

Harmony 1.7 – Athanasius’s Early Career/Continued Arian controversy (325-337)

Copyright 2016 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 2/2/17

Socrates	Sozomen	Theodoret
Born c. 296 - Athanasius’ youth		
	<p>2.17.6 It is said that the following incident occurred to Athanasius in his youth. It was the custom of the Alexandrians to celebrate with great pomp an annual festival in honor of one of their bishops named Peter, who had suffered martyrdom. Alexander, who then conducted the church, engaged in the celebration of this festival. After completing the worship, he remained on the spot, awaiting the arrival of some guests whom he expected to breakfast.</p>	
<p>1.15.1b Rufinus writes that when Athanasius was a boy, he played with others of his own age at a sacred game. This was an imitation of the priesthood and the order of consecrated persons.</p> <p>1.15.2 In this game Athanasius was given the episcopal chair, and each of the other lads played either a presbyter or a deacon. The children engaged in this sport on the day in which the memory of the martyr and bishop Peter was celebrated.</p>		
<p>1.15.3a Now at that time Alexander bishop of Alexandria happened to pass by, observed the play in which they were engaged, and sent for the children. He asked them the part each had been assigned in the game, thinking that something might be predicted by this game. He then gave directions that the children should be taken to the church and instructed in learning, especially Athanasius.</p>	<p>2.17.7 In the meantime he chanced to cast his eyes towards the sea and perceived some children playing on the shore, amusing themselves by imitating the bishop and the ceremonies of the Church. At first he considered the mimicry as innocent and took pleasure in witnessing it; but when they touched upon the unutterable, he was troubled and communicated the matter to the chief of the clergy. The children were called together and questioned as to the game at which they were playing and as to what they did and said when engaged in this amusement.</p> <p>2.17.8 At first they through fear denied; but when Alexander threatened them with torture, they confessed</p>	

Socrates	Sozomen	Theodoret
	<p>that Athanasius was their bishop and leader, and that many children who had not been initiated had been baptized by him.</p> <p>2.17.9 Alexander carefully inquired what the priest of their play was in the habit of saying or doing and what they answered or were taught. When he found that the exact routine of the Church had been accurately observed by them, he consulted the priests around him on the subject and decided that it would be unnecessary to re-baptize those who, in their simplicity, had been judged worthy of the Divine grace. He therefore merely performed for them such offices as it is lawful only for those who are consecrated to initiating the mysteries.</p>	
<p>1.15.3b After Alexander ordained Athanasius as deacon when he was of adult age, Alexander brought him to Nicaea to assist him in the disputations there when the Council was convened.</p> <p>1.15.4 Rufinus has given this account of Athanasius in his own writings; It is not improbable that it took place, for many transactions of this kind have often occurred. The above matter has sufficiently been covered.</p>	<p>2.17.10 He then took Athanasius and the other children, who had playfully acted as presbyters and deacons, to their own relations under God as a witness that they might be brought up for the Church and for leadership in what they had imitated. Not long after he took Athanasius as his table companion and secretary. He had been well educated and was versed in grammar and rhetoric. Already when was of adult age and before he attained the bishopric, he gave proof to those talking with him that he was a man of wisdom and intellectuality</p>	<p>1.26.1b Trained from his youth in sacred studies, Athanasius had attracted general admiration in each ecclesiastical office that he filled.</p>
325 - Notable bishops arrive for council		
<p>1.8.13 Many of the laity who were present at Nicaea were also practiced in the art of reasoning, and each was eager to advocate the cause of his own party. Eusebius, bishop of Nicomedia, as was before said, supported the opinion of Arius, together with Theognis and Maris. Of these the former was bishop of Nicaea, and Maris was bishop of Chalcedon in Bithynia. These two were powerfully opposed by Athanasius, a deacon of the Alexandrian church, who was highly esteemed by Alexander his bishop. Because of that he was much envied, as will be seen hereafter.</p>	<p>1.17.7 Many of the bishops who were then assembled, and the clergy who accompanied them, were noticeable for their remarkable dialectic skill and rhetorical methods, attracting the notice of the emperor and the court. Of that number Athanasius, who was then a deacon of Alexandria and had accompanied his bishop Alexander, seemed to have the largest share in the counsel concerning these subjects.</p>	<p>1.26.2 He had at the general council so defended the doctrines of the apostles that, while he won the approbation of all the champions of the truth, its opponents learned to look on their antagonist as a personal foe and public enemy.</p> <p>1.26.3a He had attended the council as one of the retinue of Alexander. Although he was the principal deacon, he was then a very young man.</p>
325 - Athanasius' account of deliberations at Nicaea		

