

Harmony 2.3 - Council of Sardica and its aftermath (343-345)

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 2/19/18

Socrates	Sozomen	Theodoret
Athanasius and Western bishops continue to push for a council		
2.20.1 The Western prelates on account of their being of another language, and not understanding this exposition, would not admit of it; saying that the Nicene Creed was sufficient, and that they would not waste time on anything beyond it.		
2.20.2 But when the emperor had again written to insist on the restoration to Paul and Athanasius of their respective sees, but without effect in consequence of the continual agitation of the people—these two bishops demanded that another Synod should be convened, so that their case, as well as other questions in relation to the faith might be settled by an ecumenical council, for they made it obvious that their deposition arose from no other cause than that the faith might be the more easily perverted.		<p>2.4.4a Athanasius went to Constans (Constantine, the eldest brother, having fallen in battle), and complained of the plots laid against him by the Arians, and of their opposition to the apostolical faith.</p> <p>2.4.4b He reminded him of his father, and how he attended in person the great and famous council which he had summoned; how he was present at its debates, took part in framing its decrees, and confirmed them by law.</p> <p>2.4.5 The emperor was moved to emulation by his father's zeal, and promptly wrote to his brother, exhorting him to preserve inviolate the religion of their father, which they had inherited; "for," he urged, "by piety he made his empire great, destroyed the tyrants of Rome, and conquered the foreign nations on every side."</p> <p>2.4.6 Constantius was led by this letter to summon the bishops from the east and from the west to Sardica, a city of Illyricum, and the metropolis of Dacia, that they might think on the means of removing the other troubles of the church, which were many and pressing.</p>
Both emperors summon a council at Sardica		
	3.11.3 After the Emperor Constans had requested his brother to reinstate the followers of Athanasius in their sees, and had found his application to be unavailing, on	

Socrates	Sozomen	Theodoret
<p>2.20.3 Another general council was therefore summoned to meet at Sardica,—a city of Illyricum,—by the joint authority of the two emperors; the one requesting by letter that it might be so, and the other, of the East, readily consenting to it.</p>	<p>account of the counteracting influence of those who adopted a hostile heresy; and when, moreover, the party of Athanasius and Paul entreated Constans to assemble a Synod on account of the plots for the abolition of orthodox doctrines, both the emperors were of the opinion that the bishops of the East and of the West should be convened on a certain day at Sardica, a city of Illyricum.</p>	
343 - The council assembles¹		
<p>2.20.4 It was the eleventh year after the death of the father of the two Augusti, during the consulship of Rufinus and Eusebius, that the Synod of Sardica met.</p> <p>2.20.5 According to the statement of Athanasius, about 300 bishops from the western parts of the empire were present; but Sabinus says there came only seventy from the eastern parts, among whom was Ischyra of Mareotes, who had been ordained bishop of that country by those who deposed Athanasius.</p> <p>2.20.6 Of the rest, some pretended infirmity of body; others complained of the shortness of the notice given, casting the blame of it on Julius, bishop of Rome, although a year and a half had elapsed from the time of its having been summoned: in which interval Athanasius remained at Rome awaiting the assembling of the Synod.</p>		<p>2.7.1 Two hundred and fifty bishops assembled at Sardica, as is proved by ancient records. The great Athanasius, Asclepas, bishop of Gaza, already mentioned, and Marcellus, bishop of Ancyra, the metropolis of Galatia, who also held this bishopric at the time of the council of Nicaea, all traveled there.</p> <p>2.7.2 The accusers, and the chiefs of the Arian faction, who had previously judged the cause of Athanasius, also attended. But when they found that the members of the synod were staunch in their adherence to sound doctrine, they would not even enter the council, although they had been summoned to it, but fled away, both accusers and judges. All these circumstances are far more clearly explained in a letter drawn up by the council; and I shall therefore now insert it.</p>

¹ Socrates misdates the Council of Sardica, in 343, to the consular year 347.

Socrates	Sozomen	Theodoret
Easterner bishops withdraw to Philippopolis and hold an Anomoian Council		
<p>2.20.7 When at last they were convened at Sardica, the Eastern prelates refused either to meet or to enter into any conference with those of the West, unless they first excluded Athanasius and Paul from the convention.</p> <p>2.20.8 But as Protogenes, bishop of Sardica, and Hosius, bishop of Cordova, a city in Spain, would by no means permit them to be absent, the Eastern bishops immediately withdrew.</p> <p>2.20.9 After returning to Philippopolis in Thrace, they held a separate council, wherein they openly anathematized the term <i>homoousios</i>; and having introduced the Anomoian opinion into their epistles, they sent them in all directions.</p>	<p>3.11.4 The bishops of the East, who had previously assembled at Philippopolis, a city of Thrace, wrote to the bishops of the West, who had already assembled at Sardica, that they would not join them, unless they would eject the followers of Athanasius from their assembly, and from communion with them, because they had been deposed. They afterwards went to Sardica, but declared they would not enter the church, while those who had been deposed by them were admitted there.</p> <p>3.11.5 The bishops of the West replied, that they never had ejected them, and that they would not yield this now, particularly as Julius, bishop of Rome, after having investigated the case, had not condemned them, and that besides, they were present and ready to justify themselves and to refute again the offenses imputed to them.</p> <p>3.11.6 These declarations, however, were of no avail. And since the time they had appointed for the adjustment of their differences, concerning which they had convened, had expired, they finally wrote letters to one another on these points, and by these they were led to an increase of their previous ill-will. And after they had convened separately, they brought forward opposite decisions;</p>	
The eastern bishops excommunicate many and forbid “<i>homoousios</i>”		
	<p>3.11.7 For the Eastern bishops confirmed the sentences they had already enacted against Athanasius, Paul, Marcellus, and Asclepas, and deposed Julius, bishop of Rome, because he had been the first to admit those who had been condemned by them, into communion; and Hosius, the confessor, was also deposed, partly for the same reason, and partly because he was the friend of Paulinus and Eustathius, the leaders of the church in Antioch. Maximus, bishop of Treves, was deposed, because he had been among the first who had received Paul into communion, and had been the cause of his</p>	

