

Harmony 2.8-Council of Constantinople and its aftermath (360-361)

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 2/27/18

Socrates	Sozomen	Theodoret
January 360¹ - The Acacians hold another council in Constantinople		
2.41.1 And now the emperor returned from the West and appointed a prefect over Constantinople, Honoratus by name, having abolished the office of proconsul.		2.27.1a Constantius, on his return from the West, passed some time at Constantinople.
2.41.2 But the Acacians who were beforehand with the bishops, slandered them before the emperor, persuading him not to admit the creed which they had proposed. 2.41.5 While they were being harassed, the partisans of Acacius remained for a considerable time at Constantinople and held another Synod, sending for the bishops at Bithynia 2.41.6 There were about fifty assembled on this occasion, among whom was Maris, bishop of Chalcedon. These bishops confirmed the creed read at Ariminum, to which the names of the consuls had been signed. It would have been unnecessary to repeat it here, if there had not been some additions made to it. 2.41.7 But since that was done, it may be desirable to include it in its new form. [Page 420]	4.24.1 The partisans of Acacius remained some time at Constantinople, and invited several bishops of Bithynia, among whom were Maris, bishop of Chalcedon, and Ulfilas, bishop of the Goths. These prelates having assembled together, in number about fifty, confirmed the formulary read at the council of Ariminum, adding this provision, that the terms “substance” and “hypostasis” should never again be used in reference to God. They also declared that all other formularies set forth in times past, as likewise those that might be compiled at any future period, should be condemned.	
2.42.1 Acacius, Eudoxius, and those at Constantinople who took part with them, became eager that they also on their side might depose some of the opposite party.		2.27.1b There Acacius urged many accusations against the assembled bishops in the presence of the emperor, called them a set of vile characters organized for the ruin and destruction of the churches, and so kindled the imperial wrath.
2.42.3 The Acacian party therefore taking advantage of the emperor’s indignation against others, and especially against Macedonius whom he was eager to put an end to, first deposed Macedonius, both because he had caused so much slaughter, and also because he had admitted to communion a deacon who had been found guilty of fornication.	4.24.3 Those who held these sentiments took advantage of the resentment with which the emperor regarded Macedonius, for reasons above mentioned, and they accordingly deposed him, and likewise Eleusius, bishop of Cyzicus; Basil, bishop of Ancyra; Heortasius, bishop of Sardis; and Dracontius, bishop of Pergamus.	

¹On this council, cf. <http://www.fourthcentury.com/index.php/council-of-constantinople-ad-360/>

Socrates	Sozomen	Theodoret
<p>2.42.6d And [they also deposed] Cyril of Jerusalem, and others for various reasons.</p>	<p>4.25.1 Besides the prelates above mentioned, Cyril, bishop of Jerusalem, was deposed because he had admitted Eustathius and Elpidius into communion, after they had opposed the decrees enacted by those convened at Melitina, among whom was Cyril himself; and because he had also received Basil and George, bishop of Laodicea, into communion after their deposition in Palestine.</p> <p>4.25.2 When Cyril was first installed in the bishopric of Jerusalem, he had a dispute with Acacius, bishop of Caesarea, concerning his rights as a Metropolitan, which he claimed on the ground of his bishopric being an apostolic see. This dispute raised up feelings of enmity between the two bishops, and they mutually accused each other of unsoundness of doctrine concerning the Godhead. In fact, they had both been suspected previously; the one, that is, Acacius, of favoring the heresy of Arius; and the other, of siding with those who maintain that the Son is in substance like the Father.</p> <p>4.25.3 Since Acacius felt so hostile towards Cyril, and since he found himself supported by the bishops of the province who were of the same sentiments as himself, he contrived to depose Cyril under the following pretext. Jerusalem and the neighboring country was at one time visited with a famine, and the poor appealed in great multitudes to Cyril, as their bishop, for necessary food. As he had no money to purchase the requisite provisions, he sold for this purpose the veil and sacred ornaments of the church.</p> <p>4.25.4 It is said that a man, having recognized an offering which he had presented at the altar as forming part of the costume of an actress, made it his business to investigate where it had come from; he found that a merchant had sold it to the actress, and that the bishop had sold it to the merchant. It was under this pretext that Acacius deposed Cyril.</p> <p>And on inquiry I find these to be the facts. It is said that the Acacians then expelled from Constantinople all the bishops above mentioned who had been deposed.</p>	<p>2.27.2 And not least was Constantius moved by what was alleged against Cyrillus, “for,” said Acacius, “the holy robe, which the illustrious Constantine the emperor, in his desire to honour the church of Jerusalem, gave to Macarius, the bishop of that city, to be worn when he performed the rite of divine baptism, all fashioned with golden threads as it was, has been sold by Cyrillus. It has been bought,” he continued, “by a certain stage dancer; dancing about when he was wearing it, he fell down and perished. With a man like this Cyrillus,” he went on, “they set themselves up to judge and decide for the rest of the world.”</p> <p>2.27.3 The influential party at the court made this an occasion for persuading the emperor not to summon the whole synod but only ten leading men, for they were alarmed at the unity of the majority.</p> <p>2.27.4 Of these were Eustathius of Armenia, Basilius of Galatia, Silvanus of Tarsus, and Eleusius of Cyzicus. On their arrival they urged the emperor that Eudoxius should be convicted of blasphemy and lawlessness. Constantius, however, as he was taught by the opposite party, replied that a decision must first be arrived at on matters concerning the faith, and that afterwards the case of Eudoxius should be looked into.</p>

Socrates	Sozomen	Theodoret
	<p>4.25.5 Ten bishops of their own party who had refused to subscribe to these edicts of deposition, were separated from the others, and were prohibited from performing the functions of the ministry or ruling their churches until they consented to give their signatures. It was enacted that unless they complied within six months, and yielded their assent to all the decrees of the council, they should be deposed, and that the bishops of every province should be summoned to elect other bishops in their place.</p>	
<p>2.42.5a A similar sentence was pronounced against Basil, or Basilas—as he was also called—who had been constituted bishop of Ancyra instead of Marcellus. The causes assigned for this condemnation were, that he had unjustly imprisoned a certain individual, loaded him with chains, and put him to the torture; that he had slandered some individuals; and that he had disturbed the churches of Africa by his epistles.</p>	<p>4.24.4 Although they differed about doctrine from those bishops, when they deposed them, no blame was thrown upon their faith, but charges were alleged against them in common with all, that they had disturbed the peace and violated the laws of the Church. They specified, in particular, that when the presbyter Diogenes was traveling from Alexandria to Ancyra, Basil seized his papers, and struck him. They also claimed that Basil had without trial, delivered over many of the clergy from Antioch, from the banks of the Euphrates, and from Cilicia, Galatia, and Asia, to the rulers of the provinces in order to be exiled and subjected to cruel punishments, so that many had been enchained, and had been forced to bribe the soldiers who were taking them away, not to mistreat them.</p> <p>4.24.5 They added that on one occasion, when the emperor had commanded Aetius and some of his followers to be led before Cecropius, that they might answer to him for various accusations laid against them, Basil recommended the person who was entrusted with the execution of this edict, to act according to his own judgment. They said that he wrote directions to Hermogenes, the prefect and governor of Syria, stating who were to be banished, and where they were to be sent; and that, when the exiles were recalled by the emperor, he would not consent to their return, but opposed himself to the wishes of the rulers and of the priests.</p> <p>4.24.6 They further claimed that Basil had incited the clergy of Sirimium against Germanius; and that, although he stated in writing that he had admitted</p>	<p>2.27.5 Basilius, relying on his former friendship, ventured boldly to object to the emperor that he was attacking the apostolic decrees; but Constantius took this poorly and told Basilius to hold his tongue, “for to you,” said he, “the disturbance of the churches is due.” When Basilius was silenced, Eustathius intervened and said, “since, sir, you wish a decision to be arrived at on what concerns the faith, consider the blasphemies rashly uttered against the Only Begotten by Eudoxius.”</p> <p>2.27.6 And as he spoke he produced the exposition of faith where, besides many other impieties, were found the following expressions: “Things that are spoken of in unlike terms are unlike in substance:” “There is one God the Father of whom are all things, and one Lord Jesus Christ through whom are all things.” Now the term “of whom” is unlike the term “through whom;” so the Son is unlike God the Father.</p> <p>2.27.7 Constantius ordered this exposition of the faith to be read, and was displeased with the blasphemy which it involved. He therefore asked Eudoxius if he had drawn it up. Eudoxius instantly denied his authorship, and said that it was written by Aetius.</p>

