

Harmony 2.2 - Council of Antioch and its aftermath (341-343)

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 2/16/18

Socrates	Sozomen	Theodoret
2.4.1a How indeed the Eusebians got Athanasius expelled I shall now tell you.		
341 - Council of Antioch summoned		
<p>2.8.1 Eusebius, however, could by no means remain quiet, but as the saying goes, left no stone unturned, in order to effect the purpose he had in view.</p> <p>2.8.2 Therefore, he caused a Synod to be convened at Antioch in Syria under the pretense of dedicating the church which the father of the Augusti had begun to build, and which his son Constantius had finished in the tenth year after its foundations were laid.</p> <p>2.8.2b The real intention, however, was subverting and abolishing the doctrine of the <i>homoiousia</i>.</p> <p>2.8.3a There were ninety bishops from various cities at this Synod.</p> <p>2.8.5 This Synod assembled at Antioch in the presence of the emperor Constantius in the consulate of Marcellus and Probinus. This was the fifth year after the death of Constantine, father of the Augusti. Placitus, successor to Euphronius, at that time presided over the church at Antioch.</p>	<p>3.5.1 Soon after these occurrences, the emperor went to Antioch, a city of Syria. Here a church had already been completed, which excelled in size and beauty. Constantine began to build it during his lifetime, and as the structure had been just finished by his son Constantius, it was deemed a favorable opportunity by the partisans of Eusebius, who of old were zealous for it, to convene a council.</p> <p>3.5.2 They, therefore, with those from various regions who held their sentiments, met together in Antioch.</p> <p>3.5.2c Their professed object was the consecration of the newly finished church; but they intended nothing else than the abolition of the decrees of the Nicaean Council, and this was fully proved by the sequel.</p> <p>3.5.2b Their bishops were about ninety-seven in number.</p> <p>3.5.2d The Church of Antioch was then governed by Placetus, who had succeeded Euphronius. The death of Constantine the Great had taken place about five years prior to this period.</p>	
Important Bishops who did not attend the Council		
<p>2.8.3b Maximus however, the bishop of Jerusalem who had succeeded Macarius, did not attend, recollecting that he had been deceived and lead to subscribe to the removal of Athanasius.</p> <p>2.8.4 Neither was Julius, bishop of the great Rome,</p>	<p>3.6.8 It is said that Maximus, bishop of Jerusalem, purposely kept aloof from this council, because he repented having unawares consented to the deposition of Athanasius. Neither the manager of the Roman see, nor any representative from the east of Italy, nor from the</p>	

Socrates	Sozomen	Theodoret
there. Nor had he sent a substitute, although an ecclesiastical canon commands that the churches shall not make any ordinances against the opinion of the bishop of Rome.	parts beyond Rome were present at Antioch.	
Arian bishops in attendance at the council		
	3.5.10 Not only did Eusebius (who, on the expulsion of Paul, had been transferred from Nicomedia to the throne of Constantinople) participate in this council, but likewise Acacius, the successor of Eusebius Pamphilus, Patrophilus, bishop of Scythopolis, Theodore, bishop of Heraclea, formerly called Perinthus, Eudoxius, bishop of Germanicia, who subsequently directed the Church of Constantinople after Macedonius, and Gregory, who had been chosen to preside over the Church of Alexandria. It was universally acknowledged that all these bishops held the same sentiments, such as Dianius, bishop of Caesarea in Cappadocia, George, bishop of Laodicea in Syria, and many others who acted as bishops over metropolitan and other distinguished churches.	
Eusebians bring old and new charges against Athanasius		
2.8.6 The allies of Eusebius had previously planned to slander Athanasius, first accusing him of having acted contrary to the canon, which they then constituted: that without the knowledge of a general council of bishops he resumed his episcopal authority, by himself taking possession of the church. 2.8.7 Then they planned on accusing him that there was chaos upon his return and many died in the riot; moreover, that some had been scourged by him, and others had been brought before the tribunals. Besides this, they brought forward what had been determined against Athanasius at Tyre.	3.5.3 When all the bishops had assembled in the presence of the emperor Constantius, the majority expressed great indignation, and vigorously accused Athanasius of having disrespected the sacerdotal regulation which they had enacted, and taken possession of the bishopric of Alexandria without first obtaining the sanction of a council. 3.5.3b They also deposed that he was the cause of the death of several persons, who fell in a sedition excited by his return; and that many others had on the same occasion been arrested and delivered up to the judicial tribunals.	
The life of Eusebius of Emesa, a proposed replacement for Athanasius		
2.9.1 On the ground of such charges as these they nominated first Eusebius, surnamed Emesa, as bishop for the Alexandrian church. George, bishop of Laodicea, who was present on this occasion, informs us who this person was.	3.6.1 Eusebius, surnamed Emesa, likewise attended the council. He sprang from a noble family of Edessa, a city of Osroënae. According to the custom of his country, he had from his youth upwards, learned the Holy Word, and was afterwards made acquainted with the learning of the	

