

Harmony 2.7-Council of Seleucia and its aftermath (359-360)

Copyright 2018 Glen L. Thompson

This document is provided for personal and educational use. It may not be used for commercial purposes without the permission of the copyright holder.

Last updated 3/28/18

27 September, 359 - The Council of Nicomedia is rescheduled for Seleucia		
<p>2.39.1 But I must now give an account of the other Synod, which the emperor's edict had called for in the east, as a rival to that of Ariminum.</p> <p>2.39.2 It was at first determined that the bishops should assemble at Nicomedia in Bithynia; but a great earthquake had nearly destroyed that city, preventing their being convened there.</p> <p>2.39.3 This happened in the consulate of Tatian and Cerealis, on the 28th day of August. They were therefore planning to transfer the council to the neighboring city of Nicaea.</p> <p>2.39.4 But this plan was again altered, as it seemed more convenient to meet at Tarsus in Cilicia. Being dissatisfied with this arrangement also, they at last assembled themselves at Seleucia, surnamed Aspera, a city of Isauria.</p> <p>2.39.5 This took place in the same year [as the council of Ariminum], under the consulate of Eusebius and Hypatius. The number of those convened was about 160. There was present on this occasion Leonas, an officer of distinction attached to the imperial household, to whom the emperor's edict had directed that the discussion respecting the faith should begin.</p> <p>2.39.6 Lauricius also, the commander-in-chief of the troops in Isauria, was ordered to be there, to serve the bishops in such things as they might require.</p> <p>2.39.7 In the presence of these officers, therefore, the bishops were there convened on the 27th of the month of September.</p>	<p>4.22.1 During about the same period, the Eastern bishops assembled to the number of about one hundred and sixty, in Seleucia, a city of Isauria. This was during the consulate of Eusebius and Hypatius.</p>	<p>2.26.4 After a time, at the suggestion of the accusers of Eudoxius, Constantius ordered the synod to be held at Seleucia. This town of Isauria lies on the seashore and is the chief town of the district. Here the bishops of the East, and with them those of Pontus in Asia, were ordered to assemble.</p> <p>2.26.5 The see of Caesarea, the capital of Palestine, was now held by Acacius, who had succeeded Eusebius. He had been condemned by the council of Sardica, but had expressed contempt for so large an assembly of bishops, and had refused to accept their adverse decision.</p> <p>2.26.6a At Jerusalem Macarius, whom I have often</p>

<p>2.39.8 They immediately began a discussion on the basis of the public records, shorthand writers being present to write down what each might say. Those who desire to learn the particulars of the several speeches, will find copious details of them in the collection of Sabinus; but we shall only notice the more principal ones.</p>		<p>mentioned, was succeeded by Maximus, a man well-known in his struggles on behalf of religion, for he had been deprived of his right eye and maimed in his right arm. After he was transported to the life which knows no old age, Cyrillus, an earnest champion of the apostolic decrees, was dignified with the Episcopal office. These men, in their contentions with one another for the first place, brought great calamities on the state.</p> <p>2.26.7 Acacius seized a small opportunity, deposed Cyrillus, and drove him from Jerusalem. But Cyrillus passed by Antioch, which he had found without a pastor, and came to Tarsus, where he dwelt with the excellent Silvanus, then bishop of that see. No sooner did Acacius become aware of this than he wrote to Silvanus and informed him of the deposition of Cyrillus.</p> <p>2.26.8 Silvanus however, both out of regard for Cyrillus, and not without suspicion of his people who greatly enjoyed the stranger's teaching, refused to prohibit him from taking a part in the service of the church.</p> <p>2.26.9a When however, they had arrived at Seleucia, Cyrillus joined with the party of Basilus, Eustathius, Silvanus, and the rest in the council.</p>
<p>359 - The Council of Seleucia is divided between the creeds of Nicaea and Antioch</p>		
<p>2.39.9 On the first day of their being convened, Leonas ordered each one to propose what he thought fit. But those present said that no question ought to be agitated in the absence of those prelates who had not yet arrived; for Macedonius, bishop of Constantinople, Basil of Ancyra, and some others who were apprehensive of an impeachment for their misconduct, had not made their appearance.</p> <p>2.39.10 Macedonius pleaded illness and failed to attend; Patrophilus said he had some trouble with his eyes, and</p>	<p>4.22.2 Leonas, who held a brilliant military office at the palace, journeyed to this council at the command of Constantius, so that the doctrinal confession might be conducted in his presence. Lauricius, the military governor of the province, was present to prepare whatever might be necessary; for the letter of the emperor had commanded him to render this service.</p> <p>4.22.3 At the first session of this council, several of the bishops were absent, and among others, Patrophilus,</p>	