Socrates	Sozomen	Theodoret
		<p>1.8.6b Athanasius, his fellow combatant, the champion of the truth, who succeeded the celebrated Alexander in the episcopate, added the following in a letter addressed to the Africans:</p> <p>1.8.7 The bishops convened in council to refute the impious assertions invented by the Arians: that the Son was created out of what was non-existent, that He is a creature and created being, that there was a period in which He was not, and that He is changeable by nature. In accordance with the Holy Scriptures the bishops agreed to write that the Son is by nature only-begotten of God, Word, Power, and sole Wisdom of the Father; that He is, as John said, ‘the true God,’ and, as Paul has written, ‘the brightness of the glory, and the express image of the person of the Father.’ [Heb. 1:3] The followers of Eusebius, drawn aside by their own vile doctrine, then began to say one to another, ‘Let us agree, because we are also of God,...</p> <p>1.8.8 There is but one God, by whom are all things,’ and, ‘Old things are passed away; behold, all things are become new, and all things are of God.’ They also gave particular attention to what is contained in ‘The Shepherd:’ ‘Believe above all that there is one God, who created and fashioned all things, and made them to be out of that which is not.’</p> <p>1.8.9 But the bishops saw through their evil design and impious fraud and gave a clearer explanation of the words ‘of God.’ They wrote that the Son is of the substance of God, so that while the creatures, which do not in any way derive their existence of or from themselves, are said to be of God, only the Son is said to be of the substance of the Father,</p> <p>1.8.10 This was unique to the only-begotten Son, the true Word of the Father. This is the reason why the bishops wrote that He is of the substance of the Father. But when the Arians, who seemed few in number, were again interrogated by the Bishops to see if they admitted</p>

Socrates	Sozomen	Theodoret
		<p>‘that the Son is not a creature, but Power, and sole Wisdom, and eternal unchangeable Image of the Father, and that He is very God,’ the Eusebians were noticed nodding to each other, saying, “These things apply to us as well. For it is said, that we are ‘the image and glory of God;’ and ‘for always we who live:’”</p> <p>1.8.11 There are, also, they said, many powers. ‘For it is written—‘All the power of God went out of the land of Egypt.’ The worm and the locust are said to be ‘a great power.’ And elsewhere it is written, ‘The God of powers is with us, our helper is the God of Jacob.’ To which may be added that we are God’s own not naturally, but because the Son called us ‘brothers.’</p> <p>1.8.12 The declaration that Christ is ‘the true God’ does not distress us, for the one who came into being is true.” This was the corrupt opinion of the Arians. But at that time the bishops, when they discovered their deceitfulness, collected from Scripture those passages which say of Christ that He is the glory, the fountain, the stream, and the express image of the person. They quoted the following words: ‘In your light we shall see light;’ and likewise, ‘I and the Father are one.’</p> <p>1.8.13 Then, with still greater clearness, they briefly declared that the Son is of one substance with the Father. For this, indeed, is the meaning of the passages which have been quoted.</p> <p>1.8.14 The complaint of the Arians, that these precise words are not to be found in Scripture, is proved groundless by their own practice. For their own impious assertions are not taken from Scripture (for it is not written that the Son comes from what was not, and that there was a time when He was not), and yet they complain about being condemned by expressions which, though not actually in Scripture, are in accordance with true religion. They themselves, on the other hand, as though they had found their words on a dunghill, uttered things that truly came from worldly thinking. The</p>

