



## **Had St.Meletius of Antioch been ordained by the Arians: another faulty analogy in the ordination issue**

**Had St.Meletius of Antioch been ordained by the Arians: another faulty analogy in the ordination issue**

**Bishop Sylvester of Belogorodka, vicar of the Kiev Metropolia,  
rector of the Kiev Theological Academy and Seminary**

In the course of debates on the order of acceptance into the Church of persons ordained in schismatic communities one can often hear references to various precedents in history. For instance, the defenders of the position of the Patriarchate of Constantinople, which had received members of the UOC KP and UAOC into communion without reordination, cite examples of acceptance in the present dignity of persons ordained by schismatics and even by heretics. Yet, in most cases these examples do not seem to be convincing upon closer look.

We will focus our attention on an example that one can encounter rather often. This is the ordination of St. Meletius and his ascension to the See of Antioch in 360. Assertions can be found in the literary works that he was ordained by the Arians. This is what both ancient church writers and modern researchers say. For instance, Socrates Scholasticus in his “Ecclesiastical History” wrote that the adherents of the Nicene faith believed that “Meletius had been ordained by the Arians” (Book II, ch. 44) [1]. St. Epiphanius of Cyprus wrote that St. Meletius “had been ordained by the Arians, followers of Acacius [of Caesarea]” (Panarion, 73, 28) [2]. Quite recently the same was said by Metropolitan Kyrillos (Katerelos) of Krini, the Patriarchate of Constantinople [3], and by Abbot Antipa of St. Anne’s scete on Mt. Athos [4].

As far as is known, St. Meletius was held in special veneration during his lifetime both in Antioch and in Constantinople and presided at the Second Ecumenical Council in 381. How can these facts consist with the accusations of Arianism? Some Orthodox authors have already answered this question [5], but, nonetheless, we will try to look more closely at this episode in church history.

## **The life of St. Meletius before his election to the See of Antioch**

It is worthy of notice that very little is known about the life of St. Meletius before his election to the See of Antioch. The historical sources contain very scarce information about his life before 360.

St. Meletius was a bishop when elected to the See of Antioch. Around 358, he replaced the deposed Bishop Eustathius at the See of Sebaste (modern Sivas, Eastern Turkey) [6], though for a very short time. Theodoret of Cyrus writes that Meletius “had been grieved with insubordination of the people under his rule and was living without occupation elsewhere” (Ecclesiastical History. Book II, ch. 27) [7] probably because of the conflict with the faithful who were amiably disposed to the expelled Bishop Eustathius. Socrates Scholasticus writes that St. Meletius was transferred from Sebaste to Beroea, a city in Syria (Book II, ch. 44) [8], but the fact of his bishopric there is questioned in the research literature. Probably he lived in Beroea in solitude, but did not perform episcopal functions. It was from Beroea that Meletius was summoned to serve in Antioch.

The extant sources contain no indication of who ordained St. Meletius Bishop of Sebaste. His theological position at the time of ordination has remained unclear. These issues are debatable. We know that St. Meletius was installed in Sebaste instead of the expelled Bishop Eustathius who belonged to the Homoiousians (Gk. ὁμοιούσιος, i.e. of like substance with the Father) and shared the assertion that the Son was like the Father. The Homoiousians rejected the terminology of the Council of Nicaea. They believed that the doctrine of the consubstantiality of the Father and the Son could lead to the heresy of Modalism (Sabellianism). In the words “of one substance” (Gk. ὁμοούσιος), used in the Nicene Creed, they saw the danger of confusing the Father and the Son “into one substance.” At the same time, they often used the word ὁμοούσιος in the sense close to that in the Nicene Creed [9].

Bishop Eustathius was deposed from the See of Sebaste most likely due to the activity of Bishop Acacius of Caesarea, the leader of another theological party, the Homoeans (Gk. ὁμοιος, 'like'). This is the name of the followers of Eusebius – the predecessor of Acacius at the See of Caesarea. The Homoeans asserted that God the Father could not enter into direct relations with the world and therefore generated his only-begotten Son in a mysterious way. Also, they did not recognize the equality of the Father and the Son, although they did not place the Son of God alongside the created beings because considered Him the Creator of the world. They believed that the origin of the Son from the Father was ineffable and unknown. The Homoiousians deemed the Son to be like the Father in substance, while the Homoeans recognized the Son to be like the Father, but found it impossible to talk about likeness in substance [10]. Thus, the Homoeans' concept was identical neither to the extreme Arianism, nor to Homoiousianism, or the Nicene faith.