<p>that on this account it was needful for him to remain in the suburbs of Seleucia; and the rest offered various pretexts to account for their absence.</p> <p>2.39.11 When, however, Leonas declared that the subjects which they had met to consider must be discussed despite the absence of these people, the bishops replied that they could not proceed to the discussion of any question, until the life and conduct of the parties accused had been investigated.</p> <p>2.39.12 For Cyril of Jerusalem, Eustathius of Sebastia in Armenia, and some others, had been charged with misconduct on various grounds long before.</p> <p>2.39.13 A sharp contest arose in consequence of this objection; some on the one hand affirmed that the way of life of those accused should be considered first, but others denied that anything whatsoever should take precedence over matters of faith.</p> <p>2.39.14 The emperor's orders contributed much to increase this dispute, because many letters of his were produced urging that one thing be considered first, while other letters were urging that another thing be considered first.</p> <p>2.39.15 On account of the dispute which had arisen on this subject, a schism was thus made, and the Seleucian council was divided into two factions.</p> <p>2.39.16 One of which was headed by Acacius of Caesarea in Palestine, George of Alexandria, Uranius of Tyre, and Eudoxius of Antioch, who were supported by only about thirty-two other bishops.</p>	<p>bishop of Scythopolis, Macedonius, bishop of Constantinople, and Basil, bishop of Ancyra. They resorted to various pretexts in order to justify their absence. Patrophilus complained about his eyes, and Macedonius an illness; but it was suspected they had absented themselves from the fear that various accusations would be brought against them.</p> <p>4.22.4a When other bishops refused to begin the investigation of disputed points during their absence, Leonas commanded them to proceed at once to the examination of the questions that had been raised.</p> <p>4.22.4b Some maintained that they ought first to examine the conduct of those among them who had been accused, as had been the case with Cyril, bishop of Jerusalem, Eustathius, bishop of Sebaste, and others.</p> <p>4.22.5 The ambiguity of the emperor's letters, which sometimes prescribed one course and sometimes another, gave rise to this dispute. The contention arising from this source became so fierce, that all union was destroyed between them, and they became divided into two parties. However, the advice of those who wished to commence with the examination of doctrine, prevailed.</p> <p>4.22.7 To the first of these parties belonged Eudoxius, Acacius, Patrophilus, George, bishop of Alexandria, Uranius, bishop of Tyre, and thirty-two other bishops. The latter party was supported by George, bishop of Laodicea, in Syria, by Eleusius, bishop of Cyzicus, and by Sophronius, bishop of Pompeiopolis, in Paphlagonia. With these the majority agreed.</p>	<p>2.26.9b But, when Acacius joined the assembled bishops, who numbered one hundred and fifty, he refused to be associated in their counsels until Cyrillus, as one stripped of his bishopric, had been expelled from them.</p> <p>2.26.10 There were some who, eager for peace, asked Cyrillus to withdraw, promising that after the decision of the decrees they would look into his case.</p> <p>2.26.11 He would not give way, and Acacius left them and went out. Then meeting Eudoxius, he removed his alarm, and encouraged him with a promise that he would stand his friend and supporter. Thus, he hindered him from taking part in the council, and set out with him for Constantinople.</p>
---	--	---