Socrates	Sozomen	Theodoret
	<p>returning to Constantinople, and because he had excluded from communion the Eastern bishops who had gone to Gaul.</p> <p>3.11.8 Besides the above, they likewise deposed Protogenes, bishop of Sardica, and Gaudentius; the one because he favored Marcellus, although he had previously condemned him, and the other because he had adopted a different line of conduct from that of Cyriacus, his predecessor, and had supported many individuals then deposed by them. After issuing these sentences, they made known to the bishops of every region, that they were not to hold communion with those who were deposed, and that they were not to write to them, nor to receive letters from them.</p> <p>3.11.9 They likewise commanded them to believe what was said concerning God in the formulary which they subjoined to their letter, and in which no mention was made of the term “consubstantial,” but in which, those were excommunicated who said there are three Gods, or that Christ is not God, or that the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost are the same, or that the Son is unbegotten, or that there was a time or an age in which He existed not.</p>	
The activity of the westerner bishops at the Council of Sardica		
<p>2.20.11 Both parties believed they had acted rightly: those of the East, because the Western bishops had met with those whom they had deposed; and those of the West, because of not only the retirement of those who had deposed them before the matter had been examined into, but also because they themselves were the defenders of the Nicene faith, which the other party had dared to adulterate.</p>		
<p>2.20.10a On the other hand those who remained at Sardica condemned at first their departure.</p> <p>2.20.10b Afterwards they stripped the accusers of Athanasius of their dignity. Then they confirmed the Nicene Creed, and rejected the term <i>anomoion</i>. They more distinctly recognized the doctrine of</p>	<p>3.12.2 They stated that Gregory had not been nominated by them bishop of Alexandria; nor Basil, bishop of Ancyra; nor Quintianus, bishop of Gaza; and that they had not received these men into communion, and did not even account them Christians.</p> <p>3.12.3 They deposed from the episcopates, Theodore, bishop of Thrace; Narcissus, bishop of Irenopolis; Acacius, bishop of Caesarea, in Palestine; Menophantus, bishop of Ephesus; Ursacius, bishop of Sigidunus in</p>	

Socrates	Sozomen	Theodoret
<p>consubstantiality, which they also inserted in epistles addressed to all the churches.</p> <p>2.20.12 They therefore restored to Paul and Athanasius their sees, and also Marcellus of Ancyra in Lesser Galatia, who had been deposed long before, as we have stated in the former book.</p> <p>2.20.13 At that time indeed he exerted himself to the utmost to procure the revocation of the sentence pronounced against him, declaring that his being suspected of entertaining the error of Paul of Samosata arose from a misunderstanding of some expressions in his book.</p>	<p>Moesia; Valens, bishop of Mursia in Pannonia; and George, bishop of Laodicea, although this latter had not attended the Synod with the Eastern bishops.</p> <p>3.12.4 They ejected the above-named individuals from the priesthood and from communion, because they separated the Son from the substance of the Father, and had received those who had been formerly posed on account of their holding the Arian heresy, and had, moreover, promoted them to the highest offices in the service of God.</p> <p>3.12.1 The adherents of Hosius, in the meantime, assembled together, and declared them innocent: Athanasius, because unjust machinations had been carried on against him by those who had convened at Tyre; and Marcellus, because he did not hold the opinions with which he was charged; and Asclepas, because he had been re-established in his diocese by the vote of Eusebius Pamphilus and of many other judges; that this was true he proved by the records of the trial; and lastly, Lucius, because his accusers had fled. They wrote to the parishes of each of the acquitted, commanding them to receive and recognize their bishops.</p>	
The western bishops write to the entire church and command that they agree		
	<p>3.12.5a After they had removed them for these perversions and decreed them to be aliens to the Catholic Church, they afterwards wrote to the bishops of every nation, commanding them to confirm these decrees, and to be of one mind on doctrinal subjects with themselves.</p>	
The letter of the western bishops at Sardica		
		<p>2.8.1 The holy council assembled at Sardica, from Rome, Spain, Gaul, Italy, Campania, Calabria, Africa, Sardinia, Pannonia, Moesia, Dacia, Dardania, Lesser Dacia, Macedonia, Thessaly, Achaia, Epirus, Thrace,</p>

Socrates	Sozomen	Theodoret
		<p>Rhodope, Asia, Caria, Bithynia, the Hellespont, Phrygia, Pisidia, Cappadocia, Pontus, the lesser Phrygia, Cilicia, Pamphylia, Lydia, the Cyclades, Egypt, the Thebaid, Libya, Galatia, Palestine and Arabia, to the bishops throughout the world, our fellow-ministers in the catholic and apostolic Church, and our beloved brethren in the Lord. Peace be unto you.</p> <p>2.8.2 The madness of the Arians has often led them to the perpetration of violent atrocities against the servants of God who keep the true faith; they introduce false doctrines themselves, and persecute those who uphold orthodox principles. So violent were their attacks on the faith, that they reached the ears of our most pious emperors.</p> <p>2.8.3 Through the co-operation of the grace of God, the emperors have summoned us from different provinces and cities to the holy council which they have appointed to be held in the city of Sardica, in order that all dissensions may be terminated, all evil doctrines expelled, and the religion of Christ alone maintained amongst all people. Some bishops from the east have attended the council at the request of our most religious emperors, principally on account of the reports circulated against our beloved brethren and fellow-ministers, Athanasius, bishop of Alexandria, Marcellus, bishop of Ancyra in Galatia, and Asclepas, bishop of Gaza.</p> <p>2.8.4 Perhaps the accusations of the Arians have already reached you, and they have endeavored thus to prevent the council, and make you believe their groundless accusations of the innocent, and prevent any suspicion being raised of the depraved heresy which they uphold.</p> <p>2.8.5 But they have not long been permitted so to act. The Lord is the Protector of the churches; for them and for us all He suffered death, and opened for us the way to heaven.</p> <p>2.8.6 The adherents of Eusebius Maris, Theodorus, Theognis, Ursacius, Valens, Menophantus, and Stephanus, had already written to Julius, the bishop of Rome, and our fellow-minister, against our aforesaid fellow-ministers, Athanasius, bishop of Alexandria,</p>

Socrates	Sozomen	Theodoret
		<p>Marcellus, bishop of Ancyra in Galatia, and Asclepas, bishop of Gaza.</p> <p>2.8.7 Some bishops of the opposite party wrote also to Julius, testifying to the innocence of Athanasius, and proving that all that had been asserted by the followers of Eusebius was nothing more than lies and slander. The refusal of the Arians to obey the summons of our beloved brother and fellow-ruler, Julius, and also the letter written by that bishop, clearly prove the falseness of their accusation. For, if they had believed that what they had done and represented against our fellow-minister deserved justification, they would have gone to Rome. But their mode of procedure in this great and holy council is a manifest proof of their fraud. Upon their arrival at Sardica, they perceived that our brethren, Athanasius, Marcellus, Asclepas, and others, were there also; they were therefore afraid to come to the test,</p> <p>2.8.8 although they had been summoned, not once or twice only, but repeatedly. There were they waited for by the assembled bishops, particularly by the venerable Hosius, one worthy of all honor and respect, on account of his advanced age, his adherence to the faith, and his labors for the church. All urged them to join the assembly and take advantage of the opportunity of proving, in the presence of their fellow-ministers, the truth of the charges they had brought against them in their absence, both by word and by letter.</p> <p>2.8.9 But they refused to obey the summons, as we have already stated, and so by their excesses proved the falsity of their statements, and all but proclaimed aloud the plot and schemes they had formed. Men confident of the truth of their assertions are always ready to stand to them openly.</p> <p>2.8.10 But as these accusers would not appear to substantiate what they had claimed, any future allegations which they may by their usual tricks bring against our fellow-ministers will only be regarded as proceeding from a desire of slandering them in their absence, without the courage to confront them openly.</p> <p>2.8.11 They fled, beloved brethren, not only because</p>