It is believed that the Homoeans made the first claim about themselves at the Council of Ancyra in 358. The council anathematized both the extreme Arian teaching (Anomoeanism) and the Nicene faith and rejected the term “one in substance,” seeing a danger of Sabellianism in it. Yet, modern scholars admit that in objective consideration the Council of Ancyra of 358 hastened Church’s victory over Arianism [11].

The assertions of St. Epiphanius of Cyprus in this regard are of particular importance. In his *Panarion* he included the name of St. Meletius in the list of the Homoeans second only to Acacius of Caesarea (*Panarion*, 73, 23) [12]. St. Epiphanius cited the text of the Synodical Letter of the Council of Seleucia and did not mention Meletius among forty-three bishops who signed it in 359 (*Panarion*, 73, 26) [13]. This is why modern scholars consider the fact of St. Meletius’ participation in the Council of Seleucia unsubstantiated. He had not ruled the diocese of Sebaste at the time of the Council and therefore could not attend.

According to St. Epiphanius, the Homoeans “concealed their thoughts” (*Panarion*, 73, 23) [14] and some of them were really Orthodox. These words illustrate the extremely complicated situation that the Church was facing in the period between the First and the Second Ecumenical Councils. It was virtually impossible to distinguish among various theological concepts. The French scholar Ferdinand Cavallera analyzed church life in the East during the years of triumph of the Arian and the semi-Arian parties and stated that in the confusion of battle between them it had been extremely difficult to tell the difference between those who had remained faithful to the Council of Nicaea and those who had rejected its Creed in principle [15].

Clearly, there is no way to reckon St. Meletius among adherents of extreme Arianism (Anomoeans). It is highly unlikely that he was a homoiousian as Eustathius because he was installed at the See of Seleucia to replace him. On the other hand, there is no evidence that Meletius openly favoured the Nicene party before 360. Probably, he was connected to Acacius’ circle. However, Ferdinand Cavallera insists that the right thing to say would be Meletius’ “belonging to the party” rather than his standing in solidarity with theological position of the Homoeans. There is no evidence either that Meletius was an ideologist and propagandist of the Homoeans’ doctrine. His contemporaries admitted that Meletius had been close to the circle of Acacius of Caesarea but never described him as a heretic.

### **The election of St. Meletius to the See of Antioch**

It has to be said now about the situation in Antioch at the time of Meletius’ election. St. Eustathius (must not be confounded with Eustathius of Sebaste), was a participant in the First Ecumenical Council and a staunch proponent of its canons. The intrigues of Eusebius of Nicomedia led to Eustathius’ deposition by a synod at Antioch around 327-330. He was accused of adultery, of insulting the emperor’s mother

and of Sabellianism. He probably died at his place in exile soon after, though the year of his death remains an open question [16].

After the expulsion of St. Eustatius, the See of Antioch passed over to the Arians for long. The extreme Nicaeans who started to call them Eustathians after the exiled Orthodox bishop had no church buildings in Antioch.

The Council of Seleucia in 359 deposed Eudoxius, an extreme Arian, who soon managed to obtain the See of Constantinople. The See of Antioch became vacant, and St. Meletius occupied it.

Almost all available sources make it clear that St. Meletius was installed at the See of Antioch by favour of Acacius of Caesarea, while most ancient writers are unanimous in saying that Meletius did not meet expectations of the Homoeans. When Meletius arrived in Antioch, he publicly “exhibited the unbending line of the canon of the faith” (Book II, ch. 27) [17]. St. Epiphanius also writes that the Acacius’s party was disappointed: “When Meletius was consecrated by Acacius’s own friends, they thought he shared their opinion. But as many report on him, he turned out not to” (Panarion, 73, 28) [18].

The first available document on Meletius’ theological position dates back to 360. This is his sermon on the verse from the Proverbs “The Lord created me in the beginning of his work, the first of his acts of old” (8,22). According to Theodoret, the election of a new bishop took place in Antioch in the presence of Emperor Constantius who ordered all candidates to expound the text [19]. This decision was not fortuitous, as it was the basis of the Arians’ teaching. Theological position of each candidate could be easily discerned in their interpretations. Relying on Theodoret’s testimony, some researchers believe that a theological dispute had been held in Antioch on the results of which the decision on a new bishop was taken [20].