Socrates	Sozomen	Theodoret
	<p>Germanius, Valens, and Ursacius into communion, he had placed them as criminals before the tribunal of the African bishops. They claimed also that that, when he was charged with this deed, he had denied it, and perjured himself. Furthermore, when he was afterwards convicted, he strove to justify his perjury by sophistical reasoning. They added, that he had been the cause of contention and of sedition in Illyria, Italy, Africa, and in the Roman church.</p> <p>4.24.7 Also, they alleged that he had thrown a servant into prison to compel her to bear false witness against her mistress; that he had baptized a man of loose life, who lived in illicit intercourse with a woman, and had promoted him to be a deacon; and that he had neglected to excommunicate a fraudulent doctor who had caused the death of several people.</p> <p>4.24.8 They then claimed that Basil and some of the clergy had bound themselves by oath before the holy table, not to bring accusations against each other. This, they said, was an plan adopted by the president of the clergy to shield himself from the accusations of his accusers. In short, such were the reasons they specified for the deposition of Basil.</p>	
	<p>4.24.9 Eustathius, they said, was deposed because he had been condemned when he was a presbyter, and was put away from the communion of prayers by Eulalius, his own father, who was bishop of the church of Caesarea, in Cappadocia. Also, Eustathius had been excommunicated by a council held at Neocaesarea, a city of Pontus, and deposed by Eusebius, bishop of Constantinople, for unfaithfulness in the discharge of certain duties that had fallen upon him. He had also been deprived of his bishopric by those who were convened in Gangroe, on account of his having taught, acted, and thought contrary to sound doctrine. He had been convicted of perjury by the council of Antioch. He had likewise endeavored to reverse the decrees of those convened at Melitina; and, although he was guilty of many crimes, he had the boldness to aspire to be judge over the others, and to stigmatize them as heretics.</p>	

Socrates	Sozomen	Theodoret
2.42.4 They then deposed Eleusius bishop of Cyzicus for having baptized, and afterwards invested with the diaconate, a priest of Hercules at Tyre named Heraclius, who was known to have practiced magic arts.	4.24.10 They deposed Eleusius because he had raised inconsiderately one Heraclius, a native of Tyre, to be a deacon; this man had been a priest of Hercules at Tyre, had been accused of and tried for sorcery, and, therefore, had retired to Cyzicus and faked his conversion to Christianity; and moreover, Eleusius, after having been informed of these circumstances, had not driven him from the Church. He had also, without asking, ordained certain individuals who had come to Cyzicus, after they had been condemned by Maris, bishop of Chalcedonia, who participated in this council.	
	4.24.11a Heortasius was deposed because he had been ordained bishop of Sardis without the sanction of the bishops of Lydia.	
2.42.5b Dracontius was also deposed, because he had left the Galatian church for that of Pergamos.	4.24.11b They deposed Dracontius, bishop of Pergamus, because he had previously held another bishopric in Galatia, and because, they stated, he had on both occasions been unlawfully ordained.	
	4.24.12 After these transactions, a second assembly of the council was held, and Silvanus, bishop of Tarsus, Sophronius, bishop of Pompeiopolis in Paphlagonia, Elpidius, bishop of Satala, and Neonas, bishop of Seleucia in Isauria, were deposed. 4.24.13 The reason they gave for the deposition of Silvanus was, that he had made himself the leader of a foolish party in Seleucia and Constantinople. He had, besides, instated Theophilus as president of the church of Castabala, who had been previously ordained bishop of Eleutheropolis by the bishops of Palestine, and who had promised upon oath that he would never accept any other bishopric without their permission.	
2.42.6b [They also deposed] Sophronius of Pompeiopolis in Paphlagonia,	4.24.14 Sophronius was deposed on account of his greed and on account of his having sold some of the offerings presented to the church for his own profit. Besides, after he had received a first and second summons to appear before the council, he could only scarcely be induced to make his appearance. And then, instead of replying to the accusations brought against him, he appealed to other judges.	

Socrates	Sozomen	Theodoret
<p>2.42.6a Moreover, they deposed on various pretenses, Neonas bishop of Seleucia, the city in which the Synod had been convened,</p>	<p>4.24.15 Neonas was deposed for having resorted to violence in his efforts to attain the ordination of Annianus in his own church, who had been appointed bishop of Antioch. He was also deposed for having ordained as bishops, certain individuals who had previously been engaged in politics, and who were utterly ignorant of the Holy Scriptures and of ecclesiastical canons, and who, after their ordination, preferred the enjoyment of their property to that of the priestly dignity, and declared in writing that they would rather take charge of their own possessions than to discharge the episcopal functions without them.</p>	
<p>2.42.6c [They deposed] Elpidius of Satala, in Macedonia.</p>	<p>4.24.16 Elpidius was deposed because he had participated in the malpractices of Basil, and had caused great disturbances; and because he had, contrary to the decrees of the council of Melitina, restored to his former rank in the presbytery a man named Eusebius, who had been deposed for having created Nectaria a deaconess, after she had been excommunicated on account of violating agreements and oaths. To confer this honor upon her was clearly contrary to the laws of the Church.</p>	
	<p>4.24.2 They then deposed Aetius from his office of deacon, because he had written works full of contention, with the appearance of wisdom but opposed to the ecclesiastical vocation, for he had used in writing and in disputation several impious expressions; and because he had been the cause of troubles and seditions in the Church. It was alleged by many that they did not depose him willingly, but merely because they wished to remove all suspicion from the mind of the emperor which he had towards them, for they had been accused of holding Aetian views.</p>	<p>2.27.8 Now Aetius was the man whom Leontius, in fear of the accusations of Flavianus and Diodorus, had formerly demoted from the office of deacon. He had also been the supporter of Georgius, the treacherous foe of the Alexandrians, alike in his impious words and his unholy deeds.</p> <p>2.27.9 At the present time he was associated with Eunomius and Eudoxius. For on the death of Leontius, when Eudoxius had laid violent hands on the episcopal throne of the church at Antioch, he returned from Egypt with Eunomius, and, as he found Eudoxius to be of the same way of thinking as himself, indulgent in luxury as well as a heretic in faith, he chose Antioch as the most agreeable place to stay, and both he and Eunomius were fast fixtures at the couches of Eudoxius. His highest ambition was to be a successful parasite, and he spent his whole time in going to gorge himself at one man's table or another's.</p>