Socrates	Sozomen	Theodoret
		<p>their charges were slander, but also because they saw men arrive with serious and numerous accusations against themselves.</p> <p>2.8.12 Chains and fetters were produced. Some were present whom they had exiled: others came forward as representatives of those still kept in exile. There stood relations and friends of men whom they had put to death. Most serious of all, bishops also appeared, one of whom exhibited the irons and the chains with which they had laden him. Others testified that death followed their false charges.</p> <p>2.8.13 For their infatuation had led them so far as even to attempt the life of a bishop; and he would have been killed had he not escaped from their hands. Theodoulos, our fellow-minister, of blessed memory, passed as a result of their accusation on his name; for, through it, he had been condemned to death. Some showed the wounds which had been inflicted on them by the sword; others related that they had been exposed to the miseries of famine.</p> <p>2.8.14 All these depositions were made, not by a few obscure individuals, but by whole churches; the presbyters of these churches giving evidence that the persecutors had armed the military against them with swords, and the common people with clubs; had employed judicial threats, and produced fake documents. The letters written by Theognis, for the purpose of prejudicing the emperor against our fellow-ministers, Athanasius, Marcellus, and Asclepas, were read and attested by those who had formerly been the deacons of Theognis.</p> <p>2.8.15 It was also proved that they had stripped virgins naked, had burnt churches, and imprisoned our fellow-ministers, and all because of the infamous heresy of the Ariomaniacs. For in this way, all who refused to join their cause were treated.</p> <p>2.8.16 The consciousness of having committed all these crimes placed them in great straits. Ashamed of their deeds, which could no longer be concealed, they went to Sardica, thinking that their boldness in venturing there</p>

Socrates	Sozomen	Theodoret
		<p>would remove all suspicion of their guilt.</p> <p>2.8.17 But when they perceived the presence of those whom they had falsely accused, and of those who had suffered from their cruelty; and that likewise several had come with indisputable accusations against them, they would not enter the council. Our fellow-ministers, on the other hand, Athanasius, Marcellus, and Asclepas, took every means to induce them to attend, by tears, by urgency, by challenge, promising not only to prove the falsity of their accusations, but also to show how deeply they had injured their own churches.</p> <p>2.8.18 But they were so overwhelmed by the consciousness of their own evil deeds, that they took to flight, and by this flight clearly proved the falsity of their accusations as well as their own guilt.</p> <p>But though their slander and deceit, which had indeed been apparent from the beginning, were now clearly perceived, yet we determined to examine the circumstances of the case according to the laws of truth, so that they would not from their very flight, derive pretexts for renewed acts of deceitfulness.</p> <p>2.8.19 Upon carrying this resolution into effect, we proved by their actions that they were false accusers, and that they had formed plots against our fellow-ministers. Arsenius, whom they declared had been put to death by Athanasius, is still alive, and takes his place among the living. This fact alone is sufficient to show that their other allegations are false.</p> <p>2.8.20 Although they spread a report everywhere that a chalice had been broken by Macarius, one of the presbyters of Athanasius, yet those who came from Alexandria, from Mareotis, and from other places, testified that this was not the fact; and the bishops in Egypt wrote to Julius, our fellow-minister, declaring that there was not the least suspicion that such a deed had been done.</p> <p>2.8.21 The judicial facts which the Arians assert they possess against Macarius have been all drawn up by one party; and in these documents the depositions of pagans and of catechumens were included. One of these</p>

Socrates	Sozomen	Theodoret
		<p>catechumens, when interrogated, replied that he was in the church on the entry of Macarius. Another said that Ischyrras, whom they had talked about so much, was then lying ill in his cell. Hence it appears that the mysteries could not have been celebrated at that time, as the catechumens were present, and as Ischyrras was absent; for he was at that very time confined by illness.</p> <p>2.8.22 Ischyrras, that wicked man who had falsely affirmed that Athanasius had burnt some of the sacred books, and had been convicted of the crime, now confessed that he was ill in bed when Macarius arrived; hence the falsehood of his accusation was clearly demonstrated. His accusation was, however, rewarded by his party; they gave him the title of a bishop, although he was not yet even a presbyter.</p> <p>2.8.23 For two presbyters came to the synod, who some time back had been attached to Meletius, and were afterwards received back by the blessed Alexander, bishop of Alexandria, and are now with Athanasius, protesting that he had never been ordained a presbyter, and that Meletius had never had any church, or employed any minister in Mareotis.</p> <p>2.8.24 Yet, although he had never been ordained a presbyter, they promote him to a bishopric, in order that his title may impose upon those who hear his false accusations.</p> <p>“The writings of our fellow-minister, Marcellus, were also read, and plainly revealed the deceit of the followers of Eusebius; for what Marcellus had simply suggested as a point of inquiry, they accused him of professing as a point of faith. The statements which he had made, both before and after the inquiry, were read, and his faith was proved to be orthodox.</p> <p>2.8.25 He did not affirm, as they represented, that the beginning of the Word of God was dated from His conception by the holy Mary, or that His kingdom would have an end. On the contrary, he wrote that His kingdom had had no beginning, and would have no end.</p> <p>2.8.26 Asclepas, our fellow-minister, produced the reports drawn up at Antioch in the presence of the</p>

Socrates	Sozomen	Theodoret
		<p>accusers, and of Eusebius, bishop of Caesarea, and proved his innocence by the sentence of the bishops who had presided as judges.</p> <p>It was not then without cause, beloved brethren, that, although so frequently summoned, they would not attend the council; it was not without cause that they took to flight.</p> <p>2.8.27 The reproaches of conscience constrained them to make their escape, and thus, at the same time, to demonstrate the groundlessness of their slandering, and the truth of those accusations which were advanced and proved against them. Besides all the other grounds of complaint, it may be added that all those who had been accused of holding the Arian heresy, and had been ejected in consequence, were not only received, but advanced to the highest dignities by them. They raised deacons to the presbyterate, and thence to the episcopate; and in all this they were driven by no other motive than the desire of propagating and diffusing their heresy, and of corrupting the true faith.</p> <p>2.8.28 Next to Eusebius, the following are their principal leaders; Theodorus, bishop of Heraclea, Narcissus, bishop of Neronias in Cilicia, Stephanus, bishop of Antioch, Georgius, bishop of Laodicea, Acacius, bishop of Caesarea in Palestine, Menophantus, bishop of Ephesus in Asia, Ursacius, bishop of Singidunum in Moesia, and Valens, bishop of Mursa in Pannonia.</p> <p>2.8.29 These bishops forbade those who came with them from the east to attend the holy council, or to unite with the Church of God.</p> <p>2.8.30 On their road to Sardica they held private assemblies at different places, and formed a compact cemented by threats, that, when they arrived in Sardica, they would not join the holy council, nor assist at its deliberations; arranging that, as soon as they had arrived they should present themselves for form's sake, and forthwith betake themselves to flight. These facts were made known to us by our fellow-ministers, Macarius of Palestine, and Asterius of Arabia, who came with them to</p>