Yet, other sources do not link Meletius’ sermon to election procedure. For instance, St. Epiphanius wrote that it had been Meletius’ first sermon at Antioch after his installation (Panarion, 73, 28) [21]. Thanks to St. Epiphanius, this text has come down to us (Panarion, 73, 29-33) [22].

As the sermon implies, St. Meletius was extremely cautious expounding the doctrine of the Son of God. He avoided the word “consubstantial,” preferring biblical terms. St. Epiphanius viewed this sermon favourably (Panarion, 73, 35) [23].

Calling the Son God and the Creator of the world in his sermon, St. Meletius makes it clear that the Son was not only a power, voice or soulless image of the Father, but independent hypostatic being. Perhaps the only place where the influence of the Homoeans’ theology can be seen is the assertion that the Son is like the Father. Yet, we can agree with the French researcher Émile Amann, who believes that “the

Nicaeans could recognize themselves” in Meletius’ sermon, that Meletius stands on the side of traditional faith and propounds all assertions of the Nicene Creed, while rejecting ambiguous interpretations someways bordering upon Arianism”[24].

Meletius was deposed only a few months after his election to the See of Antioch. The ancient church writers are almost unanimous in describing the reasons. He definitely upheld the Nicene Creed and joined the emerging New-Nicene party, which developed the Trinitarian theology. According to both Theodoret and Sozomen, it was the profession of the doctrine of the Trinity that led to the expulsion of Meletius.

### **The Eustathians and the Meletians**

There were two groups of the Orthodox believers in Antioch, namely, St. Eustathius’ followers and St. Meletius’ adherents who had refused to unite. Theodoret of Cyrus wrote: “in Antioch the sound body of the church had been split in two; at one and the same time they who from the beginning, for the sake of the right worthy Eustathius, had separated from the rest, were assembling by themselves; and they who with the admirable Meletius had held aloof from the Arian faction were performing divine services in what is called Palaea. Both parties used one confession in faith, for both parties were champions of the doctrine laid down in Nicaea. All that separated them was their mutual quarrel and their regard for their respective leaders” (Book III, ch.2) [25].

As the community of St. Eustathius’ dated back decades, other Local Churches considered it the only Orthodox community in Antioch. St. Athanasius of Alexandria and bishops of Rome maintained ties with the followers of Eustathius who had no bishop and were led by Paulinus, a presbyter. In 362, when St. Meletius was in exile, Bishop Lucifer of Cagliari visited Antioch and ordained Paulinus a bishop. This made the situation even worse, as now two bishops of the Orthodox faith, Paulinus and Meletius, aspired to the See of Antioch.

St. Meletius of Antioch became one of the chief allies of the New-Nicaeans and held the same views as St. Basil the Great and St. Gregory the Theologian. Yet, Rome maintained cautious attitude to him. In his correspondence with the Western bishops, St. Basil the Great tried to dispel their distrust of St. Meletius and gain their recognition of him as of a legitimate bishop of Antioch. For instance, he sent a letter to Rome signed by thirty-two Eastern bishops in 372 (Letter 92) [26]. However, St. Basil’s efforts have fallen short. Meletius was not recognized as primate of the Church of Antioch, but participated in the Second Ecumenical Council in 381 and even presided over it. The Fathers of the Council were trying to settle the intricate situation in Antioch and did not question the validity of Meletius’ ordination or cast doubt on his being Orthodox [27].

St. Meletius died during the Council. As he had not entered into canonical communion with Rome, the words “Meletian schism” are used in the Catholic Church on the basis of its teaching. As the Meletius’ followers in Antioch had no communion with the See of Rome, they had to be considered schismatics. In the 20<sup>th</sup> century, however, Catholic historians and theologians began to recede from this view of St. Meletius. For example, Émile Amann called these words “very inappropriate” [28].

### **The overcoming of the church schism in Antioch**

After St. Meletius' death some authoritative hierarchs, for instance, St. Gregory the Theologian and St. Ambrose of Milan, suggested not to elect a new bishop for the See of Antioch, but place it in the hands of Bishop Paulinus and thus end the schism. However, there prevailed another view. A closest associate of St. Meletius, Flavianus, was chosen to succeed him, and the division in Antioch remained. Although Bishop Paulinus’ Orthodoxy was not questioned, the East considered him responsible for the schism in Antioch, while the Roman Church continued formal communications with him.