Socrates	Sozomen	Theodoret
		<p>2.27.10 The emperor had been told all this, and now ordered Aetius to be brought before him. On his appearance Constantius showed him the document in question and proceeded to enquire if he was the author of its language.</p> <p>2.27.11 Aetius, totally ignorant of what had taken place, and unaware of the drift of the enquiry, expected that he should win praise by confession, and asserted that he was the author of the phrases in question.</p> <p>2.27.12 Then the emperor perceived the greatness of his iniquity, and forthwith condemned him to exile and to be deported to a place in Phrygia.</p> <p>2.27.13 So Aetius reaped disgrace as the fruit of blasphemy, and was cast out of the palace. Eustathius then alleged that Eudoxius too held the same views, because Aetius had shared his roof and his table, and had drawn up this blasphemous formula in submission to his judgement. To prove his argument that Eudoxius was involved in drawing up the document, he urged the fact that no one had attributed it to Aetius except Eudoxius himself.</p>
		<p>2.27.14 To this the emperor directed that judges must not decide on conjecture, but are bound to make an exact examination of the facts. Eustathius assented, and urged that Eudoxius should give proof of his dissent from the sentiments attributed to him by anathematizing the composition of Aetius.</p> <p>2.27.15 This suggestion the emperor very readily accepted, and gave his orders accordingly; but Eudoxius drew back, and employed many excuses to avoid compliance.</p> <p>2.27.16 But when the emperor became angry and threatened to send him off to share the exile of Aetius, on the ground that he was a partner in the blasphemy so punished, he denied his own doctrine, though both then and afterwards he persistently maintained it. However, he in his turn protested against the Eustathians that it was their duty to condemn the word "<i>Homoïusion</i>" as unscriptural.</p> <p>2.27.17 Silvanus on the contrary pointed out that it was their duty to reject and expel from their holy assemblies</p>

Socrates	Sozomen	Theodoret
		<p>the phrases “<i>out of the non-existent</i>” and “<i>creature</i>” and “<i>of another substance</i>,” these terms being also unscriptural and found in the writings of neither prophets nor apostles. Constantius decided that this was right, and requested that the Arians pronounce the condemnation.</p> <p>2.27.18 At first, they persisted in refusing; but in the end, when they saw the emperor’s wrath, they consented, though much against the grain, to condemn the terms Silvanus had put before them. But all the more earnestly they insisted on their demand for the condemnation of the “<i>Homoïusion</i>.”</p> <p>2.27.19 But then with unanswerable logic Silvanus put both before the Arians and the emperor the truth that if God the Word is not of the non-Existent, He is not a Creature, and is not of another Substance. He is then of one Substance with God Who begat Him, as God of God and Light of Light, and has the same nature as the Begetter.</p> <p>2.27.20 This contention he urged with power and with truth, but not one of his hearers was convinced. The party of Acacius and Eudoxius raised a mighty uproar; the emperor was angered, and threatened expulsion from their churches. After this, Eleusius and Silvanus and the rest said that while authority to punish lay with the emperor, it was their place to decide on points of piety or impiety, and “we will not,” they protested, “betray the doctrine of the Fathers.”</p>
<p>2.41.3 This so annoyed the emperor that he resolved to disperse them; he therefore published an edict, commanding that those of them as were subject to fill certain public offices should no longer be exempted from performing their duties.</p> <p>2.41.4 For several of them were liable to be called on to occupy various official departments, connected both with the city magistracy, and in subordination to the presidents and governors of provinces.</p>		<p>2.27.21 Constantius ought to have admired both their wisdom and their courage, and their bold defence of the apostolic decrees, but he exiled them from their churches, and ordered others to be appointed in their place.</p> <p>2.27.22 After these deeds, the emperor ordered Aetius to be condemned by a formal letter, and in obedience to the command, his companions in iniquity condemned their own associate.</p> <p>2.27.23 Accordingly they wrote to Georgius, bishop of Alexandria, the letter about him to which I shall give a place in my history, in order to expose their wickedness,</p>

Socrates	Sozomen	Theodoret
		for they treated their friends and their foes precisely in the same way.
Letter of the Council of Constantinople to George of Alexandria		
		<p>2.28.1 To the right honourable Lord Georgius, Bishop of Alexandria, the holy Synod in Constantinople assembled, Greeting.</p> <p>In consequence of the condemnation of Aetius by the Synod, on account of his unlawful and most offensive writings, he has been dealt with by the bishops in accordance with the canons of the church. He has been demoted from the office of deacon and expelled from the Church.</p> <p>2.28.2 And our orders have gone forth that none are to read his unlawful epistles, but that they are to be cast aside on account of their unprofitable and worthless character. We have further appended an anathema on him, if he abides in his opinion, and on his supporters. It would naturally have followed that all the bishops who met together in the council should have detested and approved the sentence delivered against a man who had been the source of such offences, disturbances and schisms,</p> <p>2.28.3 of agitation over all the world, and of the rising of church against church.</p> <p>But in spite of our prayers, and against all our expectation, Seras, Stephanus, Heliodorus and Theophilus and their party have not voted with us, and have not even consented to subscribe the sentence delivered against him. Although Seras charged the previously mentioned Aetius with another instance of insane arrogance.</p> <p>2.28.4 Seras alleged that he, with still bolder impudence, had sprung forward to declare that what God had concealed from the Apostles had been now revealed to him. Even after these wild and boastful words, reported by Seras about Aetius, the previously mentioned bishops did not seem troubled, nor could they be induced to vote with us on his condemnation.</p> <p>2.28.5 We however, with much long suffering bore with them for a great length of time, at one point being indignant, then begging them, then giving them the chance</p>

Socrates	Sozomen	Theodoret
		<p>to join with us and make the decision of the Synod unanimous; and we persevered long in the hope that they might hear and agree and give in.</p> <p>2.28.6 But when in spite of all this patience we could not shame them into acceptance of our declarations against the previously mentioned offender, we counted the rule of the church more precious than the friendship of men, and pronounced against them a decree of excommunication, allowing them a period of six months for conversion, repentance, and the expression of a desire for union and harmony with the synod. If within the given time they should turn and accept agreement with their brethren and assent to the decrees about Aetius, we decided that they should be received into the church, to the recovery of their own authority in synods, and our affection.</p> <p>2.28.7 If, however, they obstinately persisted, and preferred human friendship to the canons of the church and our affection, then we judged them deposed from the rank of the bishops.</p> <p>2.28.8 If they suffer degradation it is necessary to appoint other bishops in their place, that the lawful church may be duly ordered and at unity with herself, while all the bishops of every nation by uttering the same doctrine with one mind and one thought preserve the bond of love. To acquaint you with the decree of the Synod we have sent these things to your reverence, and pray that you may abide by them, and by the grace of Christ rule the churches under you aright and in peace.</p>
The modified “dated creed” of Ariminum read at Constantinople²		
<p>2.41.8 We believe in one God the Father Almighty, of whom are all things. And in the only-begotten Son of God, begotten of God before all ages, and before every beginning; through whom all things visible and invisible were made.</p> <p>2.41.9 Who is the only-begotten born of the Father, the only of the only, God of God, like the Father who begat</p>		

² The creed that is found in Harmony 2.5, under the heading "Dated Creed of Thracian Nicaea," is this same creed, which was modified from the "Dated Creed of Sirmium."

Socrates	Sozomen	Theodoret
<p>him, according to the Scriptures, and whose generation no one knows but the Father only that begat him.</p> <p>2.41.10 We know that this only-begotten Son of God, as sent of the Father, came down from the heavens, as it is written, for the destruction of sin and death.</p> <p>2.41.11 And we know that he was born of the Holy Spirit, and of the Virgin Mary according to the flesh, as it is written, and conversed with his disciples; and that after every dispensation had been fulfilled according to his Father's will, he was crucified and died, and was buried and descended into the lower parts of the earth.</p> <p>2.41.12 At whose presence Hades itself trembled. Who also arose from the dead on the third day, again conversed with his disciples, and after the completion of forty days was taken up into the heavens, and sits at the right hand of the Father, from where he will come in the last day, the day of the resurrection, in his Father's glory, to repay every one according to his works.</p> <p>2.41.13 We believe also in the Holy Spirit, whom he himself the only-begotten of God, Christ our Lord and God, promised to send to mankind as the Comforter, according to how it is written, "the Spirit of truth"; whom he sent to them after he was received into the heavens.</p> <p>2.41.14 But since the term <i>ousia</i> [substance or essence], which was used by the fathers in a very simple and intelligible sense, but not being understood by the people, has been a cause of offense, we have thought it proper to reject it, as it is not contained even in the sacred writings; and that no mention of it should be made in future, being that the holy Scriptures have nowhere mentioned the substance of the Father and of the Son.</p> <p>2.41.15 Nor should the "essence" of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit even be named. But we affirm that the Son is like the Father, in such a manner as the sacred Scriptures declare and teach.</p> <p>2.41.16 Let therefore all heresies which have been already condemned, or may have arisen of late, which are opposed to this exposition of the faith, be anathema.'</p>		