Socrates	Sozomen	Theodoret
		<p>Sardica, but refused to share their unorthodoxy.</p> <p>2.8.31 These bishops complained before the holy council of the violent treatment they had received from them, and of the lack of right principles evidenced in all their transactions. They added that there were many amongst them who still held orthodox opinions, but that these were prevented from going to the council; and that sometimes threats, sometimes promises, were resorted to in order to retain them in that party.</p> <p>2.8.32 For this reason they were compelled to reside together in one house; and never allowed, even for the shortest space of time, to be alone.</p> <p>It is not right to pass over in silence and without rebuke the accusations, the imprisonments, the murders, the stripes, the forged letters, the indignities, the stripping naked of virgins, the banishments, the destruction of churches, the acts of incendiarism, the translation of bishops from small towns to large dioceses, and above all, the ill-starred Arian heresy, raised by their means against the true faith. For these causes, therefore, we declare the innocence and purity of our beloved brethren and fellow-ministers, Athanasius, bishop of Alexandria, Marcellus, bishop of Ancyra in Galatia, and Asclepas, bishop of Gaza, and of all the other servants of God who are with them; and we have written to each of their dioceses, in order that the people of each church may be made acquainted with the innocence of their respective bishops, and that they may recognize them alone and wait for their return. Men who have come down on their churches like wolves, such as Gregory in Alexandria, Basilius in Ancyra, and Quintianus in Gaza, we charge them (the dioceses) not even to call bishops, nor yet Christians, nor to have any communion with them, nor to receive any letters from them, nor to write to them.</p> <p>2.8.33 Theodorus, bishop of Heraclea in Europe, Narcissus, bishop of Neronias in Cilicia, Acacius, bishop of Caesarea in Palestine, Stephanus, bishop of Antioch, Ursacius, bishop of Singidunum in Moesia, Valens, bishop of Mursa in Pannonia, Menophantus, bishop of Ephesus, and Georgius, bishop of Laodicea (for though</p>

Socrates	Sozomen	Theodoret
		<p>fear kept him from leaving the East, he has been deposed by the blessed Alexander, bishop of Alexandria, and has absorbed the infatuation of the Arians), have on account of their various crimes been cast forth from their bishoprics by the unanimous decision of the holy council. We have decreed that they are not only not to be regarded as bishops, but to be refused communion with us.</p> <p>2.8.34 For those who separate the Son from the substance and divinity of the Father, and alienate the Word from the Father, ought to be separated from the Catholic Church, and alienated from all who bear the name of Christians. Let them then be anathema to you, and to all the faithful, because they have corrupted the word of truth. For the apostle's precept cautions,</p> <p>2.8.35 if anyone should bring to you another gospel than that which you have received, <i>let him be accursed</i>. Command that no one hold communion with them; for light can have no fellowship with darkness. Keep far off from them; for what agreement has Christ with Belial?</p> <p>2.8.36 Be careful, beloved brethren, that you neither write to them nor receive their letters. Endeavour, beloved brethren and fellow-ministers, as though present with us in spirit at the council, to give your hearty consent to what is enacted, and affix to it your written signature, for the sake of preserving unanimity of opinion among all our fellow-ministers throughout the world.</p> <p>2.8.37 We declare those men excommunicate from the Catholic Church who say that Christ is God, but not the true God; that He is the Son, but not the true Son; and that He is both begotten and made; for such persons acknowledge that they understand by the term 'begotten,' that which has been made; and because, although the Son of God existed before all ages.</p> <p>2.8.38 They attribute to Him, who exists not in time but before all time, a beginning and an end. Valens and Ursacius have, like two vipers brought forth by an asp, proceeded from the Arian heresy. For they boastingly declare themselves to be undoubted Christians, and yet affirm that the Word and the Holy Ghost were both crucified and slain, and that they died and rose again; and</p>

Socrates	Sozomen	Theodoret
		<p>they stubbornly maintain, like the heretics, that the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost are of diverse and distinct essences.</p> <p>2.8.39 We have been taught, and we hold the catholic and apostolic tradition and faith and confession which teach, that the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost have one essence, which is termed substance by the heretics.</p> <p>2.8.40 If it is asked, ‘What is the essence of the Son?’ we confess, that it is that which is acknowledged to be that of the Father alone; for the Father has never been, nor could ever be, without the Son, nor the Son without the Father.</p> <p>2.8.41 It is most absurd to affirm that the Father ever existed without the Son, for that this could never be so has been testified by the Son Himself, who said, ‘<i>I am in the Father, and the Father in Me;</i>’ and ‘<i>I and My Father are one.</i>’ None of us denies that He was begotten; but we say that He was begotten before all things, whether visible or invisible; and that He is the Creator of archangels and angels, and of the world, and of the human race.</p> <p>2.8.42 It is written, ‘<i>Wisdom which is the worker of all things taught me,</i>’ and again, ‘<i>All things were made by Him.</i>’</p> <p>“He could not have existed always if He had had a beginning, for the everlasting Word has no beginning, and God will never have an end. We do not say that the Father is Son, nor that the Son is Father; but that the Father is Father, and the Son of the Father Son.</p> <p>2.8.43 We confess that the Son is Power of the Father. We confess that the Word is Word of God the Father, and that beside Him there is no other. We believe the Word to be the true God, and Wisdom and Power. We affirm that He is truly the Son, yet not in the way in which others are said to be sons: for they are either gods by reason of their regeneration, or are called sons of God on account of their merit, and not on account of their being of one essence, as is the case with the Father and the Son.</p> <p>2.8.44 We confess an Only-begotten and a Firstborn; but that the Word is only-begotten, whoever was and is in</p>

Socrates	Sozomen	Theodoret
		<p>the Father. We use the word firstborn with respect to His human nature. But He is superior (to man) in the new creation (of the Resurrection), inasmuch as He is the Firstborn from the dead.</p> <p>2.8.45 We confess that God is one; we confess the divinity of the Father and of the Son to be one. No one denies that the Father is greater than the Son: not on account of another essence, nor yet on account of their difference, but simply from the very name of the Father being greater than that of the Son. The words uttered by our Lord, <i>'I and My Father are one,'</i> are by those men explained as referring to the concord and harmony which prevail between the Father and the Son; but this is a blasphemous and perverse interpretation.</p> <p>2.8.46 We, as Catholics, unanimously condemned this foolish and lamentable opinion: for just as mortal men on a difference having arisen between them quarrel and afterwards are reconciled, so do such interpreters say that disputes and dissension are liable to arise between God the Father Almighty and His Son; a supposition which is altogether absurd and untenable.</p> <p>2.8.47 But we believe and maintain that those holy words, <i>'I and My Father are one,'</i> point out the oneness of essence which is one and the same in the Father and in the Son. We also believe that the Son reigns with the Father, that His reign has neither beginning nor end, and that it is not bounded by time, nor can ever cease.</p> <p>2.8.48 For that which always exists never begins to be, and can never cease.</p> <p>We believe in and we receive the Holy Ghost the Comforter, whom the Lord both promised and sent. We believe in It as sent.</p> <p>It was not the Holy Ghost who suffered, but the manhood with which He clothed Himself; which He took from the Virgin Mary, which being man was capable of suffering; for man is mortal, whereas God is immortal.</p> <p>2.8.49 We believe that on the third day He rose, the man in God, not God in the man; and that He brought as a gift to His Father the manhood which He had delivered from sin and corruption.</p>

