

that only the body of Jesus was human and his Divine logos mastered it. He reasoned that if Jesus had a truly human nature, he was bound to sin and so could not be divine. Eventually he conceded the soul of Jesus to be human but only a serving vehicle for the Logos to show itself. This emphasis on Deity allowed the humanity to be unreal and in effect raised the question as to whether Christ was God incarnate or simply a God-vehicle. A more precise view of Appolinaris' teaching must be had otherwise but this seems to be a fairly accurate portrait of the whole. His teaching had been condemned and forbidden after 375 on the general grounds that he had come up with a Christ who was all god but not really man.

Although the matter was originally condemned at Alexandria in 362, the problem continued to foment in the eastern church...well after the condemnation of the teacher. It was not of the Arian proportion so long as the Nicene issue was unsettled but with the agreement on the Nicene issue and the end of the formal Arian schism in the church, the matter of this teaching came to the forefront.

The question was...did Christ have a real body or did it just appear real. It was a problem close to the docetic heresy if not identical.

The resolution

Viewing the problem at great length, the Council took these actions:

--It reaffirmed the Nicene Creed.

--Appolinaris was condemned...the teacher, the teachings, the sympathizers, etc.

--a new creed was propounded that simply made the reality of Christ's person more emphatic.

Other matters at Constantinople

Along with the heavier matters, the council noted the equality of bishops...willing to allow the bishop of Rome to have a "first among equals" place due largely to the size and prestige of the see. No bishop is accorded any authority over another. In some ways this note of the council had more impact in church relations than the major question. The council also