Socrates	Sozomen	Theodoret
Socrates recaps the various creeds produced since Nicaea		
<p>2.41.17 These things were recognized at that time at Constantinople. And now as we have at length wound our way through the labyrinth of all the various forms of faith, let us reckon the number of them.</p> <p>2.41.18 After that which was promulgated at Nicaea, two others were proposed at Antioch at the dedication of the church there.</p> <p>2.41.19 A third was presented to the Emperor in Gaul by Narcissus and those who accompanied him.</p> <p>2.41.20 The fourth was sent by Eudoxius into Italy. There were three forms of the creed published at Sirmium, the one on which the consuls' names were signed, was read at Ariminum.</p> <p>2.41.21 The Acacian party produced an eighth at Seleucia.</p> <p>2.41.22 The last was that of Constantinople, containing the prohibitory clause respecting the mention of 'substance' or 'subsistence' in relation to God.</p> <p>2.41.23 To this creed Ulfilas bishop of the Goths gave his assent, although he had previously adhered to that of Nicaea; for he was a disciple of Theophilus bishop of the Goths, who was present at the Nicene council, and who had subscribed what was there determined. Let this suffice on these subjects.</p>		
Eunomius forms a separate communion from Eudoxius and Acacius		
		<p>2.29.1 Eunomius in his writings praises Aetius, styles him a man of God, and honors him with many compliments. Yet he was at that time closely associated with the party by whom Aetius had been condemned, and to them he owed his election to his bishopric. Now the followers of Eudoxius and Acacius, who had assented to the decrees put forth at Nice in Thrace, already mentioned in this history, appointed other bishops in the churches of the adherents of Basilius and Eleusius in their place.</p> <p>2.29.2 On other points I think it superfluous to write in detail. I intend only to relate what concerns Eunomius.</p>

Socrates	Sozomen	Theodoret
		<p>For when Eunomius had seized on the bishopric of Cyzicus during the lifetime of Eleusius, Eudoxius urged him to hide his opinions and not make them known to the party who were seeking a pretext to persecute him. Eudoxius was moved to offer this advice both by his knowledge that the diocese was sound in the faith and his experience of the anger manifested by Constantius against the party who asserted the only begotten Son of God to be a created being.</p> <p>2.29.3 “Let us” said he to Eunomius “bide our time; when it comes we will preach what now we are keeping dark; educate the ignorant; and win over or compel or punish our opponents.” Eunomius, yielding to these suggestions, preached his impious doctrine under the shadow of obscurity.</p> <p>2.29.4 Those of his hearers who had been nurtured on the Divine Word saw clearly that his utterances concealed under their surface a foul fester of error. But, however distressed they were, they considered it more rash than prudent to make any open protest, so they assumed a mask of heretical heterodoxy. They paid a visit to the bishop at his private residence with the earnest request that he would have regard to the distress of men who are swayed to and fro by various doctrines, and would plainly expound the truth.</p> <p>2.29.5 Eunomius thus emboldened, declared the sentiments which he secretly held. The deputation then went on to remark that it was unfair and indeed quite wrong for his whole diocese to be prevented from having their share of the truth.</p> <p>2.29.6 By these and similar arguments he was induced to lay bare his blasphemy in the public assemblies of the church. Then his opponents hurried with angry fervor to Constantinople.</p> <p>2.29.7 First they indicted him before Eudoxius, and when Eudoxius refused to see them, sought an audience of the emperor and lamented over the destruction their bishop was spreading among them. “The sermons of Eunomius,” they said, “are more impious than the blasphemies of Arius.” The wrath of Constantius was</p>

Socrates	Sozomen	Theodoret
		<p>roused, and he commanded Eudoxius to send for Eunomius, and, on his conviction, to strip him of his bishopric.</p> <p>2.29.8 Eudoxius, of course, though again and again urged by the accusers, continued to delay taking action. Then once more they approached the emperor with loud complaints that Eudoxius had not obeyed the imperial commands in a single point, and was perfectly indifferent of an important city to the blasphemies of Eunomius.</p> <p>2.29.9 Then said Constantius to Eudoxius, if you do not fetch Eunomius and try him, and on conviction of the charges brought against him, punish him, I shall exile you.</p> <p>2.29.10 This threat frightened Eudoxius, so he wrote to Eunomius to escape from Cyzicus, and told him he had only himself to blame because he had not followed the hints given him. Eunomius accordingly withdrew in alarm, but he could not endure the disgrace, and endeavoured to fix the guilt of his betrayal on Eudoxius, maintaining that both he and Aetius had been cruelly treated.</p> <p>2.29.11 And from that time he set up a sect of his own for all the men who were of his way of thinking and condemned his betrayal, separated from Eudoxius and joined with Eunomius, whose name they bear up to this day. So Eunomius became the founder of a heresy, and added to the blasphemy of Arius by his own peculiar guilt.</p> <p>2.29.12 He set up a sect of his own because he was a slave to his ambition, as the facts distinctly prove. For when Aetius was condemned and exiled, Eunomius refused to accompany him, though he called him his master and a man of God, but remained closely associated with Eudoxius. But when his turn came he paid the penalty of his iniquity; he did not submit to the vote of the synod, but began to ordain bishops and presbyters, though himself deprived of his episcopal rank. These then were the deeds done at Constantinople.</p>
Digression on Eustathius, deposed bishop of Sebastia		
2.43.1 But Eustathius bishop of Sebastia in Armenia was not even permitted to make his defense; because he had been long before deposed by Eulalius, his own father,		

Socrates	Sozomen	Theodoret
<p>who was bishop of Caesarea in Cappadocia, for dressing in a style unbecoming of the priestly office.</p> <p>2.43.2 Let it be noted that Meletius was appointed his successor, of whom we will speak later. Eustathius indeed was subsequently condemned by a Synod convened on his account at Gangra in Paphlagonia. For he had, after his deposition by the council at Caesarea, done many things contrary to the ecclesiastical canons. For he had ‘forbidden marriage,’ and maintained that meats were to be abstained from.</p> <p>2.43.3 He even separated many from their wives, and persuaded those who disliked to assemble in the churches to commune at home. Under the pretext of piety, he also seduced servants from their masters. He himself wore the clothing of a philosopher, and induced his followers to adopt a new and extraordinary appearance, directing that the hair of women should be cropped.</p> <p>2.43.4 He permitted the prescribed fasts to be neglected, but recommended fasting on Sundays. In short, he prohibited prayers from being offered in the houses of married persons.</p> <p>2.43.5 And he declared that both the benediction and the communion of a presbyter who continued to live with a wife whom he might have lawfully married, while still a layman, ought to be shunned as an abomination.</p> <p>2.43.6 Since he was doing and teaching these things and many others of a similar nature, a Synod convened, as we have said, at Gangra in Paphlagonia and deposed him, anathematizing his opinions. This, however, was done afterwards.</p>		
The Council of Constantinople is universally enforced		
	<p>4.25.6a After these decisions and deeds, letters were then sent to all the bishops and clergy, to observe and fulfill its decrees.</p>	
<p>2.43.7 But after Macedonius was ejected from the see of Constantinople, Eudoxius, who now looked upon the see of Antioch as secondary in importance, was promoted to the vacant bishopric. He was consecrated by the Acacians, who in this instance, cared not to consider that it was inconsistent with their former proceedings.</p>	<p>4.25.6b As a consequence, not long after, some of the Eudoxian party were substituted here and there. Eudoxius himself took possession of the bishopric of Macedonius.</p>	<p>2.27.21b After this, Eudoxius laid violent hands on the Church of Constantinople; and on the expulsion of Eleusius from Cyzicus, Eunomius was appointed in his place.</p>