Socrates	Sozomen	Theodoret
		<p>2.8.50 We believe that, at a meet and fixed time, He Himself will judge all men and all their deeds. So great is the ignorance and mental darkness of those whom we have mentioned, that they are unable to see the light of truth. They cannot comprehend the meaning of the words: <i>‘that they may be one in us.’</i></p> <p>2.8.51 It is obvious why the word <i>‘one’</i> was used; it was because the apostles received the Holy Spirit of God, and yet there were none amongst them who were the Spirit, neither was there any one of them who was Word, Wisdom, Power, or Only-begotten. <i>‘As Thou,’</i> He said, <i>‘and I are one, that they, may be one in us.’</i> These holy words, <i>‘that they may be one in us,’</i> are strictly accurate.</p> <p>2.8.52 For the Lord did not say, <i>‘one in the same way that I and the Father are one,’</i> but He said, <i>‘that the disciples, being knit together and united, may be one in faith and in confession, and so in the grace and piety of God the Father, and by the indulgence and love of our Lord Jesus Christ, may be able to become one.’</i></p>
		<p>2.8.53 From this letter may be learnt the deceit of the accusers, and the injustice of the former judges, as well as the soundness of the decrees. These holy fathers have taught us not only truths respecting the Divine nature, but also the doctrine of the Incarnation.</p>
The western bishops draw up an expanded version of the Nicene Creed		
	<p>3.12.5b They likewise compiled another document of faith, which was more extensive than that of Nicaea, although the same thought was carefully preserved, and very little change was made in the words of that instrument.</p> <p>3.12.6 Hosius and Protogenes, who held the first rank among the Western bishops assembled at Sardica, fearing perhaps lest they should be suspected of making any innovations upon the doctrines of the Nicene council, wrote to Julius, and testified that they were firmly attached to these doctrines, but, pressed by the need of perspicuity, they had to expand the identical thought, in order that the Arians might not take advantage of the</p>	

Socrates	Sozomen	Theodoret
	brevity of the document, to draw those who were unskilled in dialectics into some absurdity. ²	
Eusebius Pamphilus had shown Marcellus to be a Sabellian		
2.20.14 It must, however, be noticed that Eusebius Pamphilus wrote three entire books against Marcellus, in which he quotes the author's own words to prove that he asserts with Sabellius the Libyan, and Paul of Samosata, that the Lord Jesus was a mere man.		
Socrates digresses to defend Eusebius Pamphilus		
<p>2.21.1 But since some have attempted to stigmatize even Eusebius Pamphilus himself as having favored the Arian views in his works, it may not be irrelevant here to make a few remarks respecting him.</p> <p>2.21.2 In the first place then, he was both present at the council of Nicaea, which defined the doctrine of the <i>homoousion</i>, and he gave his assent to what was there determined. And in the third book of the Life of Constantine, he expressed himself in these words:</p> <p>2.21.3 'The emperor incited all to unanimity, until he had rendered them united in judgment on those points on which they were previously at variance; so that they were quite agreed at Nicaea in matters of faith.'</p> <p>2.21.4 Since therefore Eusebius, in mentioning the Nicene Synod, says that all differences were removed, and that all came to unity of sentiment, what ground is there for assuming that he was himself an Arian? The Arians are also certainly deceived in supposing him to be a favorer of their tenets. But someone will perhaps say that in his discourses he seems to have adopted the opinions of Arius, because of him frequently saying "through Christ..."</p> <p>2.21.5 ...to whom we should answer that ecclesiastical writers often use this mode of expression and others of a similar kind denoting the economy of our Savior's humanity, and that before all these the apostle made use of such expressions, and never has been accounted a</p>		

² A Latin version of this letter is preserved in an 8th century manuscript of the collection of Theodosius the Deacon. Cf. Letter 3 in G. Thompson, *The Correspondence of Pope Julius I*. Library of Early Christianity 3 (Washington D.C., 2015).

Socrates	Sozomen	Theodoret
<p>teacher of false doctrine.</p> <p>2.21.6 Moreover, inasmuch as Arius has dared to say that the Son is a creature, as one of the others, observe what Eusebius says on this subject, in his first book against Marcellus:</p> <p>2.21.7 ‘He alone, and no other, has been declared to be, and is the only-begotten Son of God; from what place anyone could justly criticize those who have presumed to affirm that he is a Creature made of nothing, like the rest of the creatures; for how then would he be a Son?</p> <p>2.21.8 And how could he be God’s only-begotten, were he assigned the same nature as the other creatures ... and were he one of the many created things, seeing that he, like them, would in that case be partaker of a creation from nothing? But the Sacred Scriptures do not thus instruct us.’</p> <p>2.21.9 He again adds a little afterwards: ‘Whoever then defines the Son as made of things that are not, and as a creature produced from nothing pre-existing, forgets that while he concedes the name of Son, he denies him to be a Son in reality. For he that is made of nothing, cannot truly be the Son of God, any more than the other things which have been made.</p> <p>2.21.10 But the true Son of God, just as he is begotten of the Father, is properly called the only-begotten and beloved of the Father. For this reason also, he himself is God.</p> <p>2.21.11 For what can the offspring of God be, but the perfect resemblance of him who begot him? A sovereign indeed builds a city, but does not beget it; and is said to beget a son, not to build one. An artificer, also, may be called the framer, but not the father of his work; while he could by no means be styled the framer of him whom he had begotten. So also the God of the Universe is the Father of the Son; but might be fitly termed the Framer and Maker of the world.</p> <p>2.21.12 And although it is once said in Scripture, “The Lord created me the beginning of his ways on account of his works,” yet it is proper for us to consider the import of this phrase, which I shall hereafter explain; and not, as</p>		

Socrates	Sozomen	Theodoret
<p>Marcellus has done, from a single passage to jeopardize the most important doctrine of the church.’</p> <p>2.21.13 These and many other such expressions Eusebius Pamphilus has given utterance to in the first book against Marcellus; and in his third book, declaring in what sense the term creature is to be taken, he says:</p> <p>2.21.14 ‘Accordingly, these things being thus established, it follows that in the same sense as that which preceded, the words, “The Lord created me the beginning of his ways, on account of his works,” must have been spoken.</p> <p>2.21.15 For although he says that he was created, it is not as if he should say that he had arrived at existence from what was not, nor that he himself also was made of nothing like the rest of the creatures, which some have erroneously supposed; but as subsisting, living, pre-existing, and being before the constitution of the whole world; and having been appointed to rule the universe by his Lord and Father: the word created being here used instead of ordained or constituted.</p> <p>2.21.16 Certainly the apostle expressly called the rulers and governors among men creature, when he said, “Submit yourselves to every human creature for the Lord’s sake; whether to the king as supreme, or to governors as those sent by him.”</p> <p>2.21.17 The prophet also when he says, “Prepare, Israel, to invoke thy God. For behold he who confirms the thunder, creates the Spirit, and announces his Christ unto men”: ... has not used the word “he who creates” in the sense of makes out of nothing.</p> <p>2.21.18 For God did not then create the Spirit, when he declared his Christ to all men, since “There is nothing new under the sun”; but the Spirit existed, and had being previously: but he was sent at what time the apostles were gathered together, when like thunder “There came a sound from heaven as of a rushing mighty wind; and they were filled with the Holy Spirit.”</p> <p>2.21.19 And thus Behold he who confirms the thunder, creates the Spirit, and announces his Christ unto men”: the word “creates” being used instead of “sends down,” or</p>		