<p>2.39.17 Of the opposing party, which was by far the more numerous, the principal men were George of Laodicea in Syria, Sophronius of Pompeiopolis in Paphlagonia, and Eleusius of Cyzicus.</p> <p>2.39.18 Once it was determined by the majority to examine doctrinal matters first, the party of Acacius openly opposed the Nicene Creed, and wished to introduce another in its place. The other faction, which was considerably more numerous, concurred in all the decisions of the council of Nicaea, but criticized its adoption of the term <i>homoousion</i>.</p> <p>2.39.19 Accordingly they debated on this point, much being said on each side, until late in the evening when Silvanus, who presided over the church at Tarsus, insisted with much vehemence of manner, ‘that there was no need of a new exposition of the faith. Instead, it was their duty rather to confirm what had been published at Antioch, at the consecration of the church in that place.’</p> <p>2.39.20 On this declaration, Acacius and his partisans privately withdrew from the council; while the others, producing the creed composed at Antioch, read it, and then separated for that day.</p> <p>2.39.21 Assembling in the church of Seleucia on the following day, after having closed the doors, they again read the same creed and ratified it by their signatures.</p> <p>2.39.22 At this time the readers and deacons present signed on behalf of certain absent bishops, who had communicated their agreement.</p>	<p>4.22.6 When they proceeded to the investigation of terms, some desired to reject the use of the term “substance,” and appealed to the authority of the credal fomula which had a short time before been compiled by Mark at Sirmium, and which had been received by the bishops who were at the court, among whom was Basil, bishop of Ancyra. Many others were eager for the adoption of the formulary of faith drawn up at the dedication of the church of Antioch.</p> <p>4.22.9 After prolonged debate and contention, Silvanus, bishop of Tarsus, declared in a loud and assertive tone, that no new formulary of faith ought to be introduced but that which had been approved at Antioch, and this alone ought to prevail.</p> <p>4.22.10a As this proposition was distasteful to the followers of Acacius, they withdrew, and the other bishops read the formulary of Antioch.</p> <p>4.22.10b The following day these bishops assembled in the church, closed the doors, and privately confirmed this formulary.</p>	
Acacius pushes his own creed at Seleucia		
<p>2.40.1 Acacius and his companions criticized what was done, because, they had closed the church doors and then affixed their signatures. But Acacius and the others declared that ‘all such secret transactions were justly to be suspected, and had no validity at all.’</p> <p>2.40.2 Acacius made these objections because he was anxious to bring forward another exposition of the faith drawn up by himself, which he had already submitted to the governors Leonas and Lauricius, and was now intent on getting it alone confirmed and established, instead of</p>	<p>4.22.10c Acacius condemned this proceeding, and laid the formulary which he advocated before Leonas and Lauricius privately.</p> <p>4.22.8 It was suspected, and with reason, that Acacius and his partisans failed to attend on account of the difference between their beliefs and those of the aforesaid bishops, and also because they desired to avoid the investigation of certain accusations which had been</p>	