Socrates	Sozomen	Theodoret
<p>2.9.2 He says in the book which he has composed on his life that Eusebius was descended from the nobility of Edessa in Mesopotamia, and that from a child he had studied the Holy Scriptures.</p> <p>2.9.3 He was afterwards instructed in Greek literature by a master resident at Edessa. Finally, the sacred books were expounded to him by Patrophilus and Eusebius, the latter of whom presided over the church at Caesarea and the former over the church at Scythopolis.</p> <p>2.9.4 Afterwards, when he dwelt in Antioch, it happened that Eustathius was deposed on the accusation of Cyrus of Beroea for believing the tenets of Sabellius.</p> <p>2.9.5 Then Eusebius again associated with Euphronius, successor of Eustathius, and, avoiding a bishopric, he retired to Alexandria. There he devoted himself to the study of philosophy.</p> <p>2.9.6 On his return to Antioch he formed an intimate acquaintance with Placitus [or Flacciltus], the successor of Euphronius. He was ordained bishop of Alexandria by Eusebius, bishop of Constantinople.</p> <p>2.9.7 He did not go there because of the great attachment of the people of that city to Athanasius. So he was sent to Emisa.</p> <p>2.9.8 When the inhabitants of Emisa protested because of his appointment, —for he was commonly charged with the study of judicial astrology, —he fled and came to Laodicea, to George, who has given so many historical details of him.</p> <p>2.9.9a George, having taken him to Antioch, procured his being again brought back to Emisa by Placitus and Narcissus.</p>	<p>Greeks.</p> <p>3.6.2a From the teachers who then frequented his native city, he subsequently acquired a more intimate knowledge of sacred literature, specifically under the guidance of Eusebius Pamphilus and Patrophilus, the president of Scythopolis.</p> <p>3.6.2b He went to Antioch at the time that Eustathius was deposed on the accusation of Cyrus, and lived with Euphronius, his successor, on terms of intimacy. He fled to escape being invested with the priestly dignity, went to Alexandria and frequented the schools of the philosophers.</p> <p>3.6.2c After acquainting himself with their mode of discipline, he returned to Antioch and dwelt with Placetus, the successor of Euphronius.</p> <p>3.6.3 During the time that the council was held in that city, Eusebius, bishop of Constantinople, implored him to accept the see of Alexandria for it was thought that, by his great reputation for sanctity and consummate eloquence, he would easily supplant Athanasius in the esteem of the Egyptians.</p> <p>3.6.4 He, however, refused the ordination, on the plea that he could otherwise only incur the ready hatred of the Alexandrians, who would have no other bishop but Athanasius. Gregory was, therefore, appointed to the church of Alexandria, and Eusebius to that of Emesa.</p> <p>3.6.5a There he (Eusebius) suffered from a sedition; for the people accused him of practicing that variety of astronomy which is called astrological, and being obliged to seek safety by flight, he retreated to Laodicea, and dwelt with George, bishop of that city, who was his particular friend.</p> <p>3.6.5b He afterwards accompanied this bishop to Antioch, and obtained permission from the bishops</p>	