The schism did not end even after Bishop Paulinus’ death as he had managed to ordain Bishop Evagrius as his successor who died in 393. Flavianus succeeded in persuading the Eustathians not to install bishops. This helped to overcome the schism little by little. Bishop Flavianus’ authority was recognized by the Church of Alexandria in 394 and by the Church of Rome in 398.

Also mentioned should be another important aspect of the church conflict in Antioch. The case is that Bishop Paulinus was the only one who ordained Evagrius [29]. Paulinus, most probably, was ordained by Bishop Lucifer of Cagliari in the same way. That is why Flavianus did not recognize the validity of ordination in the Eustathian community and insisted on the necessity of reordination.

The gravity of the situation in Antioch is clearly shown in the homilies of St. John Chrysostom who was a presbyter there from 386 to 397 and was one of Flavianus’ closest associates. For instance, in his homily on St. Paul’s words “One Lord, one faith, one baptism” (Eph. 4:5) his rather hard remarks were meant “for those who give themselves up indiscriminately to the mean who are dividing the Church.” Addressing the defenders of the Eustathians, he wrote: “What wilt thou say? Shall it be said, ‘Their faith is the same, they are orthodox as well as we’? ... Tell me, dost thou think this is enough, to say that they are orthodox? Is then the ordination of clergy past and done away? And what is the advantage of other things, if this be not strictly observed? For as we must needs contend for the faith; so must we for this also. For if it is lawful for any one, according to the phrase of them of old, to fill his hands and to become a priest, let all approach to minister. In vain has this altar been raised, in vain the fullness of the Church, in vain the number of the priests. Let us take them away and destroy them.” (Homily on Ephesians, 11, 5) [30]. We can see that St. John Chrysostom explicitly denies the presence of priesthood grace in Paulinus’ followers and counts them as a schismatic community standing against the Church.

There is a rather harsh assessment of the church schisms in this homily: “Nothing so provokes God's anger as the division of the Church. Yea, though we have achieved ten thousand glorious acts, yet shall we, if we cut to pieces the fullness of the Church, suffer punishment no less sore than they who mangled His body... For that indeed was brought to pass for the benefit of the world, even though it was done with no such intention; whereas this produces no advantage in any case, but the injury is excessive. These remarks I am addressing not to the governors only, but also to the governed. Now a certain holy man said what might seem to be a bold thing; yet, nevertheless, he spoke it out. What then is this? He said that not even the blood of martyrdom can wash out this sin. For tell me for what dost thou suffer as a martyr? Is it not for the glory of Christ? Thou then that yieldest up thy life for Christ's sake, how dost thou lay waste the Church, for whose sake Christ yielded up His life? ... This injury is not less than that received at the hands of enemies, nay, it is far greater.” (Homilies on Ephesians, 11, 4) [31].

St. John Chrysostom sets the principles of attitude to those separated from the body of the Church. He speaks about the necessity of knowing whether they kept the Orthodox faith while in schism and whether their ordinations are valid. These two factors must not be neglected as well as canonical rules on ordinations, because otherwise anyone can declare himself a priest and the rites for the ordination to the Holy Orders may be turned down.

The issue of receiving the “Eustathian clergy” was making church life in Antioch harder for a long time. We know that the schism was healed during the time of Bishop Alexander I (414-424) of Antioch from Theodoret's “Ecclesiastical History” (Book V, ch.35) [32]. So, the church conflict in Antioch lasted for almost eighty-five years, from 330 to 414.

### **Reference to St. Meletius at the Seventh Ecumenical Council**

In the ensuing centuries, church hierarchs, theologians, and canonists repeatedly referred to the events in Antioch as to an important example of the overcoming of schisms, though these events were interpreted and assessed differently.

For instance, the issue of receiving heretics in the Church was discussed at the Seventh Ecumenical Council in view of overcoming the heresy of iconoclasm. It must be explained, however, that the issue of receiving the iconoclast bishops was considered exclusively in relation to their involvement in the iconoclast strife rather than to the validity of their ordinations. A decision was made for each bishop individually after examining the extent of his involvement in the iconoclast controversy.

The “Meletius case” was mentioned at the first session of the Council [33] by a representative of Pope Hadrian I, presbyter Peter: “According to historians, St. Meletius had been ordained by the Arians; but

he said the word “consubstantial” from the ambo, and his ordination was not repudiated.” This assertion was also supported by the Sicilian bishops [34].