<p>the one that had become accepted. The second day was thus occupied with nothing else but exertions on his part to accomplish this goal.</p> <p>2.40.3 On the third day Leonas endeavored to produce a friendly meeting of both parties; being that Macedonius of Constantinople and also Basil of Ancyra had now arrived.</p> <p>2.40.4 But when the Acacians found that both the parties had come together they refused to meet, saying that not only those who had been deposed before, but also, any who were presently under accusation, ought to be excluded from the assembly.’</p> <p>2.40.5 And since, after much trivial objections on both sides, this opinion had prevailed; those who lay under any charge went out of the council, and the party of Acacius entered in their places.</p> <p>2.40.6 Leonas then said that a document had been put into his hand by Acacius, to which he desired to call their attention. He did not, however, state that it was the draft of a creed, which in some particulars covertly, and in others overtly contradicted the former creed.</p> <p>2.40.7 When those present became silent, thinking that the document contained something else besides an exposition of a creed, the following creed composed by Acacius, together with its preamble, was read:</p>	<p>brought against them. For although they had previously acknowledged in writing to Macedonius, bishop of Constantinople, that the Son is in all respects like the Father, and of the same substance, now they were shying away from their former confessions.</p> <p>4.22.11a Three days afterwards the same bishops reassembled, and were joined by Macedonius and Basil, who had been previously absent.</p> <p>4.22.11b Acacius and his partisans declared that they would take no part in the proceedings of the council until those who had been deposed and accused had left the assembly. His demand was complied with.</p> <p>4.22.12 For the bishops of the opposite party were determined that he should have no pretext for dissolving the council, which was evidently his object, in order to prevent the impending examination of the heresy of Aetius, and of the accusations which had been brought against himself and his partisans.</p> <p>4.22.13 When all the members were assembled, Leonas stated that he held a document which had been handed to him by the partisans of Acacius; it was their formulary of faith, with introductory remarks. None of the other bishops knew anything about it; for Leonas, who was of the same belief as Acacius, had willingly kept the whole matter a secret. When this document was read, the whole assembly was filled with tumult.</p>	
Creed of Acacius read at Seleucia		
<p>2.40.8 We having yesterday assembled by the emperor’s command at Seleucia, a city of Isauria, on the 27th day of September, exerted ourselves to the utmost, with all moderation, to preserve the peace of the church, and to determine doctrinal questions on prophetic and evangelical authority, so as to sanction nothing in the ecclesiastic confession of faith at variance with the sacred Scriptures, as our Emperor Constantius most beloved of God has ordered.</p> <p>2.40.9 But because certain individuals in the Synod have acted injuriously toward several of us, preventing some from expressing their beliefs, and excluding others from</p>		

the council against their wills; and at the same time they have introduced certain men who have been deposed, as well as persons who were ordained contrary to the ecclesiastical canon, so that the Synod has presented a scene of tumult and disorder, of which the most illustrious Leonas, the Comes, and the most eminent Lauricius, governor of the province, have been eye-witnesses. We are therefore under the necessity of making this declaration.

2.40.10 That we do not repudiate the faith which was ratified at the consecration of the church at Antioch; for we give it our decided preference, because it received the agreement of our fathers, who had assembled there to consider some controversial points.

2.40.11 Since, however, the terms *homoousion* and *homoiousion* have in past times troubled the minds of many, and still continue to disquiet them; and moreover, because a new term has recently been coined by some who assert the *anomoion* of the Son to the Father, we reject the first two as expressions which are not found in the Scriptures. But we utterly anathematize the last, and we regard those who approve of its use as alienated from the church.

2.40.12 We distinctly acknowledge the *homoion* of the Son to the Father, in accordance with what the apostle has declared concerning him: 'Who is the image of the invisible God.'

2.40.13 We confess then, and believe in one God the Father Almighty, the Maker of heaven and earth, and of things visible and invisible.

2.40.14 We believe also in his Son our Lord Jesus Christ, who was begotten of him without passion before all ages, God the Word, the only-begotten of God, the Light, the Life, the Truth, the Wisdom: through whom all things were made which are in the heavens and upon the earth, whether visible or invisible.

2.40.15 We believe that he took flesh of the holy Virgin Mary at the end of the ages, in order to abolish sin; that he was made man, suffered for our sin, and rose again, and was taken up into the heavens, to sit at the right hand of