Socrates	Sozomen	Theodoret
<p>2.43.8 For they who had deposed Dracontius because of his move from Galatia to Pergamos, were clearly acting contrary to their own principles and decisions in ordaining Eudoxius, who then made a second change.</p>		
	<p>4.25.6c Athanasius was placed over the church of Basil; and Eunomius, who was subsequently the leader of a heresy bearing his name, took the see of Eleusius; and Meletius was appointed to the church of Sebaste, instead of Eustathius.</p>	
<p>2.43.9 After this they sent their own exposition of the faith, in its corrected and supplementary form, to Arminum, ordering that all those who refused to sign it should be exiled on the authority of the emperor's edict. 2.43.10 They also informed the other prelates in the East who shared their opinion, of what they had done; and more especially Patrophilus bishop of Scythopolis, who on leaving Seleucia had proceeded directly to his own city.</p>		
	<p>4.26.2 Eudoxius and Acacius jointly exerted themselves to the utmost in endeavoring to cause the edicts of the Nicene Council to become forgotten. They sent the formulary read at Ariminum with various explanatory additions of their own, to every province of the empire, and obtained from the emperor an edict for the banishment of all who should refuse to subscribe to it. 4.26.3 But this undertaking, which appeared to them so easy to carry out, was the beginning of the greatest calamities, for it caused uproars throughout the empire, and imposed upon the Church in every region a persecution more grievous than those which it had suffered under the pagan emperors. 4.26.4 For if this persecution did not involve such tortures to the body as the preceding ones, it appeared more grievous to all who contemplated it rightly, on account of its disgraceful nature; for both the persecutors and the persecuted belonged to the Church. 4.26.5 And this persecution was all the more disgraceful in that men of the same religion treated their fellows with a degree of cruelty which the ecclesiastical</p>	

Socrates	Sozomen	Theodoret
	laws prohibit to be shown towards enemies and strangers.	
Eudoxius contrives a popular, impious joke		
2.43.11 When Eudoxius was constituted bishop of the imperial city, the great church named Sophia was at that time consecrated in the tenth consulate of Constantius, and the third of Julian Caesar, on the 15th day of February. [A.D. 360]	4.26.1a Macedonius, on his expulsion from the church of Constantinople, retired to one of the suburbs of the city, where he died. Eudoxius took possession of his church in the tenth year of the consulate of Constantius, and the third of Julian Caesar.	
<p>2.43.12 It was while Eudoxius occupied this see, that he first uttered that sentence which is still everywhere current, ‘The Father is impious, the Son is pious.’</p> <p>2.43.13 When the people seemed startled by this expression, and a disturbance began to be made, ‘Be not troubled,’ said he, ‘on account of what I have just said: for the Father is impious, because he worships no person; but the Son is pious because he worships the Father.’</p> <p>2.43.14 Eudoxius having said this, the tumult was appeased, and great laughter was excited in the church. And this saying of his continues to be a jest, even in the present day.</p> <p>2.43.15 The heresiarchs indeed frequently devised such subtle phrases as these, and by them split the church in two.</p> <p>2.43.16 Thus was the Synod at Constantinople terminated.</p>	4.26.1b It is said that, at the dedication of the great church called “Sophia,” when he rose to teach the people, he began his speech with the following proposition: “The Father is impious, the Son is pious”; and that, as these words caused a great commotion among the people, he added, “Be calm; the Father is impious, because he worships no one; the Son is pious, because he worships the Father.” On this explanation, he threw his audience into laughter.	
The Arians persecute all other groups all over the empire		
	<p>4.27.6b The Arians, who drove out of the churches and rigorously persecuted all who held different beliefs from themselves, deprived them of all these privileges.</p> <p>4.27.7 It would be no easy task to list the names of the priests who were at this period ejected from their own cities; for I believe that no province of the empire was exempted from such a calamity.</p>	
360/361 - Meletius is made bishop of Antioch		
2.44.1 It becomes us now to speak of Meletius, who, as we have recently observed, was created bishop of Sebastia in Armenia, after the deposition of Eustathius.		2.31.1 At this time. Constantius was residing at Antioch. The Persian war was over; there had been a time of peace, and he once again gathered bishops together with the object of making them all deny both the formula “of one substance” and also the formula “of different substance.”

Socrates	Sozomen	Theodoret
		On the death of Leontius, Eudoxius had seized the see of Antioch, but on his expulsion and illegal establishment after many synods at Constantinople, the church of Antioch had been left without a shepherd.
2.44.2 From Sebastia he was transferred to Beroea, a city of Syria. Being present at the Synod of Seleucia, he subscribed the creed set forth there by Acacius, and immediately returned from there to Beroea.	4.28.1 At the time when Eudoxius obtained the government of the church of Constantinople, there were many candidates for the see of Antioch; and as is frequently the case under such circumstances, contentions and seditions divided the clergy and the people of that church. 4.28.2 Each party was anxious to commit the government of the church to a bishop of its own persuasion; for interminable disputes concerning doctrine were rampant among them, and they could not agree as to a way of singing the psalms; and, as has been before stated, psalms were sung by each individual, according to his own peculiar creed.	
2.44.3 When the convention of the Synod at Constantinople was held, the people of Antioch found that Eudoxius, captivated by the magnificence of the see of Constantinople, had condemned their church. They then sent for Meletius, and invested him with the bishopric of the church at Antioch.	4.28.3 Such being the state of the church at Antioch, the partisans of Eudoxius thought it would be well to entrust the bishopric of that city to Meletius, then bishop of Sebaste, since he possessed such a great and persuasive eloquence, an excellent life, and as they all imagined, shared similar opinions with themselves. 4.28.4 They believed that his reputation would attract the inhabitants of Antioch and of the neighboring cities to conform to their heresy, particularly those called Eustathians, who had adhered invariably to the Nicene doctrines. But their expectations were utterly frustrated.	2.31.2 Accordingly, the assembled bishops gathered in considerable numbers from every quarter, asserted that their primary obligation was to provide a pastor for the flock and that with him, they would then deliberate on matters of faith. It fell out opportunely that the divine Meletius who was ruling a certain city of Armenia had been grieved with the insubordination of the people under his rule and was now living without occupation elsewhere. 2.31.3 The Arian faction imagined that Meletius was of the same way of thinking as themselves, and an upholder of their doctrines. They therefore petitioned Constantius to commit to his hands the reins of the Antiochene church. Indeed, in the hope of establishing their impiety there was no law that they did not fearlessly transgress; illegality was becoming the very foundation of their blasphemy. 2.31.4 Nor was this an isolated case of their irregular proceedings. On the other hand, the maintainers of apostolic doctrine, who were perfectly well aware of the soundness of the great Meletius, and had clear knowledge of his stainless character and wealth of virtue, came to a common vote, and took measures to have their resolution written out and subscribed by all without delay.