Socrates	Sozomen	Theodoret
<p>appoints; and thunder in another figure implying the preaching of the Gospel.</p> <p>2.21.20 Again he that says, “Create in me a clean heart, O God,” said not this as if he had no heart; but prayed that his mind might be purified. Thus also it is said, “That he might create the two into one new man,” instead of unite.</p> <p>2.21.21 Consider also whether this passage is not of the same kind, “Clothe yourselves with the new man, which is created according to God”; and this, “If, therefore, anyone be in Christ, he is a new creature”; and whatever other expressions of a similar nature any one may find who shall carefully search the divinely inspired Scripture. For that reason, one should not be surprised if in this passage, “The Lord created me the beginning of his ways,” the term “created” is used metaphorically, instead of “appointed” or constituted.’</p> <p>2.21.22 Such words Eusebius uses in his work against Marcellus; we have quoted them on account of those who have slanderously attempted to accuse and incriminate him.</p> <p>2.21.23 Neither can they prove that Eusebius attributes a beginning of subsistence to the Son of God, although they may find him often using the expressions by accommodation; and especially so, because he was an imitator and admirer of the works of Origen, in which those who are able to comprehend the depth of Origen’s writings, will perceive it to be everywhere stated that the Son was begotten of the Father.</p> <p>2.21.24 These remarks have been made in passing, in order to refute those who have misrepresented Eusebius.</p>		
The Council Concludes		
<p>2.22.1 Those convened at Sardica, as well as those who had formed a separate council at Philippopolis in Thrace, having separately performed what they deemed necessary, returned to their respective cities.</p>	<p>3.12.7a When what I have related had been transacted by each party, the conference was dissolved, and the members returned to their respective homes.</p> <p>3.12.7b This Synod was held during the consulate of Rufinus and Eusebius, and about eleven years after the death of Constantine. There were about three hundred bishops of cities in the West, and upwards of seventy-six Eastern bishops, among whom was Ischyron, who had</p>	

Socrates	Sozomen	Theodoret
	been appointed bishop of Mareotis by the enemies of Athanasius.	
Communion ceases between East and West		
<p>2.22.2 From that time, therefore, the Western church was severed from the Eastern; and the boundary of communion between them was the mountain called Soucis, which divides the Illyrians from the Thracians. As far as this mountain there was indiscriminate communion, although there was a difference of faith; but beyond it they did not commune with one another.</p> <p>2.22.3a Such was the perturbed condition of the churches at that period.</p>	<p>3.13.1 After this Synod, the Eastern and the Western churches ceased to maintain the fellowship which usually exists among people of the same faith, and refrained from holding communion with each other. The Christians of the West separated themselves from all as far as Thrace; those of the East as far as Illyricum. This divided state of the churches was mixed, as might be supposed, with dissenting views and accusations.</p> <p>3.13.2 Although they had previously differed on doctrinal subjects, yet the evil had attained no great height, for they had still held communion together and were generally sharing kindred feelings. The Church throughout the whole of the West in its entirety regulated itself by the doctrines of the Fathers, and kept aloof from all contentions and hair-splitting about dogma.</p> <p>3.13.3 Although Auxentius, who had become bishop of Milan, and Valens and Ursacius, bishops of Pannonia, had endeavored to lead that part of the empire into the Arian doctrines, their efforts had been carefully anticipated by the president of the Roman see and the other priests, who cut out the seeds of such a troublesome heresy.</p> <p>3.13.4 As to the Eastern Church, although it had been racked by dissension since the time of the council of Antioch, and although it had already openly differed from the Nicæan form of belief, yet I think it is true that the opinion of the majority united in the same thought, and confessed the Son to be of the substance of the Father. There were some, however, who were fond of wrangling and battled against the term “consubstantial”.</p> <p>3.13.5 For those who had been opposed to the word at the beginning, thought, as I infer, and as happens to most people, that it would be a disgrace to appear as conquered. Others were finally convinced of the truth of the doctrines concerning God, by the habit of frequent disputation on these themes, and ever afterwards continued firmly attached to them. Others again, being</p>	

Socrates	Sozomen	Theodoret
	<p>aware that contentions ought not to arise, inclined toward that which was gratifying to each of the sides, on account of either the influence of friendship, or they were swayed by the various causes which often induce men to embrace what they ought to reject, and to act without boldness, in circumstances which require thorough conviction.</p> <p>3.13.6 Many others, accounting it absurd to consume their time in altercations about words, quietly adopted the sentiments taught by the council of Nicaea. Paul, bishop of Constantinople, Athanasius, bishop of Alexandria, the entire multitude of monks, Antony the Great who still survived, his disciples, and a great number of Egyptians and other places in the Roman territory, firmly and openly maintained the doctrines of the Nicaean council throughout the other regions of the East. As I have been led to allude to the monks, I shall briefly mention those who flourished during the reign of Constantius.</p>	
344 - Easter bishops form another creed and deliver it to Italy		
<p>2.19.1 After the lapse of about three years from the events above recorded, the Eastern bishops again assembled a Synod³, and having composed another form of faith, they transmitted it to those in Italy by the hands of Eudoxius, at that time bishop of Germanicia, and Martyrius, and Macedonius, who was bishop of Mopsuestia in Cilicia.</p> <p>2.19.2 This expression of the Creed, being written in more lengthy form, contained many additions to those which had preceded it, and was set forth in these words:</p>	<p>3.11.1a Three years afterwards, the bishops of the East sent to those of the West a formulary of faith, which, because it had been framed with more verbiage and thoughts than any former confession, was called μακροστιχος εκθεσις⁴.</p> <p>3.11.1b In this formulary they made no mention of the substance of God, but those are excommunicated who maintain that the Son arose out of what had no previous existence, or that He is of Another hypostasis, and not of God, or that there was a time or an age in which He existed not.</p>	
The Macrostichos, or “Lengthy” Creed		

³ This creed was adopted by the so-called third Council of Antioch in 344. Cf. T.D. Barnes, *Athanasius and Constantius: Theology and Politics in the Constantinian Empire*. Harvard University Press, 2001, p. 201.

⁴ This is translated as "lengthy creed."