<p>the Father, from where he will come again in glory to judge the living and the dead.</p> <p>2.40.16 We believe also in the Holy Spirit, whom our Lord and Savior has named the Comforter, and whom he sent to his disciples after his departure, according to his promise, by whom also he sanctifies all believers in the church, who are baptized in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.</p> <p>2.40.17 Those who preach anything contrary to this creed, we regard as aliens from the catholic church.</p> <p>2.40.18 This was the declaration of faith proposed by Acacius, and subscribed by himself and all who adhered to his opinion, the number of whom we have already given.</p>		
<p>Summary of Acacius's creed</p>		
	<p>4.22.14 For some of the statements it contained were to the effect that, although the emperor had prohibited the introduction of any term into the formularies of faith which was not found in the Sacred Scriptures, yet bishops who had been deposed were brought from various provinces to the assembly along with others who had been illegally ordained. Also, the council had been thrown into confusion, and some of the members had been insulted, and others were prevented from speaking.</p> <p>4.22.15 It was added that Acacius and his partisans did not reject the formulary which had been compiled at Antioch, (although those who had assembled in that city had drawn it up for the express purpose of meeting the difficulty which had just then arisen) but that, since the terms "consubstantial" and "of similar substance" had grieved some individuals, and that since it had been recently asserted that the Son is dissimilar from the Father, it was necessary, on this account, to reject the terms "consubstantial" and a "similar substance" which do not occur in Scripture. It was also deemed necessary to condemn the term "dissimilar," and to confess clearly that the Son is like unto the Father; for He is, as the Apostle Paul somewhere says, "the image of the invisible God."</p> <p>4.22.16 These introductory observations were followed by a formulary, which neither agreed with that of Nicaea, nor with that of Antioch, and which was so artfully</p>	

	<p>worded that the followers of Arius and of Aetius would not appear to be in error if they were to state their faith in that manner.</p> <p>4.22.17 In this formulary, the words used by those who had convened at Nicaea in condemnation of the Arian doctrine, were omitted. Also, the declarations of the council of Antioch—concerning the unchanging nature of the Deity of the Son, and concerning His being the unchangeable image of the substance, counsel, power, and glory of the Father—these were passed over in silence, and belief was simply expressed in the Father, in the Son, and in the Holy Ghost.</p> <p>4.22.18 And after giving some vulgar names to a few individuals who had never entered into any doctrinal contention on one side or the other, all those who entertained any other opinions than those set forth in this formulary were declared to be aliens to the Catholic Church. Such were the contents of the document presented by Leonas, and which had been signed by Acacius, and by those who had adopted his sentiments.</p>	
Digression, lamenting the polemics of the council		
<p>2.40.19 When this had been read, Sophronius bishop of Pompeiopolis in Paphlagonia, thus expressed himself:</p> <p>2.40.20 If to express a separate opinion day after day will be received as the exposition of the faith, we will never arrive at any accurate understanding of the truth.</p> <p>2.40.21 These were the words of Sophronius. And I firmly believe, that if the predecessors of these men as well as their successors, had believed the same thing in reference to the Nicene creed, all polemical debates would have been avoided, nor would the churches have been agitated by such violent and irrational disturbances. However let those judge who are capable of understanding how these things are.</p>		
The council ends in division		
<p>2.40.22 At that time, after many remarks on all sides had been made both in reference to this doctrinal statement, and in relation to the parties accused, the assembly was dissolved.</p> <p>2.40.23 On the fourth day they all met again in the same place, and resumed their proceedings in the same</p>	<p>4.22.19 After it had been read, Sophronius, a bishop of Paphlagonia, exclaimed, “If we daily receive the opinions</p>	