Socrates	Sozomen	Theodoret
		2.31.5a This document, both parties, as a bond of compromise, entrusted to the safe keeping of a bishop who was a noble champion of the truth, Eusebius of Samosata.
Meletius is deposed for preaching the Nicene Creed		
2.44.4a Now at first, he avoided all doctrinal questions, confining his discourses to moral subjects.	4.28.5 It is said that on his first arrival in Antioch, an immense multitude, composed of Arians, and of those who were in communion with Paulinus, flocked around him. Some wished to see the man because his fame was great, even before his coming; others were anxious to hear what he had to say, and to find out the nature of his opinions; for a report had been spread abroad which was afterwards proved to be true, that he maintained the doctrines of those convened at Nicaea. 4.28.6a In his first discourses, he confined himself to instructing the people in what we call ethics.	
2.44.4b But subsequently, he expounded to his hearers the Nicene creed, and asserted the doctrine of the <i>homoousion</i> .	4.28.6b Afterwards, however, he openly declared that the Son is of the same substance as the Father. It is said that at these words, the arch deacon of the church, who was then one of the clergy there, stretched out his hand, and covered the mouth of the preacher. 4.28.7 But he continued to explain his sentiments more clearly by means of his fingers than he could by language. He extended three fingers only towards the people, closed them, and then allowed only one finger to remain extended, and thus expressed by signs what he was prevented from uttering. As the archdeacon, in his embarrassment, seized the hand, he released the mouth; the tongue was free, and Meletius declared his opinion still more clearly and with a loud voice, and exhorted his listeners to hold fast the tenets of the council of Nicaea, and he testified to his hearers that those who held other views deviated from the truth. 4.28.8 As he persisted in the proclaiming of these same beliefs, either by word of mouth or by means of signs when the archdeacon closed his mouth, a contention between both sides occurred, not unlike that of the pancratium. The followers of Eustathius shouted aloud and rejoiced and leaped, while the Arians were cast down.	2.31.5b And when the great Meletius had received the imperial summons and arrived, forth to meet him came all the higher ranks of the priesthood, forth came all the other orders of the church, and the whole population of the city. There too, were Jews and Gentiles all eager to see the great Meletius. 2.31.6 Now the emperor had charged both Meletius and the rest who were able to speak to expound to the multitude the text “The Lord formed me in the beginning of his way, before his works of old” (Prov. viii. 22. lxx), and he ordered skilled writers to take down on the spot what each man said, with the idea that in this manner their instruction would be more exact. 2.31.7 First of all, Georgius of Laodicea spouted off his foul heresy. After him, Acacius of Caesarea preached a doctrine of compromise far removed indeed from the blasphemy of the enemy, but not preserving the apostolic doctrine pure and undefiled. Then up rose the great Meletius, and he exhibited the unbending line of the canon of the faith. 2.31.8 For using the truth as a carpenter does his rule, he avoided excess and defect. Then the multitude broke into loud applause and besought him to give them a short summary of his teaching. Accordingly, after showing three fingers, he withdrew two, left one, and uttered the

Socrates	Sozomen	Theodoret
	<p>4.28.9a Eudoxius and his partisans went away with indignation at this discourse, and contrived by their schemes to expel Meletius from Antioch. Soon afterwards, however, they recalled him, for they thought that he had renounced his former beliefs and had adopted theirs.</p>	<p>memorable sentence, “Even though they are three but we speak as to one.” 2.31.9 Against this teaching the men who had the plague of Arius in their hearts whetted their tongues, and started an ingenious slander, declaring that the divine Meletius was a Sabellian.</p>
<p>2.44.5 When the emperor was informed of this, he ordered that he should be sent into exile; and he caused Euzoius, who had before been deposed together with Arius, to be installed bishop of Antioch in his place.</p>	<p>4.28.9b As, however, it soon became apparent that his devotion to the Nicene doctrines was firm and unalterable, he was ejected from the church, and banished by order of the emperor. 4.28.10a And the see of Antioch was given Euzoius, who had formerly been banished with Arius.</p>	<p>2.31.10a Thus they persuaded the fickle sovereign who, like the well-known Euripus, easily shifted his current now this way and now that, and induced him to send Meletius to his own home. 2.31.10b Euzoius, an open defender of Arian tenets, was promptly promoted to his place; the very man whom, when a deacon, the great Alexander had degraded at the same time as Arius.</p>
Devotees of Meletius form a separate communion		
<p>2.44.6 Those, however, who were attached to Meletius, separated themselves from the Arian congregation and held their assemblies apart. Nevertheless, those who originally embraced the <i>homoousian</i> opinion would not communicate with them, because Meletius had been ordained by the Arians, and his adherents had been baptized by them.</p> <p>2.44.7a Thus was the Antiochian church divided, even in regard to those whose views on matters of faith exactly corresponded.</p>	<p>4.28.10b The followers of Meletius separated themselves from the Arians, and held their assemblies apart, for those who had from the beginning maintained that the Son is consubstantial with the Father refused to admit them into communion, because Meletius had been ordained by Arian bishops, and because his followers had been baptized by Arian priests.</p> <p>4.28.11a For this reason they were separated, although they held the same views.</p>	<p>2.31.11a Now the portion of the people who remained sound separated from the unsound and assembled in the apostolic church which is situated in the part of the city called the Palaea. For thirty years indeed after the attack made upon the illustrious Eustathius, they had gone on enduring the abomination of Arianism, in the expectation of some favorable change. 2.31.12 But when they saw impiety on the increase, and men faithful to the apostolic doctrines both openly attacked and threatened by secret conspiracy, the divine Meletius in exile, and Euzoius the champion of heresy established as bishop in his place, they remembered the words spoken to Lot, “Escape for your life”; and further the law of the gospel which plainly ordains “if your right eye offends you, pluck it out and cast it away from you.” 2.31.13 The Lord laid down the same law about both hand and foot, and added, “It is more beneficial for you that one of your members should perish and not that your whole body should be cast into hell.” Thus came about the division of the Church.</p>

Socrates	Sozomen	Theodoret
Eusebius of Samosata defies Constantius		
		<p>2.32.1 The admirable Eusebius mentioned above, who was entrusted with the common resolution, when he beheld the violation of the covenant, returned to his own see. Then certain men who were uneasy about the written document, persuaded Constantius to dispatch a messenger to recover it.</p> <p>2.32.2 Accordingly the emperor sent one of the officers who ride post with relays of horses, and bring communications with great speed. On his arrival he reported the imperial message, but, "I cannot," said the admirable Eusebius, "surrender the deed deposited with me until I am directed to do so by the whole assembly who gave it to me." This reply was reported to the emperor.</p> <p>2.32.3 Boiling with rage he sent to Eusebius again and ordered him to give it up, with the further message that he had ordered his right hand to be cut off if he refused. But he only wrote this to terrify the bishop, for the courier who conveyed the dispatch had orders not to carry out the threat.</p> <p>2.32.4 But when the divine Eusebius opened the letter and saw the punishment which the emperor had threatened, he stretched out his right hand and his left, bidding the man cut off both. "The decree," said he, "which is a clear proof of Arian wickedness, I will not give up."</p> <p>2.32.5 When Constantius had been informed of this courageous resolution he was struck with astonishment, and did not cease to admire it; for even foes are obliged by the greatness of bold deeds to admire their adversaries' success.</p>
Early 360 - Constantius prepares to fight the Persians		
<p>2.44.7b Meanwhile the emperor getting intelligence that the Persians were preparing to undertake another war against the Romans, traveled with great haste to Antioch.</p>	<p>4.28.11b The emperor having been informed that an insurrection was about to arise in Persia, traveled to Antioch.</p>	<p>2.30.1 As war was being waged against the Romans by Sapor King of Persia, Constantius mustered his forces and marched to Antioch. But the enemy was driven forth not by the Roman army, but by Him whom the pious soldiers in the Roman army worshipped as their God. How the victory was won I shall now proceed to relate.</p>

