubstantial. Consubstantial or una substantia (Latin) is used in the doctrine of the trinity which means one substance of three personal natures (Father, Son, and Holy Spirit).[24]

The discussion of the word *homoousios* concerns not only its meaning but also the origin of its use in the history of Christianity. In the fourth century there was a controversy about the essence of Jesus. The controversy took place before and during the Council of Nicaea. Before the Council of Nicaea, the word *homoousios* was used by the Gnostics. The Gnostics in the second century interpreted *homoousios* as God who only gave birth to and presented creations that were consubstantial (*homoousios*) with Himself.[25] Some Christian theologians avoid using the term *homoousios* as interpreted by the Gnostics because they suspect it of bringing heresy or false doctrine. The Gnostics viewed everything in a dualistic concept, namely that the material world is evil and created by a lesser divine being. This tendency makes the concept of *homoousios* in the Gnostic view considered negative.

The use of the word *homoousios* in theological discussions before the Council of Nicaea continued into the third century, especially by Origen. Origen did not directly use the word *homoousios* to refer to the divinity of Jesus. Origen stated that Jesus as the logos made flesh came from God the Father. Jesus is the second God, but his divinity is subordinate to God. Origen spoke of a degree of transcendence between the three subsistences (Father, Son, and Spirit), and distinguished the divine trinity from creation.[26] In other words, Origen's view leads to the meaning of the trinity as a hierarchy, namely the Father who is the greatest of the three, the Spirit who is the smallest, and the Son who was eternally created by the Father. This teaching about subordination (the Son as the second God under the Father) became the starting

[23] Beatrice, "The Word 'Homoousios' from Hellenism to Christianity," 248–49.

[24] Suhassatya, 100..

[25] Michael Allen Williams, *Rethinking "Gnosticism" : An Argument for Dismantling A Dubious Category* (United Kingdom: Princeton University Press, 1996), 17.

[26] Augustine Casiday and Frederick W. Norris, ed., *The Cambridge History of Christianity : Constantine to c. 600, vol. 2* (*Cambridge University Press, 2007*), *432.*

point of the heretical teaching of Arianism.[27] Origen uses a metaphor to show the special relationship of Christ as the wisdom of God (Wis 7:25) to the Father. When he uses the term breath, he takes it from the physical world, so that we can understand, as Christ himself is wisdom, by the breath that comes from the power of God.[28] This parable shows that Jesus' wisdom was produced by the substance of God and through fellowship with God.

Origen's view of the essence of Jesus received a reaction from Arius. Arius said that Origen's view made the Christian faith no longer monotheistic, because there were two different Gods (polytheistic).[29] Arius offered a solution to Origen's view by saying that Jesus was the most noble creature among all humans, but he was not God. Jesus did come from God the Father, but he did not become divine because of that. The use of the word son or Son for Jesus is a form of respect for his act of surrender but does not mean that Jesus has the same status as God. Jesus is the divine logos who came from the Father's choice to bring things into being from nothing.[30] Arius held that the logos was not the same as God, He was created by God before all things. In other words, Arius and his followers rejected the concept of self-equality of existence and the sharing of essence between the Father and the Son. They saw the unity of the Father and the Son in the indivisible unity of the monad. To emphasize his view, Arius used the analogy of an apple. According to him, an apple is not the same as its tree and both do not use the same name. Similarly, God and Jesus do not use the same name, so they do not come from the same existence.[31] Thus, according to Arius, Jesus was neither fully God nor fully man. Arius considered his view correct and sent a letter to Bishop Alexander in Alexandria.

Arius' views were rejected by the Bishop of Alexandria and considered heretical. The Bishop of Alexandria was more in favor of Origen's teaching on the Trinity as a hierarchy. According to Bishop Alexander, Jesus is essentially eternal and

[27] Randy Bonifield, "It Turned on a Word : Homoousios and the Council of Nicaea," *Academia.Edu*, n.d., 1.

[28] Beatrice, "The Word 'Homoousios' from Hellenism to Christianity," 250.

[29] Radius Aditiya Jonas, "Teologis atau Politis? : Pencarian Makna Pergulatan Historis dalam Pengakuan Iman Nicea-Konstantinopel," *Theologia in Loco* 2, no. 1 (1 Mei 2020): 51, https://doi.org/10.55935/thilo.v2i1.186.

[30] John Anthony McGuckin, *The Path of Christianity: The First Thousand Years* (Westmont: InterVarsity Press, 2017), 292.