<p>contentious spirit as before. On this occasion Acacius expressed himself in these words:</p> <p>2.40.24 ‘Since the Nicene Creed has been altered not once only, but frequently, there is no hindrance to our publishing another at this time.’</p> <p>2.40.25 To which Eleusius bishop of Cyzicus, replied, ‘The Synod is at present convened not to learn what it had no previous knowledge of, nor to receive a creed which it had not assented to before, but to confirm the faith of the fathers, from which it should never recede, either in life or death.’</p> <p>2.40.26 When Eleusius was opposing Acacius, he meant by ‘the faith of the fathers,’ that creed which had been published at Antioch.</p> <p>2.40.27 But surely he too might have been fairly answered in this way: ‘How is it O Eleusius, that you call those who convened at Antioch “the fathers,” when you do not recognize those who were their fathers? The framers of the Nicene Creed, by whom the <i>homoousian</i> faith was acknowledged, have a far higher claim to the title of “the fathers,” for they had come first, and had also ordained those who had assembled at Antioch.</p> <p>2.40.28 Now if those at Antioch have disowned their own fathers, those who follow them are unconsciously following parricides.</p> <p>2.40.29 Besides how can they have received a legitimate ordination from those whose faith they pronounce unsound and impious? If those, however, who constituted the Nicene Synod did not have the Holy Spirit which is imparted by the placing on of hands, then those at Antioch have not duly received the priesthood either. For how could they have received it from those who did not have the power of conferring it?</p> <p>2.40.30 Such considerations as these could have been submitted to Eleusius in reply to his objections.</p> <p>2.40.31 But they then proceeded to another question, connected with the assertion made by Acacius in his exposition of the faith, ‘that the Son was like the Father’; enquiring of one another in what this resemblance consisted. The Acacian party affirmed that the Son was</p>	<p>of individuals as a statement of the faith, we shall fail in attaining precision of the truth.”</p> <p>4.22.20 Acacius having retorted that it was not forbidden to compile new formularies, as that of Nicaea had been once and frequently altered, Eleusius replied as follows: “But the council has not now met for the purpose of learning what it has not known, or of accepting any other formulary than that which has been already approved by those who assembled at Antioch; and, moreover, living and dying, we will adhere to this formulary.”</p> <p>4.22.21 Now that the dispute had taken this turn, they entered upon another inquiry, and asked the partisans of Acacius, in what way they considered the Son to be like the Father. They replied that the Son is similar in will only, but not in substance. And to that the others insisted that He is similar in substance, and they convicted</p>	
---	---	--

<p>like the Father as it respected his will only, and not his 'substance' or 'essence'</p> <p>2.40.32 But the rest maintained that the likeness extended to both essence and will.</p> <p>2.40.33 In arguments concerning this point, the whole day was consumed. And Acacius was refuted by his own published works, in which he had asserted that 'the Son is in all things like the Father.'</p> <p>2.40.34 His opponents asked him 'how do you now deny the likeness of the Son to the Father as to his 'essence'?' Acacius in reply said that 'no author, ancient or modern, was ever condemned out of his own writings.'</p> <p>2.40.35 As they kept on their discussion on this matter to a most tedious extent, with much bitter feeling and subtlety of argument, but without any approach to unity of judgment, Leonas arose and dissolved the council. And this was the end of the Synod at Seleucia.</p> <p>2.40.36 For on the following day Leonas, although he was urged to do so, would not meet with them again. 'I have been appointed by the emperor,' said he, 'to attend a council where unanimity was expected to prevail. But since you can by no means come to a mutual understanding, I can no longer be present. Go therefore to the church, if you please, and indulge in vain babbling there.'</p> <p>2.40.37 The Acacian faction conceiving this decision to be advantageous to themselves, also refused to meet with the others.</p>	<p>Acacius, by a work which he had formerly written, that he had once been of their opinion.</p> <p>4.22.22 Acacius replied that he ought not to be judged from his own writings; and the dispute had continued with heat for some time, when Eleusius, bishop of Cyzicus, spoke as follows: "It matters little to the council whether Mark or Basil has transgressed in any way, whether they or the adherents of Acacius have any accusation to bring against each other; nor is the council responsible for examining whether or not their formulary is commendable; it is enough to maintain the formulary which has been already confirmed at Antioch by ninety-seven priests. And if any one desire to introduce any doctrine which is not contained in that formulary, he ought to be held as an alien to religion and the Church."</p> <p>4.22.23 Those who were of his opinion applauded his speech; and the assembly then arose and separated. The following day, the partisans of Acacius and of George refused to attend the council.</p> <p>4.22.24 And Leonas, who had now openly declared himself to be sympathetic with them, likewise refused in spite of all pleas, to go to it. Those who were sent to request his attendance found the partisans of Acacius in his house; and he declined their invitation, under the claim that too much discord prevailed in the council, and that he had only been commanded by the emperor to attend the council in case of unanimity among the members.</p> <p>4.22.25a Much time was consumed in this way, and the partisans of Acacius were frequently asked by the other bishops to attend the assemblies; but they sometimes demanded a special conference in the house of Leonas, and other times alleged that they had been commissioned by the emperor to judge those who had been accused. For</p>	
---	---	--