Socrates	Sozomen	Theodoret
		<p>2.30.2 Nisibis, sometimes called Antiochia Mygdonia, lies on the border of the realms of Persia and of Rome. In Nisibis, Jacobus whom I named just now was at once bishop, guardian, and commander in chief. He was a man who shone with the grace of a truly apostolic character.</p> <p>2.30.3 His extraordinary and memorable miracles, which I have fully related in my religious history, I think it superfluous and irrelevant to list once again. One, however, I will record because of the subject before us. The city which Jacobus ruled was now in possession of the Romans, and besieged by the Persian Army.</p> <p>2.30.4 The blockade was prolonged for seventy days. "Helepoles" and many other engines were advanced to the walls. The town was surrounded by a palisade and entrenchment, but still held out.</p> <p>2.30.5 The river Mygdonius which flowed through the middle of the town, at last the Persians dammed its stream a considerable distance up, and increased the height of its bank on both sides so as to shut the waters in. When they saw that a great mass of water was collecting and already beginning to overflow the dam, they suddenly launched it like an engine against the wall.</p> <p>2.30.6 The impact was tremendous; the bulwarks could not sustain it, but gave way and fell down. Just the same fate befell the other side of the circuit, through which the Mygdonius River made its exit; it could not withstand the shock, and was carried away.</p> <p>2.30.7 No sooner did Sapor see this than he expected to capture the rest of the city, and for all that day he rested for the mud to dry and the river to become passable. Next day he attacked in full force, and looked to enter the city through the breaches that had been made. But he found the wall built up on both sides, and all his labor vain.</p> <p>2.30.8 For that holy man, through prayer, filled both the troops and the rest of the townsfolk with valor, and both built the walls, withstood the engines, and beat off the advancing foe. And all this he did without approaching the walls, but by praying to the Lord of all within the church. Sapor, moreover, was not only astounded at the speed of the building of the walls but awed by another spectacle.</p>

Socrates	Sozomen	Theodoret
		<p>2.30.9 For he saw standing on the battlements one of kingly appearance and all ablaze with purple robe and crown. He supposed that this was the Roman emperor, and threatened his attendants with death for not having announced the imperial presence.</p> <p>2.30.10 But when they firmly maintained that their report had been a true one and that Constantius was at Antioch, he perceived the meaning of the vision and exclaimed “their God is fighting for the Romans.” Then the wretched man in a rage flung a javelin into the air, though he knew that he could not hit a bodiless being, but was unable to curb his passion.</p> <p>2.30.11 Therefore the excellent Ephraim (he is the best writer among the Syrians) urged the divine Jacobus to mount the wall to see the barbarians and to let fly at them the darts of his curse. So the divine man consented and climbed up into a tower.</p> <p>2.30.12 But when he saw the innumerable host he discharged no other curse than that mosquitoes and gnats might be sent forth upon them, so that by means of these tiny animals they might learn the might of the Protector of the Romans.</p> <p>2.30.13 On his prayer followed clouds of mosquitoes and gnats; they filled the hollow trunks of the elephants, and the ears and nostrils of horses and other animals.</p> <p>2.30.14 Finding the attack of these little creatures past endurance they broke their bridles, unseated their riders and threw the ranks into confusion. The Persians abandoned their camp and fled head-long. So the wretched prince learned by a slight and kindly chastisement the power of the God who protects the pious, and marched his army home again, reaping for all the harvest of the siege not triumph but disgrace.</p>
360/361³ - At a council in Antioch, the Acacians fail in an attempt to erase the term “similar” from the creed		
	<p>4.29.1 The partisans of Acacius were not able to stay in peace; and they therefore assembled together with a few others in Antioch, and condemned the decrees which</p>	

³ On this council, see: <http://www.fourthcentury.com/index.php/council-of-antioch-ad-360361/>

Socrates	Sozomen	Theodoret
	<p>they had themselves enacted. They decided to erase the term “similar” from the formulary which had been read at Ariminum and at Constantinople, and affirmed that in all respects, in substance and in will, the Son is dissimilar from the Father, and that He proceeded from what had no previous existence, even as Arius had taught from the beginning.</p> <p>4.29.2 They were joined by the partisans of Aetius, who had been the first after Arius to venture openly upon the profession of these opinions; hence Aetius was called atheist, and his approvers, Anomians and Exucotians.</p> <p>4.29.3 When those who maintained the Nicene doctrines demanded of the Acacians how they could say that the Son is dissimilar from the Father, and that He proceeded out of nothing, when it was affirmed in their own formulary that He is “God of God,” they replied that the Apostle Paul had declared that “All things are of God,” and that the Son is included in the term “all things”; and that it was in this sense, and in accordance with the Sacred Scriptures, that the expressions in their formulary were to be understood. Such were the misleading expressions and sophistry which they made use of.</p> <p>4.29.4 At length, finding that they could advance no efficient argument to justify themselves in the opinion of those who pressed them on this point, they withdrew from the assembly, after the formulary of Constantinople had been read a second time, and returned to their own cities.</p>	
Macedonius starts faction, promotes <i>homoiousios</i>, and is called a Macedonian and Pneumatomachian		
<p>2.45.1 Macedonius on being ejected from Constantinople, did not take his condemnation well and became restless.</p>	<p>4.27.1a The spirit of innovation is self-glorifying, and so it advanced further and further, and crept along to greater novelties with increasing self-conceit, and in scorn of the fathers it enacted laws of its own. Nor does the spirit of innovation honor the doctrines of the ancients concerning God, but is always thinking out strange dogmas and restlessly adds novelty to novelty as the events now show. For after Macedonius had been deposed from the church of Constantinople, he renounced the tenets of Acacius and Eudoxius.</p>	

Socrates	Sozomen	Theodoret
<p>2.45.2 He therefore associated himself with the other faction that had deposed Acacius and his party at Seleucia, and sent a deputation to Sophronius and Eleusius, to encourage them to adhere to that creed which was first promulgated at Antioch, and afterwards confirmed at Seleucia, proposing to give it the counterfeit name of the 'homoiousian' creed.</p> <p>2.45.3 By this means he drew around him a great number of followers, who because of him are still labeled 'Macedonians.' And although those who dissented from the Acacians at the Seleucian Synod had not previously used the term homoiousios, yet from that period they distinctly asserted it.</p> <p>2.45.5 To this party Eustathius joined himself, who for the reasons before stated had been ejected from the church at Sebastia.</p> <p>2.45.4 There was, however, a popular report that this term did not originate with Macedonius, but was the invention rather of Marathonius, who a little while before had been set over the church at Nicomedia. On this account the maintainers of this doctrine were also called 'Marathonians.'</p> <p>2.45.6 But when Macedonius began to deny the Divinity of the Holy Spirit in the Trinity, Eustathius said: 'I can neither admit that the Holy Spirit is God, nor can I dare affirm him to be a creature.'</p> <p>2.45.7 For this reason those who hold the homoousion of the Son call these heretics 'Pneumatomachi.'</p>	<p>4.27.2 This doctrine was embraced by Eleusius, Eustathius, and by all the other bishops who had been deposed at Constantinople, by the partisans of the opposite heresy. Their example was quickly followed by no small part of the people of Constantinople, Bithynia, Thrace, the Hellespont, and of the neighboring provinces.</p> <p>4.27.3 For their way of life had no little influence, and to this do the people give special attention. They assumed a very important demeanor, and their discipline was like that of the monks; their conversation was plain and of a style fitted to persuade.</p> <p>4.27.4 It is said that all these qualities came together in Marathonius. He originally held a public appointment in the army, under the command of the prefect. After amassing some money in this employment, he quit military science, and undertook the overseeing of the establishments for the sick and the destitute. Afterwards, at the suggestion of Eustathius, bishop of Sebaste, he embraced an ascetic mode of life, and founded a monastical institution in Constantinople which exists to the present day.</p> <p>4.27.5 He brought so much zeal, and so much of his own wealth to the support of the previously mentioned heresy, that the Macedonians were by many termed Marathonians, and it seems to me not without reason. For it appears that he alone, together with his institutions, was the reason that the heresy was not altogether extinguished in Constantinople.</p> <p>4.27.1b He began to teach that the Son is God, and that He is in all respects and in substance like the Father. But he affirmed that the Holy Ghost does not share in these honors, and he designated the Holy Spirit a minister and a servant, and applied to Him whatever could, without error, be said of the holy angels.</p>	