[31] Jonas, "Teologis atau Politis?," 51.

uncreated, just like the Father.[32] The Father and Jesus have an inseparable unity, this unity is what makes the logos like God. The view of the Bishop of Alexandria wanted to emphasize the meaning of *homoousios* as the equality of divinity between the Father and the Son. Bishop Alexander tried to defend Origen's view that the Logos is truly God and not a dignified being who has a divine status title. The Logos is eternal, because if the Logos is not eternal, then He cannot be God.[33] This assertion makes Arius' view of the Son as not the same as God and the Logos as a created being, inconsistent with the teachings of Origen and Bishop Alexander. Bishop Alexander saw that Arius' logic of thought was different from Origen's teaching and led to heresy. Bishop Alexander concluded his view by stating that the Son who is the Logos came from the Father before time, was not bound by creation, the Father and the Son are eternal. The Father and the Son have the same existence and share each other's essence.[34]

The difference of opinion between Arius and Bishop Alexander became a controversy that led to the holding of the Council of Nicaea. If examined, the difference of opinion between Arius and the Bishop of Alexandria lies in the critical principle of metaphysics about *homoousios*, where both did not see the possibility of reconciliation. [35] Arius' view was rejected because it obscured the meaning of *homoousios* as the unity of the essence of God and the Son, while also considering the Son as a creature that is not the same as God. Arius firmly rejected the teachings of Origen and Bishop Alexander about the equality of the essence of the Father and the Son. For Arius, the concept of equality and sharing of essence made the Christian view no longer monotheistic, because there are two Gods. Arius' view was considered wrong because it did not correspond to Trinitarian logic. In Trinitarian logic, the Son is seen as the agent of the Father, who is obedient to the Father in all things, but *homoousios* or equal to the Father in His glory and existence. The existence of the Father is the existence of the Son, because both are *homoousios* and consubstantial in substance.[36]

[32] Williston Walker, *A History of the Christian Church* (United States of America: Scribiner's Press, 1918), 115.
[33] McGuckin, *The Path of Christianity*, 287–88.
[34] McGuckin, 289.
[35] Louis Berkhof, *The History of Christian Doctrines* (Monergism, 1949), 67–69.
[36] McGuckin, *The Path of Christianity*, 290.

The controversy over the divinity of the Son, especially about *homoousios*, became widespread because Arius asked for help from Bishop Eusebius of Nicomedia. Bishop Eusebius of Nicomedia happened to have close ties with Emperor Constantine. Constantine tried to quell the controversy by sending Bishop Hosius of Cordoba, but failed.[37] This failure prompted Bishop Hosius of Cordoba to propose to Constantine to hold a Council to end the controversy. Constantine accepted the proposal because the issue of debate could lead to division and disrupt political stability.[38] To prevent a split, Constantine immediately held a council and invited the bishops to attend the council.

The Council of Nicaea (325) was held to end the controversy about the divinity of Jesus and to prevent the spread of false doctrine.[39] The council opened on June 19, 325, and was attended by about 318 bishops. In the council of Nicaea, Arius was given the opportunity to express his views. Arius rejected the idea of the same substance between the Father and the Son. The divine essence is an inseparable unity, not a substation that can be divided. Therefore, the Son must be created and have the same status as other creatures.[40] Arius held the view that there is one God, eternal, without beginning, everlasting, and sovereign over all things. If the Son shared in the essence of the Father, this would result in a duality of divinity.[41] Bishops Alexander and Athanasius, who were present at the council, stated that Arius had blurred the meaning of the doctrine of salvation. The Son cannot be separated from the Father, because he has the same essence or nature as the Father. Therefore, the view that the Son is an ordinary creature created by the Father is wrong, because the Father and the Son are eternal. The council took action to resolve this controversy by rejecting Arius' view because it was contrary to Church teaching. The council responded to Arius' view by stating that Jesus is of one substance (*homoousios*) with the Father. Jesus is the divine Logos who is consubstantial (equal in being) with the Father. Thus, Jesus is fully divine because He is all that the Father has.[42]

---

[37] Walker, *A History of the Christian Church*, 116.

[38] Philip Schaff, *History of the Christian Church,* Volume III: Nicene and Post-Nicene Christianity. A.D. 311-600. (Grand Rapids, 2002), 377.

[39] Norman P. Tanner, ed., *Decrees of the Ecumenical Councils* (London: Sheed & Ward [ua], 1990), 1.

[40] Steven Gertz, D.H. Williams, and John Anthony McGuckin, "Debating Jesus Divinity: Did You Know?," *Christian History*, 2005, 5.

[41] David R. Maxwell, "The Nicene Creed in the Church," *Concordia Journal* 41, no. 1 (2015): 15.