Socrates	Sozomen	Theodoret
		<p>bishops, on the other hand, did not find their expressions for themselves, but received their testimony from the fathers and wrote accordingly.</p> <p>1.8.15 Indeed, there were bishops of old, nearly one hundred and thirty years ago, both of the great city of Rome and of our own city, who condemned those who asserted that the Son is a creature and that He is not of one substance with the Father. Eusebius, the bishop of Caesarea, was acquainted with these facts; he, at one time, favored the Arian heresy, but later signed the confession of faith of the Council of Nicaea.</p> <p>1.8.16 He wrote to the people of his diocese, maintaining that the word ‘consubstantial’ was ‘used by illustrious bishops and learned writers as a term for expressing the divinity of the Father and of the Son.’</p> <p>1.8.17 So these men concealed their madness because they feared the majority and gave their assent to the decisions of the council, thus drawing upon themselves the condemnation of the prophet, for the God of all cries out against them, “This people honor Me with their lips, but in their hearts they are far from Me.”</p> <p>1.8.18 Theonas and Secundus, however, did not want to take this course and were excommunicated by unanimous agreement as men who lifted the Arian blasphemy above evangelical doctrine. The bishops then returned to the council and drew up twenty laws to regulate the discipline of the Church.</p>
Continued debate about the term homoousios between bishops		
1.23.5 Meanwhile, another commotion was raised in the church. In fact, her own children again disturbed her peace.	2.18.3a At this period the bishops had another fierce dispute among themselves concerning the precise meaning of the term “consubstantial.”	
1.23.7 Those who objected to the word <i>homoousios</i> thought that those who approved it favored the opinion of Sabellius and Montanus. They therefore called them blasphemers, as subverting the existence of the Son of God. And again the advocates of this term, charging their opponents with polytheism, inveighed against them as	2.18.3b Some thought that this term could not be admitted without blasphemy, that it implied the non-existence of the Son of God, and that it involved the error of Montanus and Sabellius. Those, on the other hand, who defended the term, regarded their opponents as Greeks (or pagans), and considered that their sentiments led to	

Socrates	Sozomen	Theodoret
introducers of heathen superstitions.	polytheism.	
<p>1.23.6 Eusebius Pamphilus says that immediately after the Council Egypt was engulfed by internal divisions. However, he did not provide the reason for this. As a result he gained a reputation of hypocrisy. He avoided specifying the causes of these divisions because he was determined not to give his approval to the proceedings at Nicaea. Yet as we ourselves have discovered from various letters which the bishops wrote to one another after the Synod, the term <i>homoousios</i> troubled some of them. While they occupied themselves in a small investigation of its implication, they roused discord against each other. It seemed not unlike a contest in the dark; neither party appeared to understand distinctly the grounds on which they accused one another.</p>		
<p>1.23.8 Eustathius, bishop of Antioch, accused Eusebius Pamphilus of perverting the Nicene Creed. Eusebius denied that he violated that exposition of the faith. In response Eusebius charged Eustathius of defending the opinion of Sabellius. In consequence of these misunderstandings, each of them wrote as if contending against adversaries, although both sides confessed that the Son of God has a distinct person and existence and all acknowledged that there is one God in three Persons. Yet from what cause I am unable to discern, they could not agree among themselves and therefore could not be at peace.</p>	<p>2.18.4 Eusebius, surnamed Pamphilus, and Eustathius, bishop of Antioch, took the lead in this dispute. They both confessed the Son of God to exist hypostatically and yet contended together as if they had misunderstood each other. Eustathius accused Eusebius of altering the doctrines ratified by the council of Nicaea, while the latter declared that he approved of all the Nicaean doctrines and reproached Eustathius for cleaving to the heresy of Sabellius.</p>	
327 – Council of Antioch deposes Eustathius		
		<p>1.21.1 Eusebius, as I have already stated, seized the diocese of Constantinople by force. And thus having acquired great power in that city, by frequently visiting and holding familiar intercourse with the emperor he gained confidence and formed plots against those who were foremost in the support of the truth.</p>
		<p>1.21.2 He at first feigned a desire of going to Jerusalem, to see the celebrated edifices there erected. And the emperor, who was deceived by his flattery, allowed him to set out with the utmost honor, providing him with carriages and the rest of his equipage and retinue.</p>