Socrates	Sozomen	Theodoret
2.45.8 How these Macedonians came to be so numerous in the Hellespont, I shall state in its proper place.	4.27.6a In fact, after the deposition of Macedonius, the Macedonians possessed neither churches nor bishops until the reign of Arcadius.	
361 - Acacians and followers of Aëtius embrace Anomoean position and are so-called Anomoeans and Exucontians		
<p>2.45.9 The Acacians meanwhile became extremely anxious that another Synod should be convened at Antioch, in consequence of having changed their mind respecting their former assertion of the likeness 'in all things' of the Son to the Father.</p> <p>2.45.10 A small number of them therefore assembled in the following consulate which was that of Taurus and Florentius, at Antioch in Syria, where the emperor was at that time residing, Euzoïus being bishop. A discussion was then renewed on some of those points which they had previously determined, in the course of which they declared that the term '<i>homoios</i>' ought to be erased from the form of faith which had been published both at Ariminum and Constantinople; and they no longer concealed but openly declared that the Son was altogether unlike the Father, not merely in relation to his essence, but even as it respected his will asserting boldly also, as Arius had already done, that he was made of nothing.</p> <p>2.45.11 Those in that city who favored the heresy of Aëtius, gave their assent to this opinion. Because of this, in addition to the name 'Arians' they were also termed '<i>Anomoeans</i>,' and '<i>Exucontians</i>,' by those at Antioch who embraced the <i>homoousian</i>, who nevertheless were at that time divided among themselves on account of Meletius, as I have before observed.</p> <p>2.45.12 Being therefore questioned by them, how they dared to affirm that the Son is unlike the Father, and has his existence from nothing, after having acknowledged him 'God of God' in their former creed, they attempted to sidestep this objection by such deceptive excuses as follows.</p> <p>2.45.13 'The expression, "God of God," ' said they, 'is to be understood in the same sense as the words of the apostle, "but all things of God." Because of this the Son is of God, since he is one of these 'all things.' And it is for</p>		

Socrates	Sozomen	Theodoret
<p>this reason the words “according to the Scriptures” are added in the draft of the creed.’</p> <p>2.45.14 The author of this sophism was George, bishop of Laodicea, who being unskilled in such phrases, was ignorant of the manner in which Origen had formerly explained these peculiar expressions of the apostle, having thoroughly investigated the matter.</p> <p>2.45.15 But despite these evasive maneuvers, they were unable to bear the reproach which they humiliatingly brought upon themselves, and they fell back upon the creed which they had before put forth at Constantinople. And so, each one retired to his own district.</p>		
George oppresses pagans and Christians in Alexandria		
<p>2.45.16 George returning to Alexandria, resumed his authority over the churches there, as Athanasius had still not made his appearance. Those in that city who were opposed to his sentiments he persecuted.</p> <p>2.45.17a Conducting himself with great severity and cruelty, he caused himself to be extremely hated by the people.</p>	<p>4.30.1 During this period, Athanasius was obliged to remain in hiding, and George returned to Alexandria, and began a cruel persecution against the pagans, and against the Christians who differed from him in opinion. He compelled both parties to offer worship in the mode he indicated, and where opposition was made, he enforced obedience by compulsion. He was hated by the rulers because he scorned them and was giving orders to the officers; and the multitude detested him on account of his tyranny, for his power was greater than all the rest.</p> <p>4.30.2 The pagans regarded him with even greater hostility than the Christians, because he prohibited them from offering sacrifices, and from celebrating their ancestral festivals; and because he had on one occasion, introduced the governor of Egypt and armed soldiery into the city, and defaced their images, votives and temple ornaments. This was, in fact, the cause of his death, on which I will dwell.</p>	
Succecion of bishops in Jerusalem		
<p>2.45.17b At Jerusalem, Arrenius was placed over the church instead of Cyril.</p> <p>2.45.18 We may also remark that Heraclius was ordained bishop there after him, and after him Hilary. At length, however, Cyril returned to Jerusalem, and was</p>	<p>4.30.3 On the deposition of Cyril, Erennius obtained the church of Jerusalem; he was succeeded by Heraclius, and to Heraclius succeeded Hilarius; for we have gathered from tradition that in that period these individuals administered the church there until the reign</p>	

Socrates	Sozomen	Theodoret
<p>again invested with the presidency over the church there. About the same time another heresy sprang up, which arose from the following circumstance.</p>	<p>of Theodosius, when Cyril was once more restored to his own see.</p>	
<p>The Apollinaries devise a new Christological heresy</p>		
<p>2.46.1 There were two men of the same name at Laodicea in Syria, a father and son. Their name was Apollinaris; the former of them was a presbyter, and the latter a reader in that church.</p> <p>2.46.2 Both taught Greek literature, the father grammar, and the son rhetoric.</p> <p>2.46.3 The father was a native of Alexandria, and at first taught at Berytus, but afterwards moved to Laodicea, where he married, and the younger Apollinaris was born.</p> <p>2.46.4 They were contemporaries of Epiphanius the sophist, and being true friends, they became close with him.</p> <p>2.46.5 But Theodotus bishop of Laodicea, fearing that such communication should pervert their principles and lead them into paganism, forbade their associating with him. They, however, paid little attention to this prohibition, and continued their familiarity with Epiphanius.</p> <p>2.46.6 George, the successor of Theodotus, also endeavored to prevent their conversing with Epiphanius; but not being able in any way to persuade them on this point, he excommunicated them.</p> <p>2.46.7 The younger Apollinaris regarded this severe procedure as an act of injustice, and relying on the resources of his rhetorical sophistry, originated a new heresy, which was named after its inventor, and still has many supporters.</p> <p>2.46.8 Nevertheless some affirm that it was not for the above reason that they dissented from George, but because they saw the unsettledness and inconsistency of his profession of faith; since he sometimes maintained that the Son is like the Father, in accordance with what had been determined in the Synod at Seleucia, and at other times approved of the Arian view.</p>		

Socrates	Sozomen	Theodoret
<p>2.46.9 They therefore made this a pretext for separation from him. But as no one followed their example, they introduced a new form of doctrine.</p> <p>2.46.10 At first, they asserted that in the performing of the incarnation, God the Word assumed a human body without a soul.</p> <p>2.46.11 Afterwards, as if changing their mind, they retracted, admitting that he took a soul indeed, but that it was an irrational one, God the Word himself being in the place of a mind.</p> <p>2.46.12 Those who followed them and bear their name at this day affirm that this is their only point of distinction from the Catholics; for they recognize the consubstantiality of the persons in the Trinity.</p> <p>2.46.13 But we will make further mention of the two Apollinares in the proper place.</p>		
Julian enjoys great success in Gaul		
<p>2.47.1 While the Emperor Constantius continued his residence at Antioch, Julian Caesar engaged with an immense army of barbarians in the Gauls, and obtained the victory over them.</p> <p>2.47.2 He became extremely popular among the soldiery and was proclaimed emperor by them.</p>		
3 November, 361 - Constantius dies on the way to engage Julian		
<p>2.47.3 When this was made known, the Emperor Constantius prepared himself for a struggle. He was therefore baptized by Euzoius, and immediately prepared to undertake an expedition against Julian.</p> <p>2.47.4 On arriving at the frontiers of Cappadocia and Cilicia, his excessive agitation of mind produced a stroke, which ended his life at Mopsucrene, in the consulate of Taurus and Florentius, on the 3d of November.</p> <p>2.47.5 This was in the first year of the 285th Olympiad.</p> <p>2.47.6 Constantius had lived forty-five years, having reigned thirty-eight years; thirteen of which he was his father's colleague in the empire, and after his father's death for twenty-five years [sole emperor], the history of which latter period is contained in this book.</p>		<p>2.32.6a At this time, Constantius learned that Julian, whom he had declared Caesar of Europe, was aiming at sovereignty and mustering an army against his master.</p> <p>2.32.6b Therefore he set out from Syria, and died in Cilicia. Nor had he the helper whom his Father had left him; for he had not kept intact the inheritance of his Father's piety, and so bitterly mourned his change of faith.</p>