We can see in the minutes of the session that the words of the representative of Rome were not discussed. St. Tarasius of Constantinople, who chaired the Council, did not respond to them at all. There is no true story of St. Meletius’ ordination in these words, and it is quite evident that presbyter Peter put three events, namely, Meletius’ ordination, his election to the See of Antioch and his expulsion, in one storyline. The Roman legate says that St. Meletius had been ordained by the Arians, but right after his ordination he professed the Nicene Creed from the ambo and was immediately expelled. Presbyter Peter, probably, narrated the story described by Theodoret and Sozomen from memory. As we have shown above, St. Meletius was appointed to the See of Antioch when he was a bishop and professed his faith not immediately after ordination. Also, he did not use the word “consubstantial” in his sermon delivered in Antioch.

It is beyond argument that the Roman legate presented a view traditional for the Western Church. This is confirmed by the fact that only the Bishops from Sicily, i.e representatives of the Western Church, expressed support to his words, whereas the Eastern bishops did not react in any way.

So, the Seventh Ecumenical Council had not given any assessment of St. Methodius’ ordination. His name was just casually mentioned during debates at the Council.

## **Summary**

Summarizing the above, we can draw the following conclusions.

- The extant sources are not clear on who had ordained St. Meletius to the See of Sebaste. Also, we do not have a reliable testimony about his theological position at the time of election. There are reasons to believe that he was close to the party of Acacius of Caesarea, but he was not a signatory to the Synodical Letter of the Council of Seleucia in 359 compiled by the Homoeans.

- Account must be taken of an intricate situation in which the Church found itself in the period between the First and the Second Ecumenical Councils. At that time, the extreme Arianism (Anomoeanism) was officially condemned. As for the Homoiousians and the Homoeans, they were theological movements usually described as semi-Arian in opposition to the extreme Arians. The Homoeans’ theological formulas were not denounced at that time, but the extreme Nicaeans refused to accept them. Also, it is important to underscore that neither the Homoeans nor the Homoiousians were parallel hierarchies. According to Archimandrite Dorotheus (Voulisma), heretics and Orthodox were “intermingled” at that time. The opponents of the Nicene Creed did not create a separate hierarchy, but sought to move their



adherents to episcopal sees [35], which could be occupied in one and the same Church and at one and the same time by representatives of different groups of influence, religious parties and doctrinal views. Often enough, bishops adhering to different doctrinal positions could succeed one another at the same see quite legitimately.

That is why the adherents of different theological doctrines could go to the same churches and take part in the sacraments together in such large church centers as Antioch. Only the formation of the new Nicene terminology and its acceptance by the Church could bring about a clear distinction between heresy and Orthodoxy. According to Archimandrite Doroteus, it would be appropriate to call the Homoeans the “unexposed heretics.” Ordinations performed by them did not mean opposition to the Church and intentional withdrawal to a heretic community.

– The installation of St. Meletius to the See of Antioch was an election rather than ordination, because he was a bishop at that time. The ancient church historians say that he was installed to the See of Antioch by the adherents of Acacius of Caesarea, having in mind that assertion. Archimandrite Dorotheus (Voulisma) confirms it, saying that St. Meletius was Bishop of Sebaste and was elected to the See of Antioch rather than ordained [36].

– The words “Meletian schism” must be considered incorrect. They are typical for Catholic tradition because St. Meletius was not in communion with the See of Rome, but in the 20<sup>th</sup> century there appeared a tendency in Catholic literature to drop these words as inappropriate.

– St. Meletius not only participated in the Second Ecumenical Council, but presided over it. The Fathers of the Council were trying to settle an intricate situation in Antioch and did not question Meletius’ ordination or cast doubt on his being Orthodox. The ordination issue (recognition or non-recognition) was not approached at all. The reasons for the “Antiochian schism” lie in a completely different plane.

– A younger contemporary of St. Meletius, St. John Chrysostom, who used to live in Antioch, views him as a legitimate hierarch without debating his ordination and describes his opponents as schismatics. Moreover, St. John Chrysostom defines clear criteria according to which account must be taken of preserving the Orthodox faith while in schism and of the validity of ordinations. These two factors must not be neglected as well as canonical rules on ordinations, because otherwise anyone can declare himself a priest thus turning down the rites for the ordination to the Holy Orders.

The abovesaid amply proves, in our opinion, the unsound nature of referring to the “Meletius case” as to an example of ordinations performed by heretics or schismatics recognized by the Church.