Socrates	Sozomen	Theodoret
	2.19.1 A Synod was convened at Antioch.	1.21.3 Theognis, bishop of Nicaea, who, as we have before said, was his accomplice in his evil designs, travelled with him. When they arrived at Antioch, they put on the mask of friendship and were received with the utmost deference. Eustathius, the great champion of the faith, treated them with fraternal kindness.
		<p>1.21.4 When they arrived at the holy places, they had an interview with those who were of the same opinions as themselves, namely, Eusebius, bishop of Caesarea, Patrophilus, bishop of Scythopolis, Aetius, bishop of Lydda, Theodotus, bishop of Laodicea, and others who had imbibed the Arian sentiments. They made known to them the plot they had hatched and went with them to Antioch.</p> <p>1.21.5 The pretext for their journey was that due honor might be rendered to Eusebius, but their real motive was their war against religion. They bribed a low woman, who made a traffic of her beauty, to sell them her tongue and then repaired to the council. When all the spectators had been ordered to depart, they introduced the wretched woman.</p> <p>1.21.6 She held a babe in her arms, of which she loudly and impudently affirmed that Eustathius was the father. Eustathius, conscious of his innocence, asked her whether she could bring forward any witness to prove what she had stated.</p> <p>1.21.7 She replied that she could not. Yet these equitable judges admitted her to oath, although it is said in the law that ‘at the mouth of two or three witnesses shall the matter be established,’ and the apostle says, “against an elder receive not any accusation but before two or three witnesses.”</p> <p>1.21.8 But they despised these divine laws and admitted the accusation against this great man without any witnesses. When the woman had again declared upon oath that Eustathius was the father of the babe, these truth-loving judges condemned him as an adulterer.</p>

Socrates	Sozomen	Theodoret
	<p>2.19.1 And Eustathius was deprived of the church of that city. It was most generally believed that he was deposed merely on account of his adherence to the faith of the council of Nicaea and on account of his having accused Eusebius, Paulinus, bishop of Tyre, and Patrophilus, bishop of Scythopolis (whose sentiments were adopted by the Eastern priests) of favoring the heresy of Arius. The pretext resorted to for his deposition, however, was that he had defiled the priesthood by unholy deeds.</p>	<p>1.21.9 When the other bishops, who upheld the apostolic doctrines, ignorant of all these intrigues, openly opposed the sentence and advised Eustathius not to submit to it, the originators of the plot promptly repaired to the emperor and endeavored to persuade him that the accusation was true and the sentence of deposition just. They succeeded in obtaining the banishment of this champion of piety and chastity as an adulterer and a tyrant.</p> <p>1.22.1a He was conducted across Thrace to a city of Illyricum.</p>
Church of Antioch divided for 8 years, emperor get involved		
<p>1.24.5 At that time, however, there arose a dangerous revolt at Antioch on account of his deposition. When they proceeded to elect a successor, so fierce a dissension was kindled that the whole city was threatened with destruction. The populace was divided into two factions: one which vehemently fought for the appointment of Eusebius Pamphilus from Caesarea in Palestine to Antioch; the other which equally insisted on the reinstatement of Eustathius.</p> <p>1.24.6 The people of the city were so infected with the spirit of division in this quarrel among the Christians that a military force was mustered on both sides with hostile intent. A bloody incident would have taken place, had not God and the dread of the emperor repressed the violence of the masses.</p>	<p>2.19.2 His deposition caused so great a disturbance at Antioch that the people were on the point of taking up arms, and the whole city was in a state of commotion. This greatly injured him in the opinion of the emperor. For when he understood what had happened and that the people of that church were divided into two parties, he was much enraged and regarded him with suspicion as the author of the tumult. The emperor, however, sent an illustrious officer of his palace, invested with full authority, to calm the populace and put an end to the disturbance without having recourse to violence or injury.</p> <p>2.19.3 Those who had deposed Eustathius and who on this account were assembled in Antioch hoped that their sentiments would be universally received if they could succeed in placing over the Church of Antioch one of their own opinion who was known to the emperor and held in repute for learning and eloquence. Hoping that they could obtain the obedience of the rest, they fixed their thoughts upon Eusebius Pamphilus for that see. They wrote to the emperor upon this subject and stated that this course would be highly acceptable to the people. He had, in fact, been sought by all the clergy and laity who were prejudiced to Eustathius.</p>	<p>1.22.1b Eulalius was first consecrated in place. But Eulalius surviving his elevation only a short period, for it was intended that Eusebius of Palestine should be translated to this bishopric. Eusebius, however, refused the appointment, and the emperor forbade its being conferred on him. Next Euphronius was put forward. When he also died, after a lapse of only one year and a few months, the see was conferred on Flaccillus.</p> <p>1.22.2 All these bishops secretly clung to the Arian heresy. Therefore it was that most of those individuals, whether of the clergy or of the laity, who valued the true religion left the churches and formed assemblies among themselves. They were called Eustathians, since it was after the banishment of Eustathius that they began to hold their meetings.</p>
<p>1.24.7 For the emperor, through letters, and Eusebius, by refusing to accept the bishopric, served to ease the tension.</p>	<p>2,19.4 Eusebius, however, wrote to the emperor refusing the dignity. The emperor approved of his refusal with</p>	