Socrates	Sozomen	Theodoret
<p>2.9.9b But he was afterwards charged with holding the Sabellian views. George more elaborately describes the circumstances of his ordination and adds at the close that the emperor took him with him in his expedition against the barbarians, and that miracles were wrought by his hand. The information given by George concerning Eusebius of Emisa may be considered reproduced at sufficient length by me here.</p>	<p>Placetus and Narcissus to return to Emesa. 3.6.6 He was much esteemed by the emperor Constantius, and attended him in his military expedition against the Persians. It is said that God worked miracles through him, as is testified by George of Laodicea, who has related these and other incidents about him. 3.6.7 But although he was endowed with so many exalted qualities, he could not escape the jealousy of those who are irritated by witnessing the virtues of others. He endured the blame of having embraced the doctrines of Sabellius. At the present time, however, he voted with the bishops who had been convened at Antioch.</p>	
Constantius exiles Athanasius		
		<p>2.4.1a With these and similar arguments, the bishops assailed the weak-minded emperor, and persuaded him to expel Athanasius from his church.</p>
Gregory appointed to replace Athanasius instead		
<p>2.10.1 Now at that time, Eusebius having been nominated and yet fearing to go to Alexandria, the Synod at Antioch designated Gregory as bishop of that church.</p>	<p>3.5.4 By these accusations they contrived to cast disfavor on Athanasius, and it was decreed that Gregory should be invested with the government of the Church of Alexandria.</p>	<p>2.4.3b But perceiving that the flock of Athanasius was left without a pastor, they appointed over it a wolf instead of a shepherd. Gregory, for this was his name, surpassed the wild beasts in his deeds of cruelty towards the flock: but at the expiration of six years he was destroyed by the sheep themselves.</p>
Arians plot to nullify the Nicæan creed with numerous other creeds		
<p>2.10.2 This being done, they altered the creed; not as condemning anything in what was set forth at Nicæa, but in fact with a determination to subvert and nullify the doctrine of consubstantiality by means of frequent councils, and the publication of various expositions of the faith, so as gradually to establish the Arian views. 2.10.3 How these things happened, we will set forth in the course of our narrative; but the epistle respecting the faith, which was then publicized widely, was as follows:</p>	<p>3.5.5 They then turned to the discussion of doctrinal questions, and found no fault with the decrees of the council of Nicæa. They dispatched letters to the bishops of every city, in which they declared that, as they were bishops themselves, they had not followed Arius.</p>	
First conciliar letter and creed of Antioch		
<p>2.10.4 “We have neither become followers of Arius, — for how should we, who are bishops, be guided by a</p>	<p>3.5.5b “For how,” said they, “could we have been followers of him, when he was but a presbyter, and we</p>	

Socrates	Sozomen	Theodoret
	truths, but they did not describe the doctrine of the Son being co-eternal or consubstantial with the Father, or the opposite.	
Second conciliar letter and creed of Antioch		
<p>2.10.9 Having thus written in their first epistle, they sent it to the bishops of every city. But after remaining some time at Antioch, as if to condemn the former, they published another letter in these words:</p> <p>2.10.10 “In conformity with evangelic and apostolic tradition, we believe in one God, the Father Almighty, the Creator and Frammer of the universe.</p> <p>2.10.11 And in one Lord Jesus Christ, his Son, God the only-begotten, through whom all things were made: begotten of the Father before all ages, God of God, Whole of Whole, Only of Only, Perfect of Perfect, King of King, Lord of Lord; the living Word, the Wisdom, the Life, the True Light, the Way of Truth, the Resurrection, the Shepherd, the Gate; immutable and inconvertible; the unaltering image of the Divinity, Substance and Power, and Counsel and Glory of the Father; born ‘before all creation’; who was in the beginning with God, God the Word, just as it is declared in the Gospel, and the Word was God.</p> <p>2.10.12 By whom all things were made, and in whom all things subsist: who in the last days came down from</p>	<p>3.5.8 They subsequently changed their minds, it appears, about this formulary, and issued another, which, I think, very nearly resembled that of the council of Nicaea, unless, indeed, some secret meaning be attached to the words which is not apparent to me. Although they refrained—I know not from what motive—from saying that the Son is consubstantial, they confessed that He is immutable, that His Divinity is not susceptible of change, that He is the perfect image of the substance, and counsel, and power, and glory of the Father, and that He is the first-born of every creature.</p> <p>3.5.9 They stated that they had found this formulary of faith, and that it was entirely written by Lucianus, who was martyred in Nicomedia, and who was a man highly approved and exceedingly accurate in the sacred Scriptures. I know not whether this statement was really true, or whether they merely advanced it in order to give weight to their own document, by connecting with it the dignity of a martyr.</p>	

Socrates	Sozomen	Theodoret
<p>above, and was born of the virgin according to the Scriptures; and was made man, the Mediator between God and men, the Apostle of our Faith, and the Prince of Life, as he says, ‘I came down from heaven, not to do mine own will, but the will of him that sent me.’ And he suffered on our behalf, and rose again for us on the third day, and ascended into the heavens, and is seated at the right hand of the Father; and will come again with glory and power to judge the living and the dead.</p> <p>2.10.13 [We believe] also in the Holy Spirit, who is given to believers for their consolation, sanctification, and perfection; even as our Lord Jesus Christ commanded his disciples, saying, ‘Go and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit.’</p> <p>2.10.14 That is to say of the Father who is truly the Father, of the Son who is truly the Son, and of the Holy Spirit who is truly the Holy Spirit, these words not being simply or insignificantly applied, but accurately expressing the proper subsistence, glory, and order, of each of these who are named: so that there are three in person, but one in concordance.</p> <p>2.10.15 Holding therefore this faith in the presence of God and of Christ, we anathematize all heretical and false doctrine.</p> <p>2.10.16 And if any one shall teach contrary to the sound and right faith of the Scriptures, affirming that there is or was a period or an age before the Son of God existed, let him be accursed.</p> <p>2.10.17 And if any one shall say that the Son is a creature as one of the creatures, or that he is offspring as one of the offsprings, and shall not hold each of the aforesaid doctrines as the Divine Scriptures have delivered them to us, or if any one shall teach or preach any other doctrine contrary to that which we have received, let him be accursed.</p> <p>2.10.18 For we truly and unreservedly believe and follow all things handed down to us from the sacred Scriptures by the prophets and apostles.”</p>		
Council of Antioch closes		