[42] Rebecca Lyman, "The Theology of the Council of Nicaea," *St Andrews Encyclopaedia of Theology,* April 25, 2024, 15.

The Council of Nicaea's view of the Son's divinity of one substance (*homoousios*) with the Father, is the same as the thinking of Origen and his followers (Bishop Alexander and Athanasius). The Council of Nicaea was also attended by Bishop Eusebius of Caesarea who supported and took a middle path with Bishop Alexander's view. Eusebius stated that Jesus was not a creature, but was co-eternal with the Father, although not the same, but still had the same essence or nature (*homoousios*) with the Father.[43] This view was accepted by Constantine and at the suggestion of Bishop Hosius of Cordoba (as the leader of the council) the word *homoousios* was included in the formulation of the Creed. The use of the word *homoousios* in the council of Nicaea describes the consubstantial relationship of Jesus with the Father. Thus, the formulation *homoousios* expresses the inseparability of Jesus and the Father because Jesus has the same *ousia* or substance as the Father.

Exploring the Concept of God from the Cordiality of the Good Samaritan and *Homoousios* in the Council of Nicaea

Almighty God transcends the boundaries of human identity and loves humanity, especially the poor and marginalized.

From the cordiality of the good Samaritan and *homoousios* at the Council of Nicaea, one concept of God that emerged was Almighty God. Through the good Samaritan's act of mercy, God demonstrated an element of his omnipotence. The good Samaritan became an extension of God. Almighty God is truly present in human life through the coming of Jesus Christ to save humans from sin and open salvation to humans.[44] Jesus Christ, who is of the same essence as the Father (*Homoousios*), became human. The love of Almighty God was presented by Jesus. And this good Samaritan demonstrated God's almighty love for the victim. These two elements cannot be separated from the work of Jesus Christ who is of the same essence as the Father and who also emptied himself into being human. Thus, he is present and participates in human life.

The presence of Jesus amid human life presents the love of God and saves humans from alienation from God due to sin. Humans are also invited to be open to

[43] Bonifield, "It Turned on a Word : Homoousios and the Council of Nicaea," 3.

[44] John Paul II, "Apostolic Letter In The Form Of Motu Proprio Misericordia Dei On Certain Aspects Of The Celebration Of The Sacrament Of Penance," April 7, 2002, https://www.vatican.va/content/john-paul-ii/en/motu_proprio/documents/hf_jp-ii_motu-proprio_20020502_misericordia-dei.html.

the abundant love of Almighty God by also becoming a neighbor to other humans through repentance that is manifested. This act of love implies love for God and love for others, especially for those who are marginalized. The Good Samaritan is a good example of how to carry out acts of compassion for marginalized victims of robbery. Those who are marginalized need the outstretched love of Almighty God and it can be obtained through the outstretched love of others who are compassionate.

Relevance for Today

The theme of Cordiality in theology and *homoousios* provides a picture of God's abundant love for humans in the person of Jesus Christ. Humans are also invited to participate in realizing God's love. The way to do this is through repentance and acts of love. Through repentance, humans realize their limitations as humans and improve their relationship with Almighty God. Through acts of mercy, humans become neighbors to other humans and become channels of blessing for others.

Today, humans are invited to increasingly reflect and implement this abundant love of God. The way is to be a fellow human being, especially for the poor and marginalized. Pope John Paul II, in *Misericordia Dei*, calls for self-conversion in the Sacrament of Reconciliation faithfully as one of the first steps that can be taken by Christians to receive abundant love of God.[45] Pope Francis also in his appeals invites humans to repent and dare to be a neighbor to humans amid today's world. The appeals in *Laudato Si'* and *Fratelli Tutti* voice the Pope's invitation to repent and become a neighbor amid the world. *Laudato Si'* contains Pope Francis' invitation to humans in general and Christians to carry out Ecological repentance.[46] Meanwhile, *Fratelli Tuti* contains Pope Francis' invitation to be a neighbor to other humans and to have a sense of universal brotherhood among humans throughout the world. Pope Francis emphasizes the importance of these two things being implemented amid a world that is unknowingly being hit by this crisis.

As followers of Christ, Christians are increasingly called to repent and become neighbors to the poor and marginalized. The acts of Christian charity, both individually and in groups through institutions, deserve appreciation and attention.

[45] John Paul II.

[46] Fransiskus, *Mari Bermimpi: Jalan Menuju Masa Depan yang Lebih Baik* (Jakarta: Gramedia, 2021), 34–35.