Socrates	Sozomen	Theodoret
<p>Because of this the emperor highly admired Eusebius. The emperor wrote to him, commending his prudent determination and congratulating him as one who was considered worthy of being bishop not of merely one city, but of almost the whole world.</p>	<p>praise; for there was an ecclesiastical law prohibiting the removal of a bishop from one bishopric to another. He wrote to the people and to Eusebius, adopting his judgment and calling him happy because he was worthy to hold the bishopric not only of one single city, but of the world.</p> <p>2.19.5 The emperor also wrote to the people of the Church of Antioch concerning like-mindedness and told them that they ought not to desire the bishops of other regions, even as they ought not to covet the possessions of others.</p> <p>2.19.6 In addition to these he dispatched another epistle to the Synod in private session and similarly commended Eusebius, as in the letter to him, for having refused the bishopric. Because he was convinced that Euphronius, a presbyter of Cappadocia, and George of Arethusa were men approved in creed, he commanded the bishops to decide for one or other of them, or for whomsoever might appear worthy of the honor, and to ordain a president for the Church of Antioch. On the receipt of these letters from the emperor, Euphronius was ordained.</p> <p>2.19.7 And I have heard that Eustathius bore this unjust accusation calmly, judging it to be better, as he was a man who, besides his virtues and excellent qualities, was justly admired on account of his fine eloquence. This is evidenced by his transmitted works, which are highly approved for their choice of words, flavor of expression, temperateness of sentiments, elegance and grace of narration.</p>	
<p>1.24.8 Consequently, it is said that the episcopal chair of the church at Antioch was vacant for eight consecutive years after this period. At length, by the efforts of those who strove for the sabotage of the Nicene creed, Euphronius was installed. This is the amount of my information respecting the Synod held at Antioch on account of Eustathius.</p>		
		<p>[The woman who framed Eustathius later confesses] 1.22.3 The wretched woman above-mentioned was</p>

Socrates	Sozomen	Theodoret
		soon after attacked by a severe and protracted illness. She then confessed the trickery in which she had been engaged and made known the whole plot, not only to two or three, but to a very large number of priests. She confessed that she had been bribed to bring this false and impudent charge, but that her oath was not altogether false, as a certain Eustathius, a coppersmith, was the father of the babe. Such were some of the crimes perpetrated in Antioch by this most excellent faction.
Eusebius asks Constantine to readmit Arius		
<p>1.23.4 He sought to persuade the emperor to give Arius an audience and permit him to return to Alexandria. How he attained his goal, I shall mention in its proper place.</p> <p>[Eusebius Nic. continues his efforts to have Arius reinstalled]</p> <p>1.24.9 Immediately after these events Eusebius, who had long before left Berytus and was at that time presiding over the church at Nicomedia, strenuously exerted himself, together with those of his party, to bring back Arius to Alexandria. But how they managed to do this and how the emperor was persuaded to admit both Arius and with him Euzoïus into his presence must now be related.</p>		
A priest of the imperial household convinces Constantine that Arius should be recalled		
<p>1.25.1 The Emperor Constantine had a sister named Constantia, the widow of Licinius. He had for some time shared the imperial dignity with Constantine. However, he had begun acting tyrannically and had been put to death as a result.</p>		
<p>1.25.2 This princess maintained in her household a certain confidential presbyter who was saturated with the dogmas of Arianism. Because Eusebius and others prompted him, he insinuated in his daily conversations with Constantia that the Synod had done Arius injustice and that the common report concerning him was not true.</p>	<p>2.27.2 A certain presbyter who was a great admirer of the Arian doctrines was on terms of intimacy with the emperor's sister. At first he concealed his sentiments; but as he frequently visited and became increasingly more familiar with Constantia, for this was the name of the sister of Constantine, he gained enough confidence to tell her that Arius was unjustly exiled from his country and</p>	