Socrates	Sozomen	Theodoret
<p>2.10.19 Such was the exposition of the faith published by those then assembled at Antioch, to which Gregory also subscribed as bishop of Alexandria, although he had not yet entered that city.</p> <p>2.10.20 The Synod, having done these things, and legislated some other canons, was dissolved.</p>		
List of major Arians and orthodox sees		
	<p>3.7.1 Thus were the schemes of those who upheld various heresies in opposition to truth successfully carried into execution; and thus did they depose those bishops who strenuously maintained throughout the East the supremacy of the doctrines of the Nicaean Council. These heretics had taken possession of the most important sees, such as Alexandria in Egypt, Antioch in Syria, and the imperial city of the Hellespont, and they held all the persuaded bishops in subjection.</p> <p>3.7.2a The ruler of the Church at Rome and all the priests of the West regarded these deeds as a personal insult; for they had accorded from the beginning with all the decisions in the vote made by those convened at Nicaea, nor did they now cease from that way of thinking.</p>	
Eusebius asks Julius to investigate Athanasius, but dies before receiving a reply		
<p>2.11.7 Now Eusebius, having thus far obtained his object [cf. Harmony 2.1, pages 10-11], sent a deputation to Julius, bishop of Rome, begging that he would himself take notice of the charges against Athanasius, and order a judicial investigation to be made in his presence.</p> <p>2.12.1 But Eusebius did not live to learn the decision of Julius concerning Athanasius, for he died a short time after that Synod was held.</p>	<p>3.7.3a Irritated at this interference [cf. Harmony 2.1, pages 10-11], Eusebius wrote to Julius, exhorting him to constitute himself a judge of the decrees that had been enacted against Athanasius by the council of Tyre.</p> <p>3.7.3b But before he had been able to ascertain the sentiments of Julius, and, indeed, not long after the council of Antioch, Eusebius died.</p>	
Winter 341/2 - Renewed struggle in Constantinople over bishopric		
<p>2.12.2a Closely following this, the people introduced Paul again into the church of Constantinople.</p> <p>2.12.2b The Arians however, ordained Macedonius at the same time, in the church which was dedicated to Paul.</p>	<p>3.7.4a Immediately after this event the citizens of Constantinople who upheld the doctrines of the Nicaean Council conducted Paul to the church.</p> <p>3.7.4b At the same time those of the opposing multitude seized this occasion and came together in another church, among whom were the adherents of Theognis, bishop of Nicaea, of Theodore, bishop of Heraclea, and others of</p>	

Socrates	Sozomen	Theodoret
	the same party who chanced to be present, and they ordained Macedonius bishop of Constantinople.	
2.12.3 It was those who had formerly co-operated with Eusebius (that disturber of the public peace) who brought this about, assuming all his authority. These were Theognis, bishop of Nicaea, Maris of Chalcedon, Theodore of Heraclea in Thrace, Ursacius of Singidunum in Upper Mysia, and Valens of Mursa in Upper Pannonia.		
2.12.4 Ursacius and Valens indeed afterward altered their opinions, and presented a written recantation of them to bishop Julius, so that on subscribing to the doctrine of consubstantiality they were again admitted to communion. 2.12.5 But at that time they warmly supported the Arian error, and were instigators of the most violent conflicts in the churches, one of which was connected with Macedonius at Constantinople. By this internal war among the Christians, continuous seditions arose in that city, and many lives were sacrificed in consequence of these occurrences.		
2.12.5 But at that time they warmly supported the Arian error, and were instigators of the most violent conflicts in the churches, one of which was connected with Macedonius at Constantinople. By this internal war among the Christians, continuous seditions arose in that city, and many lives were sacrificed in consequence of these occurrences.	3.7.5a This roused frequent riots in the city which assumed the complete appearance of a war, for the people attacked one another, and many perished.	
342 - General Hermogenes is slain in Constantinople		
2.13.1a Intelligence of these proceedings reached the ears of the Emperor Constantius, whose residence was then at Antioch. 2.13.1b Accordingly he ordered his general Hermogenes, who had been dispatched to Thrace, to pass through Constantinople on his way, and expel Paul from the church. 2.13.2 He, on arriving at Constantinople, threw the whole city into confusion, attempting to cast out the bishops; for sedition immediately arose from the people	3.7.5b The city was filled with tumult, so that the emperor, who was then at Antioch, on hearing of what had occurred, was moved to wrath, and issued a decree for the expulsion of Paul. 3.7.6a Hermogenes, general of the cavalry, endeavored to put this edict of the emperor into execution; for having been sent to Thrace, he had, on the journey, to pass by Constantinople. And he intended, by means of his army, to eject Paul from the church by force. 3.7.6b But the people, instead of yielding, met him with open resistance.	