Socrates	Sozomen	Theodoret
<p>2.19.3 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.</p> <p>2.19.4 And in his only-begotten Son Jesus Christ our Lord, 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; who was crucified, and died, and was buried, and rose again from the dead on the third day, and ascended into heaven, and 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 sits at the right hand of the Father, not only in this age, but also in that which is to come.</p> <p>2.19.5 We believe also in the Holy Spirit, that is, in the Comforter, whom the Lord according to his promise sent to his apostles after his ascension into heaven, to teach them and bring all things to their remembrance, through whom also the souls of those who sincerely believe on him are sanctified.</p> <p>2.19.6 But those who assert that the Son was made of things not in being, or of another substance, and not of God, or that there was a time or age when he did not exist, the holy catholic Church accounts as aliens.</p> <p>2.19.7 The holy and catholic Church likewise anathematizes those also who say that there are three Gods, or that Christ is not God before all ages, or that he is neither Christ, nor the Son of God, or that the same person is Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, or that the Son was not begotten, or that the Father begat not the Son by his own will or desire.</p> <p>2.19.8 Neither is it safe to affirm that the Son had his existence from things that were not, since this is nowhere declared concerning him in the divinely inspired Scriptures. Nor are we taught that he had his being from any other pre-existing substance besides the Father, but</p>		

Socrates	Sozomen	Theodoret
<p>that he was truly begotten of God alone; for the Divine word teaches that there is one unbegotten principle without beginning, the Father of Christ.</p> <p>2.19.9 But those who unauthorized by Scripture rashly assert that there was a time when he was not, ought not to preconceive any antecedent interval of time, but God only who without time begat him; for both times and ages were made through him.</p> <p>2.19.10 Yet it must not be thought that the Son is co-unoriginated, or co-unbegotten with the Father: for there is properly no father of the co-unoriginated or co-unbegotten. But we know that the Father alone being unoriginated and incomprehensible, has ineffably and incomprehensibly to all begotten, and that the Son was begotten before the ages, but is not unbegotten like the Father, but has a beginning, viz. the Father who begat him, for 'the head of Christ is God.'</p> <p>2.19.11 Now although according to the Scriptures we acknowledge three things or persons, viz. that of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit, we do not on that account make three Gods.</p> <p>2.19.12 Since we know that that there is but one God perfect in himself, unbegotten, unoriginated, and invisible, the God and Father of the only-begotten, who alone has existence from himself, and alone affords existence abundantly to all other things.</p> <p>2.19.13 But neither while we assert that there is one God, the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, the only-begotten, do we therefore deny that Christ is God before the ages, as the followers of Paul of Samosata do, who affirm that after his incarnation he was by exaltation deified, in that he was by nature a mere man.</p> <p>2.19.14 We know indeed that he was subject to his God and Father: nevertheless, he was begotten of God, and is by nature true and perfect God, and was not afterwards made God out of man; but was for our sake made man out of God, and has never ceased to be God.</p> <p>2.19.15 Moreover we execrate and anathematize those who falsely style him the mere unsubstantial word of God, having existence only in another, either as the word</p>		

Socrates	Sozomen	Theodoret
<p>to which utterance is given, or as the word conceived in the mind: and who pretend that before the ages he was neither the Christ, the Son of God, the Mediator, nor the Image of God; but that he became the Christ, and the Son of God, from the time he took our flesh from the virgin, about four hundred years ago. For they assert that Christ had the beginning of his kingdom from that time, and that it shall have an end after the consummation of all things and the judgment.</p> <p>2.19.16 Such persons as these are the followers of Marcellus and Photinus, the Ancyro-Galatians, who under pretext of establishing his sovereignty, like the Jews set aside the eternal existence and deity of Christ, and the perpetuity of his kingdom.</p> <p>2.19.17 But we know him to be not simply the word of God by utterance or mental conception, but God the living Word subsisting of himself; and Son of God and Christ; and who did, not by presence only, co-exist and was conversant with his Father before the ages, and ministered to him at the creation of all things, whether visible or invisible, but was the substantial Word of the Father, and God of God.</p> <p>2.19.18 For this is he to whom the Father said, "Let, us make man in our image, and according to our likeness:" who in his own person appeared to the fathers, gave the law, and spoke by the prophets; and being at last made man, he manifested his Father to all men, and reigns to endless ages. Christ has not attained any new dignity; but we believe that he was perfect from the beginning, and like his Father in all things.</p> <p>2.19.19 And those who say that the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, are the same person, impiously supposing the three names to refer to one and the same thing and person, we deservedly expel from the church because by the incarnation they render the Father, who is incomprehensible and insusceptible of suffering, subject to comprehension and suffering.</p> <p>2.19.20 Such are those denominated Patropassians among the Romans, and by us Sabellians. For we know that the Father who sent, remained in the proper nature of</p>		

Socrates	Sozomen	Theodoret
<p>his own immutable deity; but that Christ who was sent, has fulfilled the economy of the incarnation.</p> <p>2.19.21 In like manner those who irreverently affirm that Christ was begotten not by the will and pleasure of his Father; thus attributing to God an involuntary necessity not springing from choice, as if he begat the Son by constraint, we consider most impious and strangers to the truth because they have dared to determine such things respecting him as are inconsistent with our common notions of God, and are contrary indeed to the sense of the divinely-inspired Scripture.</p> <p>2.19.22 For knowing that God is self-dependent and Lord of himself we devoutly maintain that of his own volition and pleasure he begat the Son.</p> <p>And while we reverentially believe what is spoken concerning him; “The Lord created me the beginning of his ways on account of his works”: yet we do not suppose that he was made similarly to the creatures or works made by him.</p> <p>2.19.23 For it is impious and repugnant to the church’s faith to compare the Creator with the works created by him; or to imagine that he had the same manner of generation as things of a nature totally different from himself.</p> <p>2.19.24 For the sacred Scriptures teach us that the alone only-begotten Son was really and truly begotten. Nor when we say that the Son is of himself, and lives and subsists in like manner to the Father, do we therefore separate him from the Father, as if we supposed them dissociated by the intervention of space and distance in a material sense.</p> <p>2.19.25 For we believe that they are united without medium or interval, and that they are incapable of separation from each other: the whole Father embosoming the Son; and the whole Son attached to and eternally reposing in the Father’s bosom.</p> <p>2.19.26 Believing, therefore, in the altogether perfect and most holy Trinity, and asserting that the Father is God, and that the Son also is God, we do not acknowledge two Gods, but one only, on account of the</p>		