All these methods are carried out to show that God loves this world and at the same time invites all humans to create universal brotherhood.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Arifianto, Yonatan Alex. "Deskripsi Sejarah Konflik Horizontal Orang Yahudi dan Samaria." Pasca: Jurnal Teologi dan Pendidikan Agama Kristen 16, no. 1 (Mei 2020): 34–45.

Beatrice. "The Word 'Homoousios' from Hellenism to Christianity." Church History 71, no. 2 (2002): 243–272.

Berkhof, Louis. The History of Christian Doctrines. Grand Rapids: Monergism, 1949.

Bonifield, Randy. "It Turned on a Word: Homoousios and the Council of Nicaea." Academia.edu, t.t.

Casiday, Augustine, dan Frederick W. Norris, eds. The Cambridge History of Christianity: Constantine to c. 600. Vol. 2. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007.

Crown, Alan D. "Redating the Schism Between the Judaens and the Samaritans." The Jewish Quarterly Review 82, nos. 1–2 (July–October 1991): 17–50.

Dailey, Thomas. "Cordiality as a Salesian Approach to Healing Relationships." Indian Journal of Spirituality 35, no. 1 (March 2022): 1–12.

Esler, Philip F. "Jesus and the Reduction of Intergroup Conflict: The Parable of the Good Samaritan in the Light of Social Identity Theory." Biblical Interpretation 8, no. 3 (2000): 325–357.

Fernandes, Pontas Surya. "Tinjauan Historis terhadap Eksistensi dan Perkembangan Efraim." Logon Zeos: Jurnal Teologi, Sosial dan Budaya 4 (2021): 55–70.

Fransiskus. Mari Bermimpi: Jalan Menuju Masa Depan yang Lebih Baik. Jakarta: Gramedia, 2021.

Gertz, Steven, D. H. Williams, dan John Anthony McGuckin. "Debating Jesus' Divinity: Did You Know?" Christian History (2005): 4–7.

Groen, Jakob Pieter Douwe. Terpanggil untuk Mengakui Iman: Pembimbing ke dalam Dokumen-Dokumen Pengakuan Gereja. Jakarta: BPK Gunung Mulia, 2012.

Jonas, Radius Aditiya. "Teologis atau Politis? Pencarian Makna Pergulatan Historis dalam Pengakuan Iman Nicea-Konstantinopel." Theologia in Loco 2, no. 1 (Mei 2020): 45–60. https://doi.org/10.55935/thilo.v2i1.186.

Lyman, Rebecca. "The Theology of the Council of Nicaea." St Andrews Encyclopaedia of Theology. 25 April 2024.

Manser, Martin, dan Nigel Turton. Student's English Dictionary. United Kingdom: North Parade Publishing, 1987.

Maxwell, David R. "The Nicene Creed in the Church." Concordia Journal 41, no. 1 (2015): 1–18.

McFarland, Ian A. "Who Is My Neighbor? The Good Samaritan as a Source for Theological Anthropology." Modern Theology 17, no. 1 (January 2001): 57–74.

McGuckin, John Anthony. The Path of Christianity: The First Thousand Years. Westmont, IL: InterVarsity Press, 2017.

Meyer, John P. "The Historical Jesus and the Historical Samaritans: What Can Be Said?" Biblica 83, no. 2 (2002): 199–220.

Paul II, John. "Apostolic Letter Misericordia Dei." April 7, 2002. https://www.vatican.va/content/john-paul-ii/en/motu_proprio/documents/hf_jp-ii_motu-proprio_20020502_misericordia-dei.html.

Plummer, Robert L. "Parables in the Gospels: History of Interpretation and Hermeneutical Guidelines." Southern Baptist Journal of Theology 13, no. 3 (2009): 4–21.

Schaff, Philip. History of the Christian Church. Vol. 3, Nicene and Post-Nicene Christianity, A.D. 311–600. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2002.

Schultz, S. J. "Ephraim." Dalam M. C. Tenney, ed., The Zondervan Pictorial Encyclopedia of the Bible, vol. 2, 333–335. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1975.

Sukendar, Yohanes. "Perjalanan Iman Wanita Samaria (Yoh 4:1–42)." SAPA: Jurnal Kateketik dan Pastoral 4, no. 1 (2019): 1–20.

Tanner, Norman P., ed. Decrees of the Ecumenical Councils. Vol. 1. London: Sheed & Ward, 1990.

Walker, Williston. A History of the Christian Church. New York: Scribner's Press, 1918.

Watson, Thomas. A Divine Cordial, or, The Transcendent Privilege of Those That Love God. London: Thomas Parkhurst, 1809.

Williams, Michael Allen. Rethinking "Gnosticism": An Argument for Dismantling a Dubious Category. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1996.