Socrates	Sozomen	Theodoret
<p>in their eagerness to defend the bishop.</p> <p>2.13.3 And when Hermogenes persisted in his efforts to drive out Paul by means of his military force, the people became exasperated as is usual in such cases; and making a desperate attack upon him, they set his house on fire, and after dragging him through the city, they at last put him to death.</p> <p>2.13.4 This took place during the consulate of the two Augusti,—that is to say, the third consulship,—Constantius, and the second of Constans: 4b.at which time Constans, having subdued the Franks, compelled them to enter into a treaty of peace with the Romans.</p>	<p>3.7.7c While the soldiers, in order to carry out the orders they had received, attempted still greater violence, the insurgents entered the house of Hermogenes. They then set fire to it, killed him, and attaching a cord to his body, dragged it through the city.</p>	
342 - Constantius punishes Constantinople and deposes Paul		
<p>2.13.5 The Emperor Constantius, on being informed of the assassination of Hermogenes, set off on horseback from Antioch, and arriving at Constantinople immediately expelled Paul. He then punished the inhabitants by withdrawing from them more than 40,000 measures of the daily allowance of wheat which had been granted by his father for gratuitous distribution among them: for prior to this catastrophe, nearly 80,000 measures of wheat brought from Alexandria had been bestowed on the citizens.</p> <p>2.13.6 He hesitated, however, to ratify the appointment of Macedonius to the bishopric of that city, because he was irritated against him—not only because he had been ordained without his own consent; but also, because it was on account of the contests in which he had been engaged with Paul, that Hermogenes his general, and many other persons had been slain.</p> <p>2.13.7 But having given him permission to minister in the church in which he had been consecrated, he returned to Antioch.</p>	<p>3.7.7 The emperor had no sooner received this intelligence than he took horse for Constantinople, in order to punish the people. But he spared them when he saw them coming to meet him with tears and supplications. He deprived the city of about half of the corn which his father, Constantine, had granted them annually out of the public treasury from the tributes of Egypt, probably from the idea that luxury and excess made the populace idle and disposed to sedition.</p> <p>3.7.8a He turned his anger against Paul and commanded his expulsion from the city. He manifested great displeasure against Macedonius also, because he was the occasion of the murder of the general and of other individuals and also, because he had been ordained without first obtaining his sanction.</p> <p>3.7.8b He, however, returned to Antioch, without having either confirmed or dissolved his ordination.</p>	
Summer 342 - Constans requests a delegation of Eastern bishops		
<p>2.18.1a When the Western emperor [Constans] was informed of their affairs [Athanasius and Paul], ...</p>	<p>3.10.3b When Julius perceived that what he had written to those who held the sacerdotal dignity in the East was of no avail, he made the matter known to Constans the emperor.</p>	

Socrates	Sozomen	Theodoret
2.18.b ...he sympathized with their sufferings; and wrote to his brother Constantius, begging him to send three bishops who should explain to him the reason for the deposition of Athanasius and Paul.	3.10.4a Accordingly, Constans wrote to his brother Constantius, requesting him to send some of the bishops of the East, that they might assign a reason for the edicts of deposition which they had passed.	
The Eastern delegation refuses communion with the Westerners		
2.18.1c In compliance with this request, Narcissus the Cilician, Theodore the Thracian, Maris of Chalcedon, and Mark the Syrian, were sent to perform this commission. On their arrival they refused to hold any communication with Athanasius or his friends. 2.18.2 But they concealed the creed which had been spread around at Antioch and presented to the Emperor Constans another declaration of faith composed by themselves, in the following terms:	3.10.4b Three bishops were selected for this purpose; namely, Narcissus, bishop of Irenopolis, in Cilicia; Theodore, bishop of Heraclea, in Thrace; and Mark, bishop of Arethusa, in Syria. 3.10.5 On their arrival in Italy, they strove to justify their actions and to persuade the emperor that the sentence passed by the Eastern Synod was just. Being required to produce a statement of their belief, they concealed the formulary they had drawn up at Antioch, and presented another written confession which was equally at variance with the doctrines approved at Nicaea.	
Creed of the Eastern delegations		
2.18.3 We believe in one God the Father Almighty, the Creator and Maker of all things, of whom the whole family in heaven and upon earth is named. 2.18.4 And in his only-begotten Son, our Lord Jesus Christ, who was begotten of the Father before all ages; God of God; Light of Light; through whom all things in the heavens and upon the earth, both visible and invisible, were made: who is the Word, and Wisdom, and Power, and Life, and true Light: who in the last days for our sake was made man, and was born of the holy virgin; was crucified, and died; was buried, arose again from the dead on the third day, ascended into the heavens, is seated at the right hand of the Father, and shall come at the consummation of the ages, to judge the living and the dead, and to render to every one according to his works: whose kingdom being perpetual, shall continue to infinite ages; for he shall sit at the right hand of the Father, not only in this age, but also in that which is to come. 2.18.5 We believe in the Holy Spirit, that is, in the Comforter, whom the Lord, according to his promise, sent to his apostles after his ascension into the heavens, to teach them, and bring all things to their remembrance: by		