	<p>they would not receive the creed adopted by the other bishops, nor clear themselves of the crimes of which they had been accused. Neither would they examine the case of Cyril, whom they had deposed; and there was no one to force them to do so.</p>	
<p>The council deposes or excommunicates many of the Acacian party</p>		
<p>2.40.38 The other party, left alone, met in the church and requested the attendance of those who followed Acacius, so that they might deal with the case of Cyril, bishop of Jerusalem.</p> <p>2.40.39 For he had been accused long before, on what grounds however I am unable to state. He had even been deposed, because since he was afraid, he had not made his appearance during two whole years, after having been repeatedly summoned in order that the charges against him might be investigated.</p> <p>2.40.40 Nevertheless, when he was deposed, he sent a written notification to those who had condemned him, that he would appeal to a higher jurisdiction. And to this appeal, the emperor Constantius gave his sanction.</p> <p>2.40.41 Cyril was thus the first and indeed only clergyman who ventured to break the ecclesiastical tradition by becoming an appellant, in the way commonly done in the secular judicial courts. And he was now present at Seleucia, ready to be put on trial.</p> <p>2.40.42 On this account the other bishops invited the Acacian party to take their places in the assembly, so that in a general council a definite judgment might be pronounced on the case of those who were accused. For they cited others also charged with various misdemeanors to appear before them at the same time, who to protect themselves had sought refuge among the partisans of Acacius.</p> <p>2.40.43 When therefore, that faction persisted in their refusal to meet after being repeatedly summoned, the bishops deposed Acacius himself, together with George of Alexandria, Uranius of Tyre, Theodulus of Chaeretapi in Phrygia, Theodosius of Philadelphia in Lydia, Evagrius of the island of Mytilene, Leontius of Tripolis in Lydia, and Eudoxius who had formerly been bishop of Germanica,</p>	<p>4.22.25b The council, however, eventually deposed George, bishop of Alexandria; Acacius, bishop of Caesarea; Uranius, bishop of Tyre; Patrophilus, bishop of Scythopolis; and Eudoxius, bishop of Antioch; and several other church officials.</p>	

<p>but had afterwards insinuated himself into the bishopric of Antioch in Syria.</p> <p>2.40.44 They also deposed Patrophilus for his disobedience in not presenting himself to answer a charge laid against him by a presbyter named Dorotheus.</p> <p>2.40.45 These they deposed. They also excommunicated Asterius, Eusebius, Abgarus, Basilicus, Phoebus, Fidelis, Euty chius, Magnus, and Eustathius, determining that they should not be restored to communion, until they make a defense that would clear them of the accusations against them.</p> <p>2.40.46 Once this was done, they addressed explanatory letters to each of the churches whose bishops had been deposed. Anianus was then constituted bishop of Antioch instead of Eudoxius, but when the Acacians soon after apprehended him, he was delivered into the hands of Leonas and Lauricius, by whom he was sent into exile.</p> <p>2.40.47 The bishops who had ordained him, being enraged because of this, lodged protests against the Acacian party with Leonas and Lauricius, in which they openly charged them of having violated the decisions of the Synod.</p> <p>2.40.48 Finding that no satisfaction could be obtained by this means, they went to Constantinople to lay the whole matter before the emperor.</p>	<p>4.22.26 Many persons were likewise put out of communion until they could purge themselves of the crimes of which they had been accused. The decisions were conveyed by letter to each clergy's respective parish.</p> <p>4.22.27 Adrian, a presbyter of Antioch, was ordained bishop over that church, in place of Eudoxius; but the partisans of Acacius arrested him and delivered him over to Leonas and Lauricius. They committed him into the custody of the soldiers, but afterwards sent him into exile.</p> <p>4.22.28 We have now given a brief account of the end of the council of Seleucia. Those who desire more detailed information must seek it in the acts of the council, which have been transcribed by attendant shorthand writers.</p>	
<p>Constantius is persuaded to impose the creed of Ariminum of all</p>		
	<p>4.23.1 Immediately after the above deeds, the followers of Acacius went to the emperor; but the other bishops returned to their respective homes. The ten bishops who had been unanimously chosen as deputies to the emperor met, on their arrival at the court, the ten deputies of the council of Ariminum, and likewise the partisans of Acacius. The latter had gained over to their cause the chief men of the palace, and through their influence, had secured the favor of the emperor.</p> <p>4.23.2 It was reported that some of these new converts had accepted the beliefs of Acacius at some previous period, that some were bribed by means of the wealth belonging to the churches, and that others were seduced by the craftiness of the arguments presented to them, and</p>	