Socrates	Sozomen	Theodoret
<p>majesty of the Deity, and the perfect blending and union of the kingdoms.</p> <p>2.19.27 The Father ruling over all things universally, and even over the Son himself; the Son being subject to the Father, but except him, ruling over all things which were made after him and by him; and by the Father's will bestowing abundantly on the saints the grace of the Holy Spirit. For the Sacred Oracles inform us that in this consists the character of the sovereignty which Christ exercises.</p> <p>2.19.28 We have been compelled, since the publication of our former epitome, to give this more ample exposition of the creed; not in order to gratify a vain ambition, but to clear ourselves from all strange suspicion respecting our faith which may exist among those who are ignorant of our real sentiments. And that the inhabitants of the West may both be aware of the shameless misrepresentations of the heterodox party; and also know the ecclesiastical opinion of the Eastern bishops concerning Christ, confirmed by the unwrested testimony of the divinely-inspired Scriptures, among all those of unperturbed minds.</p>		
Westerners do not accept the Macrostichos, or "Lengthy" Creed		
	<p>3.11.2 Eudoxius, who was still bishop of Germanicia, Martyrius, and Macedonius, carried this document, but the Western priests did not pay attention to it; for they declared that they felt fully satisfied with the doctrines established at Nicaea, and thought it entirely unnecessary to be too curious about such points.</p>	
344 - Paul is deposed from Constantinople (again) and immediately exiled		
<p>2.16.1 When the Emperor Constantius, who then held his court at Antioch, heard that Paul had again obtained possession of the episcopal throne, he was excessively enraged at his presumption.</p> <p>2.16.2 He therefore dispatched a written order to Philip, the Praetorian Prefect, whose power exceeded that of the other governors of provinces, and who was styled the</p>	<p>3.9.1 After having written in this way to Julius, the bishops of the East brought accusations against those whom they had deposed before the emperor Constantius. Accordingly, the emperor, who was then at Antioch, wrote to Philip, the prefect of Constantinople, commanding him to surrender the Church to Macedonius, and to expel Paul from the city.</p>	

Socrates	Sozomen	Theodoret
<p>second person from the emperor, to drive Paul out of the church again, and introduce Macedonius into it in his place.</p> <p>2.16.3 Now the prefect Philip, dreading an insurrectionary movement among the people, used artifice to entrap the bishop: keeping, therefore, the emperor's mandate secret, he went to the public bath called Zeuxippus, and on pretense of attending to some public affairs, sent to Paul with every demonstration of respect, requesting his attendance there, on the ground that his presence was indispensable.</p> <p>2.16.4 The bishop came; and as he came in obedience to this summons, the prefect immediately showed him the emperor's order.</p> <p>2.16.5 The bishop patiently submitted to condemnation without a hearing. But as Philip was afraid of the violence of the multitude—for great numbers had gathered around the building to see what would take place, for their suspicions had been aroused by current reports—he commanded one of the bath doors to be opened which connected with the imperial palace, and through that Paul was carried off, put on board a vessel provided for the purpose, and so sent into exile immediately.</p> <p>2.16.6 The prefect directed him to go to Thessalonica, the metropolis of Macedonia, from where he had derived his origin from his ancestors; commanding him to reside in that city, but granting him permission to visit other cities of Illyricum, while he strictly forbade his passing into any portion of the Eastern empire.</p> <p>2.16.7a Thus was Paul, contrary to his expectation, at once expelled from the church, and from the city, and again hurried off into exile.</p>	<p>3.9.2a The prefect feared the commotion among the people, and before the order of the emperor could be divulged, he went to the public bath which is called Zeuxippus, a conspicuous and large structure, and summoned Paul, as if he wished to converse with him on some affairs of general interest.</p> <p>3.9.2b As soon as he had arrived, he showed him the edict of the emperor. Paul was, according to orders, secretly conducted through the palace contiguous to the bath, to the seaside, and placed on board a vessel and was sent to Thessalonica, from where, it is said, his ancestors originally came.</p> <p>3.9.3a He was strictly prohibited from approaching the Eastern regions, but was not forbidden to visit Illyricum and the remoter provinces.</p>	
344 - Many are killed in the chaos as Macedonius is installed in Constantinople		
<p>2.16.7b Philip, the imperial prefect, leaving the bath, immediately proceeded to the church.</p> <p>2.16.8 Together with him, as if thrown there by an engine, Macedonius rode seated in the same seat with the prefect in the chariot seen by everybody, and a military guard with drawn swords was about them.</p> <p>2.16.9 The multitude was completely overawed by this</p>	<p>3.9.3b After leaving the court room, Philip, accompanied by Macedonius, proceeded to the church.</p> <p>The people, who had in the meantime been assembling</p>	

Socrates	Sozomen	Theodoret
<p>spectacle, and both Arians and Homoousians hastened to the church, every one endeavoring to secure an entrance there.</p> <p>2.16.10 As the prefect with Macedonius came near the church, an irrational panic seized the multitude and even the soldiers themselves</p> <p>2.16.11 For as the assemblage was so numerous and no room to admit the passage of the prefect and Macedonius was found, the soldiers attempted to thrust aside the people by force.</p> <p>2.16.12 But the confined space into which they were crowded together rendering it impossible to recede, the soldiers imagined that resistance was offered, and that the populace intentionally stopped the passage; they accordingly began to use their naked swords, and to cut down those that stood in their way.</p> <p>2.16.13 It is affirmed that about 3150 persons were massacred on this occasion; of whom the greater part fell under the weapons of the soldiers, and the rest were crushed to death by the desperate efforts of the multitude to escape their violence.</p> <p>2.16.14 After such distinguished achievements, Macedonius, as if he had not been the author of any calamity, but was altogether guiltless of what had been perpetrated, was seated in the episcopal chair by the prefect, rather than by the ecclesiastical canon.</p> <p>2.16.15 Thus, then, by means of so many murders in the church, Macedonius and the Arians grasped the supremacy in the churches.</p> <p>2.16.16 About this period the emperor built the great church called Sophia, adjoining to that named Irene, which being originally of small dimensions, the emperor's father had considerably enlarged and adorned. In the present day both are seen within one enclosure, and have but one name.</p>	<p>together in untold numbers, quickly filled the church, and the two parties into which they were divided, namely, the supporters of the Arian heresy and the followers of Paul respectively, strove to take possession of the building.</p> <p>3.9.4 When the prefect and Macedonius arrived at the gates of the church, the soldiers endeavored to force back the people, in order to make way for these dignitaries, but as they were so crowded together, it was impossible for them to recede, since they were closely packed to the farthest point, or to make way.</p> <p>3.9.4b And so, the soldiers, under the impression that the crowd was unwilling to retire, slew many with their swords, and a great number were killed by being trampled upon.</p> <p>3.9.4c The edict of the emperor was thus accomplished, and Macedonius received the Churches.</p> <p>3.9.5a But Paul was unexpectedly ejected from the Church in Constantinople.</p>	
344/5 -Paul secretly leaves his exile in Thessalonica and travels to Rome		

Socrates	Sozomen	Theodoret
2.17.12 This is sufficient on this subject. Not long after this, Paul, pretending to make a journey from Thessalonica to Corinth, arrived in Italy: upon which both the bishops made an appeal to the emperor of those parts, laying their respective cases before him.		
Macedonius starts his own sect		
		<p>2.6.1 The Arians, having effected the death of Paul, or rather having dispatched him to the kingdom of heaven, promoted Macedonius in his place, who, they imagined, held the same sentiments, and belonged to the same faction as themselves. For he also, like them, blasphemed the Holy Ghost. But shortly after, they deposed him also, because he refused to call Him a creature Whom the Holy Scriptures affirm to be the Son of God.</p> <p>2.6.2 After his separation from them, he became the leader of a sect of his own. He taught that the Son of God is not of the same substance as the Father, but that He is like Him in every particular. He also openly affirmed that the Holy Ghost is a creature. These circumstances occurred not long afterwards as we have narrated them.</p>