Socrates	Sozomen	Theodoret
<p>whom also the souls of those who have sincerely believed on him shall be sanctified.</p> <p>2.18.6a And those who assert that the Son was made of things which are not, or of another substance, and not of God, or that there was a time when he did not exist, the Catholic Church accounts as aliens.</p>		
The departure of the Eastern delegation		
<p>2.18.6b Having delivered this creed to the emperor, and exhibited it to many others also, they departed without attending to anything besides.</p>	<p>3.10.6 Constans perceived that they had unjustly entrapped both Paul and Athanasius, and had ejected them from communion, not for charges against his conduct, as the depositions held, but simply on account of differences in doctrine; and he accordingly dismissed the deputation without giving any credit to the representations for which they had come.</p>	
The Photinian heresy begins at Sirmium		
<p>2.18.7 But while there was yet an inseparable communion between the Western and Eastern churches, there sprang up another heresy at Sirmium, a city of Illyricum; for Photinus, who presided over the churches in that district, a native of the Lesser Galatia, and a disciple of that Marcellus who had been deposed, adopting his master's sentiments, asserted that the Son of God was a mere man. We shall, however, enter into this matter more fully in its proper place.</p>		
Julius exonerates five eastern bishops		
<p>2.15.1 Athanasius meanwhile, after a lengthened journey at last reached Italy. The western division of the empire was then under the sole power of Constans, the youngest of Constantine's sons. His brother Constantine had been slain by the soldiers, as was before stated.</p> <p>2.15.2 At the same time, also Paul, bishop of Constantinople, Asclepas of Gaza, Marcellus of Ancyra, a city of the Lesser Galatia, and Lucius of Adrianople, having been accused on various charges and expelled from their several churches, arrived at the imperial city.</p> <p>2.15.3 There each laid his case before Julius, bishop of Rome. He on his part, by virtue of the Church of Rome's peculiar privilege, sent them back again into the East, fortifying them with commendatory letters; and at the</p>	<p>3.8.1a Athanasius, on leaving Alexandria, had fled to Rome.</p> <p>3.8.1b Paul, bishop of Constantinople, Marcellus, bishop of Ancyra, and Asclepas, bishop of Gaza, retreated to there at the same time. Asclepas, was opposed to the Arians and had therefore been deposed, after having been accused by some of the heterodox of having thrown down an altar; Quintianus had been appointed in his stead over the Church of Gaza. Lucius also, bishop of Adrianople, who had been deposed from the church under his care on</p>	

Socrates	Sozomen	Theodoret
<p>same time restored to each his own place, and sharply rebuked those by whom they had been deposed.</p> <p>2.15.4 Relying on the signature of the bishop Julius, the bishops departed from Rome, and again took possession of their own churches, forwarding the letters to the parties to whom they were addressed.</p>	<p>another charge, was dwelling at this period in Rome.</p> <p>3.8.2 The Roman bishop, on learning the accusation against each individual, and on finding that they held the same sentiments about the Nicæan dogmas, admitted them to communion as of like orthodoxy; and as the care for all was fitting to the dignity of his see, he restored them all to their own churches.</p>	
Summary of letters between Julius and the eastern Arian bishops		
	<p>3.8.3 He wrote to the bishops of the East, and rebuked them for having judged these bishops unjustly, and for harassing the Churches by abandoning the Nicæan doctrines. He summoned a few among them to appear before him on an appointed day, in order to account to him for the sentence they had passed, and threatened to bear with them no longer, unless they would cease to make innovations. This was the tenor of his letters. Athanasius and Paul were reinstated in their respective sees, and forwarded the letter of Julius to the bishops of the East.</p>	
	<p>3.8.4 The bishops could scarcely tolerate such documents, and they assembled together at Antioch, and framed a reply to Julius, beautifully expressed and composed with great legal skill, yet filled with considerable irony and indulging in the strongest threats.</p> <p>3.8.5 They confessed in this epistle, that the Church of Rome was entitled to universal honor, because it was the school of the apostles, and had become the metropolis of piety from the outset, although the introducers of the doctrine had settled there from the East. They added that the second place in point of honor ought not to be assigned to them, because they did not have the advantage of size or number in their churches; for they excelled the Romans in virtue and determination.</p> <p>3.8.6 They called Julius to account for having admitted the followers of Athanasius into communion, and expressed their indignation against him for having insulted their Synod and abolished their decrees, and they assailed his actions as unjust and discordant with</p>	