*I deem it my duty to thank the Department of Ancient Languages and Philology at the Kiev Theological Academy for assistance in my work with literature in foreign languages.*

## Notes

[1] Socrates Scholasticus, *The Ecclesiastical History*, Moscow, 1996, p. 126.

[2] St.Epiphanius of Cyprus, *Works*, pt. 4. Moscow, 1880, p. 345.

[3] Ιριλλος (τατερελος), επισκοπος Αβύδου. Α Αυτοκέφαλη Εκκλησία της Ουκρανίας // δωδεκάνησος: Επισημον Δελτίον νων Εν Δωδεκανήσω Επαρχιών ου ου υου ΚΓ΄. Ύουλιος-Δεκέμβριος 2019, Σ. 38-39.

[4] Hieromonk Antipas of Mount Athos, *Schismatics who returned to the Church and became Saints*. E-resource: <https://bogoslov.ru/article/6171932>.

[5] See for example: Vasily I. Tulumtsis, *Ordinations performed by heretics as arguments on the issue of the Ukrainian autocephaly*. E-resource: <https://mospat.ru/ru/articles/87403/>.

[6] See: Daniil V.Zaitsev, *St.Meletius I of Antioch* // Orthodox Encyclopedia, Vol. 44, Moscow, 2016, pp. 573-574.

[7] Theodoret of Cyrus, *The Ecclesiastical History*, Moscow, 1993, p. 115.

[8] Socrates Scholasticus, *op.cit.*, p. 126.

[9] For more details see: Rev. Vladimir Shmaliy, *Arianism* // Orthodox Encyclopedia, vol. 3, Moscow, 2001. pp. 221-223.

[10] See for example *Ibid.*, pp. 223-225.

[11] Cf. for example: *Councils of Ancyra* // Orthodox Encyclopedia, Vol. 2. Moscow, 2001. pp. 448-449.

[12] St.Epiphanius of Cyprus, *Works*, pt. 4, Moscow, 1880, p. 337.

[13] *Ibid.*, pp. 342-343.

[14] *Ibid.*, p. 337.

[15] Ferdinand Cavallera, *Le schisme d'Antioche (IV-V siècle)*, pp. 44-46.

[16] See: Maksim V. Nikiforov, *St. Eustathius of Antioch* // Orthodox Encyclopedia, Vol. 17, Moscow, 2008, pp. 286-287.

[17] Theodoret of Cyrus, *op.cit.*, pp. 115-116.

[18] St.Epiphanius of Cyprus, *op.cit.* p. 345.

[19] Theodoret of Cyrus, *op.cit.*, p. 116.

[20] Daniil V. Zaitsev, *op.cit.*, p. 574.

[21] St.Epiphanius of Cyprus, *op.cit.*, pp. 345-346.

[22] *Ibid.* pp. 346-355.

[23] *Ibid.*, pp. 356-357.

[24] Émile Amann, *Mélèce d'Antioche*, p. 523.

[25] Theodoret of Cyrus, *op.cit.*, p. 120.

[26] St. Basil the Great, *Works*, Vol. 3, St. Petersburg, 1911, pp. 115-118.

[27] Archbishop Peter (L'Huillier), *The Church of the Ancient Councils. The Disciplinary Work of the First Four Ecumenical Councils*, pp. 210-212.

[28] Émile Amann, *op.cit.*, p. 520.

[29] Theodoret of Cyrus, *op.cit.*, p. 200.

[30] St.John Chrysostom, *Works* in Russian translation, Vol. 11, book 1, St.Petersburg, 1905, p. 103.

[31] *Ibid.*, p. 102.

[32] Theodoret of Cyrus, *op.cit.*, p. 209.

[33] For more details see *Τουλουμτσής Βασίλειος*. Το Εκκλησιολογικό πλαίσιο και οι προϋποθέσεις αποδοχής των αιρετικών σύμφωνα με τα Πρακτικά της Ζ΄ Οικουμενικής Συνόδου. 2022.

[34] *The Acts of the Ecumenical Councils* published in Russian translation at the Kazan Theological Academy, Vol. 7, Kazan, 1909, p. 55.

[35] The biography of Eusebius of Nicomedia is very illustrative. See Daniil V. Zaitsev, *Bishop Eusebius of Nicomedia* // Orthodox Encyclopedia, Vol. 17, Moscow, 2013, pp. 246-249.

[36] See: Theodore X. Yiangou, *Pedalion: History of Compilation and Publication*, pp. 94-95.