	<p>by the dignity of the persuader. Acacius was, in fact, no common character. By nature, he was gifted with great powers of intellect and eloquence, and he exhibited no lack of skill or of efficiency in the accomplishment of his schemes. He was the president of an illustrious church, and could boast of Eusebius Pamphilus as his teacher, whom he succeeded in the episcopate, and was more honorably known than any other man by the reputation and succession of his books. Endowed with all these advantages, he succeeded with ease in whatever he undertook.</p> <p>4.23.3 There were at this period at Constantinople all together twenty deputies, ten from each council, besides many other bishops, who, for various motives, had left for the city. Honoratus, whom the emperor, before his departure to the West, had constituted chief governor of Constantinople, received directions to examine in the presence of the deputies of the great council, the reports circulated concerning Aetius and his heresy.</p> <p>4.23.4 Constantius, with some of the rulers, eventually undertook the investigation of this case. And as it was proved that Aetius had introduced dogmas essentially opposed to the faith, the emperor and the other judges were offended at his blasphemous statements. It is said that the partisans of Acacius at first faked ignorance of this heresy, for the purpose of inducing the emperor and those around him to take interest in it. For they imagined that the eloquence of Aetius would be irresistible, that he would inevitably succeed in convincing his audience, and that his heresy would conquer the unwilling.</p> <p>4.23.5 When, however, their expectations were proved futile by the results, they demanded that the formulary of faith accepted by the council of Ariminum should receive the sanction of the deputies from the council of Seleucia. As the latter protested that they would never renounce the use of the term “substance,” the Acacians declared to them upon oath that they did not hold the Son to be, in substance, dissimilar from the Father. On the contrary, they claimed, they were ready to denounce this opinion as heresy.</p>	
--	---	--

	<p>4.23.6 They added that they esteemed the formulary compiled by the Western bishops at Ariminum the more highly because the word “substance” had been unexpectedly blotted out of it. For, they said, if this formulary were to be received, there would be no further mention either of the word “substance” or of the term “consubstantial,” to which many of the Western priests were, from their reverence for the Nicaean council, particularly attached.</p> <p>4.23.7 It was for these reasons that the emperor approved of the formulary. For he recalled to mind the great number of bishops who had been convened at Ariminum, and reflected that there is no error in saying either that “the Son is like the Father” or “of the same substance as the Father,” and he further considered that no difference in meaning would ensue, if, for terms which do not occur in Scripture, other equivalent and unarguable expressions were to be substituted (such, for instance, as the word “similar”). Thus, he decided to give his sanction to the formulary.</p> <p>4.23.8 Such being his own sentiments, he commanded the bishops to accept the formulary. The next day, preparations were made for the pompous ceremony of proclaiming him consul, which, according to the Roman custom, took place in the beginning of the month of January. And all of that day and part of the ensuing night the emperor spent with the bishops, and at length succeeded in persuading the deputies of the council of Seleucia to receive the formulary transmitted from Ariminum.</p>	
360 - Constantius heads East, appointing Julian as Caesar in the West		
	<p>4.21.6b Being determined to visit the East, the emperor held his course; he conferred the title of Caesar on his cousin Julian, and sent him to Western Gaul.</p>	