Socrates	Sozomen	Theodoret
	<p>ecclesiastical right.</p> <p>3.8.7 After these rebukes and protestations against such grievances, they proceeded to state that if Julius would acknowledge the deposition of the bishops whom they had expelled, and the substitution of those whom they had ordained in their stead, they would promise peace and fellowship; but that, unless he would agree to these terms, they would openly declare their opposition. They added that the priests who had preceded them in the government of the Eastern churches had offered no opposition to the deposition of Novatian, by the Church of Rome.</p> <p>3.8.8 They made no allusion in their letter to any deviations they had manifested from the doctrines of the council of Nicaea, but merely stated they had various reasons to justify the course they had pursued, and that they considered it unnecessary to enter at that time upon any defense of their conduct, as they were suspected of having violated justice in every respect.</p>	
342 - A council is summoned in Antioch to reproach Julius		
<p>2.15.5 These persons, because they considered themselves treated with indignity by the reproaches of Julius, called a council at Antioch, assembled themselves and dictated a reply to his letters as the expression of the unanimous feeling of the whole Synod. It was not his place, they said, to take cognizance of their decisions in reference to any whom they might wish to expel from their churches, especially since they had not opposed themselves to him, when Novatus was ejected from the church.</p> <p>2.15.6a These things the bishops of the Eastern church communicated to Julius, bishop of Rome.</p>		
A deadly riot ensues as Athanasius enter Alexandria¹		
<p>2.15.6b But during the entry of Athanasius into Alexandria, a tumult was raised by the partisans of George the Arian, in consequence of which, it is affirmed that many persons were killed; and since the Arians</p>		

¹ T.D. Barnes thinks that this return is “sheer fantasy, but may ultimately be based on a confused recollection of the attempt of Lucius and Paul to resume their sees after the Council of Serdica.” *Athanasius and Constantius: Theology and Politics in the Constantinian Empire*. Harvard University Press, 2001, p. 201.

Socrates	Sozomen	Theodoret
endeavor to throw the whole hostility of this transaction on Athanasius as the author of it, we feel compelled to make a few remarks on the subject.		
Digression: Socrates objects to Sabinus' portrayal of the Arian Controversy		
<p>2.15.7 God, the Judge of all, only knows the true causes of these disorders; but no one of any experience can be ignorant of the fact, that such fatal accidents are for the most part connected to the rebellious movements of the populace.</p> <p>2.15.8 It is vain, therefore, for the accusers of Athanasius to attribute the blame to him, especially for Sabinus, the bishop of the Macedonian heresy. For had the latter reflected on the number and magnitude of the wrongs which Athanasius, along with the rest who hold the doctrine of consubstantiality, had suffered from the Arians, or (if he had reflected) on the many complaints made of these things by the Synods convened on account of Athanasius, or in short on what that arch-heretic Macedonius himself has done throughout all the churches, he would either have been wholly silent, or if forced to speak, would have spoken more plausible words instead of these rebukes.</p> <p>2.15.9 But as he is intentionally overlooking all these things, he willfully misrepresents the facts. He makes, however, no mention whatever of the heresiarch, desiring by all means to conceal the brazen actions of which he knew him to be guilty.</p> <p>2.15.10 And what is still more extraordinary, he has not said one word to the disadvantage of the Arians, although he was far from entertaining their sentiments. The ordination of Macedonius, whose heretical views he had adopted, he has also passed over in silence.</p> <p>2.15.11 For had he mentioned it, he would have had to record his impieties also, which were most distinctly manifested on that occasion. Let this suffice on this subject.</p>		
Athanasius threatened by Constantius		
2.17.1 At this time another accusation was concocted against Athanasius by the Arians, who invented this pretext for it.	3.9.5b Athanasius in the meantime had fled, and concealed himself, fearing the menace of the emperor Constantius, for he had threatened to punish him with	

Socrates	Sozomen	Theodoret
<p>2.17.2 The father of the Augusti had long before granted an allowance of corn to the church of the Alexandrians for the relief of the indigent. This, they asserted, had usually been sold by Athanasius, and the proceeds converted to his own advantage [made against Athanasius in 337/8].</p> <p>2.17.3 The emperor, giving credence to this slanderous report, threatened Athanasius with death, as a penalty; who, becoming alarmed at the announcement of this threat, took to flight, and kept himself concealed.</p>	<p>death.</p> <p>3.9.5c For the heterodox had made the emperor believe that he was a seditious person, and that he had, on his return to the bishopric, indirectly caused the death of several persons. But the anger of the emperor had been chiefly excited by the representation that Athanasius had sold the provisions which the emperor Constantine had bestowed on the poor of Alexandria, and had appropriated the price.</p>	
Julius of Rome replies to the letter from the Council of Antioch²		
<p>2.17.4 When Julius, bishop of Rome, was told of these fresh machinations of the Arians against Athanasius, and had also received the letter of the then deceased Eusebius, he invited the persecuted Athanasius to come to him, having ascertained where he was hidden.</p>	<p>3.10.1a The bishops of Egypt, having sent a declaration in writing that these allegations were false, and Julius having been told that Athanasius was far from being in safety in Egypt, sent for him to his own city.</p>	
<p>2.17.5 The epistle also of the bishops who had been some time before assembled at Antioch, just then reached him.</p> <p>2.17.6 And at the same time others from the bishops in Egypt reached him [referring to a letter sent from the Egyptian Bishops in 338], assuring him that the entire charge against Athanasius was a fabrication</p> <p>2.17.7 On the receipt of these contradictory communications, Julius first replied to the bishops who had written to him from Antioch, complaining of the acrimonious feeling they had evinced in their letter, and charging them with a violation of the canons, because they had not requested his attendance at the council, seeing that the ecclesiastical law required that the churches should pass no decisions contrary to the views of the bishop of Rome: he then censured them with great</p>	<p>3.10.1b He replied at the same time to the letter of the bishops who were convened at Antioch, for just then he happened to have received their epistle, and accused them of having secretly introduced innovations contrary to the dogmas of the Nicene council, and of having violated the laws of the Church, by neglecting to invite him to join their Synod; for he claimed that there was a sacerdotal canon which declared that whatever is enacted contrary to the judgment of the bishop of Rome is null.</p> <p>3.10.2 He also reproached them for having deviated from justice in all their proceedings against Athanasius, both at Tyre and Mareotis, and stated that the decrees enacted at the former city had been annulled, on account of the false charges concerning the hand of Arsenius, and at the latter city, on account of the absence of Athanasius.</p> <p>3.10.3a Last of all he reprehended the arrogant style of their epistle. Julius was induced by all these reasons to</p>	

² This council appears to be the one in 341, cf. T.D. Barnes, *Athanasius and Constantius: Theology and Politics in the Constantinian Empire*. Harvard University Press, 2001, p. 202.

Socrates	Sozomen	Theodoret
<p>severity for secretly attempting to pervert the faith.</p> <p>2.17.8 In addition, that their former proceedings at Tyre were fraudulent, because the investigation of what had taken place at Mareotes was on one side of the question only; not only this, but that the charge respecting Arsenius had plainly been proved a false charge. Such and similar sentiments did Julius write in his answer to the bishops convened at Antioch.</p> <p>2.17.9 We would have inserted his entire letter here, as well as the letters addressed to Julius, if their length hadn't interfered with our purpose.³</p>	<p>undertake the defense of Athanasius and of Paul. The latter had arrived in Italy not long previously, and had lamented bitterly these calamities.</p>	
Socrates disapproves of Sabinus' account		
<p>2.17.10 But Sabinus, the advocate of the Macedonian heresy, of whom we have before spoken, has not incorporated the letters of Julius in his Collection of Synodical Transactions; although he has not omitted that which the bishops of Antioch sent to Julius.</p> <p>2.17.11 This, however, is usual with him; he carefully introduces such letters and makes no reference to, or wholly repudiates the term <i>homoousion</i>; while he purposely passes over in silence those of a contrary tendency.</p>		

³ The long letter of Julius was preserved by Athanasius in his *Apologia secunda* (also known as the *Apologia contra arianos*), 21-35. For a critical edition and translation, as well as a discussion of the dating and surrounding events, cf. G. Thompson, *The Correspondence of Pope Julius I*. Library of Early Christianity 3 (Washington D.C., 2015).