Socrates	Sozomen	Theodoret
	cast out from the Church through the jealousy and personal enmity of Alexander, bishop of the Alexandrian Church. He said that his jealousy had come from the honor which the people felt towards Arius.	
<p>1.25.3 Constantia gave full credence to the presbyter's claims but did not dare report them to the emperor. Now it happened that she became dangerously ill, and her brother visited her daily.</p> <p>1.25.4 As the disease grew worse and she expected to die, she commended this presbyter to the emperor, testifying to his diligence and piety as well as his devoted loyalty to his sovereign.</p>	<p>2.27.3 Constantia believed these claims to be true, yet took no steps in her lifetime to change the decrees of Nicaea. When she was attacked with a disease which threatened to end in death, she besought her brother. He went to visit her, to grant what she was about to ask as a last favor. This request was to receive the above-mentioned presbyter on terms of intimacy and to rely upon him as a man who had correct opinions about the Divinity. 'For my part,' she added, 'I am drawing near to death and am no longer interested in the concerns of this life; the only apprehension I now feel arises from dread lest you should incur the wrath of God and suffer any calamity, or the loss of your empire, since you have been persuaded to condemn just and good men wrongfully to perpetual banishment.'</p>	
<p>1.25.5 She died soon after. Consequently, the presbyter became one of the most confidential persons around the emperor. As he grew more and more comfortable, he repeated to the emperor what he had before stated to his sister: that Arius had no other views than the beliefs asserted by the Synod, that if he were admitted to the imperial court, he would give his full assent to what the Synod had decreed, and that he had been unreasonably slandered.</p> <p>1.25.6 The presbyter's words were curious to the emperor, and he said, 'If Arius subscribes with the Synod and holds its views, I will both give him an audience and send him back to Alexandria with honor.' After saying this, he immediately wrote to Arius these words:</p>		
Constantine's letter summoning Arius to Constantinople		
<p>1.25.7 Victor Constantine Maximus Augustus, to Arius. It was announced to your reverence some time since that you might come to our court in order to obtain an interview with us. We are not a little surprised that you did not do this</p>		

Socrates	Sozomen	Theodoret
<p>immediately.</p> <p>1.25.8 Therefore, find transportation and hasten to our court. When you have experienced our mercy and regard for you, you may return to your own country. May God protect you, beloved.</p> <p>Dated the twenty-fifth of November.</p> <p>1.25.9 This was the letter of the emperor to Arius. And I cannot but admire the ardent zeal which the prince expressed for religion. For it appears from this document that he had often before exhorted Arius to change his views, considering that he criticized Arius' delay in returning to the truth, although he had himself written frequently to Arius.</p>		
November 27, 327 - Constantine ask Arius and Euzoius for a statement of faith		
<p>1.25.10 After receiving this letter, Arius came to Constantinople accompanied by Euzoïus, whom Alexander had deprived of his deaconship when he excommunicated Arius and his followers.</p> <p>1.25.11 The emperor accordingly admitted them to his presence and asked them whether they would agree to the creed. And when they readily gave their assent, he ordered them to deliver to him a written statement of their faith.</p>	<p>2.27.4 From that period the emperor received the presbyter into favor. After permitting him to speak freely with him and to converse on the same topics concerning which his sister had given her command, he thought it necessary to subject the case of Arius to a fresh examination. It is probable that, in forming this decision, the emperor was either influenced by a belief in the credibility of the attacks or by the desire of gratifying his sister. It was not long until he recalled Arius from exile and demanded of him a written exposition of his faith concerning the Godhead.</p> <p>2.27.5 Arius avoided making use of the new terms which he had previously devised and constructed another exposition by using simpler terms, ones that were used by the sacred Scriptures. He declared upon oath that he held the doctrines set forth in this exposition, that he both felt these statements <i>ex animo</i> and had no other thought than these.</p>	
<p>1.26.1 They drew up a declaration in following effect manner and presented it to the emperor.</p>	<p>It was as follows:</p>	
<p>[The letter of Arius and Euzoius with their confession]</p> <p>1.26.2 Arius and Euzoïus, to our most reverent and pious lord, Emperor Constantine.</p> <p>In accord with the command of your devout piety, sovereign</p>	<p>[This letter is also found in Sozomen 2.27.6-10]</p>	

Socrates	Sozomen	Theodoret
<p>lord, we declare our faith, and in writing profess before God that we and our adherents believe as follows:</p> <p>1.26.3 We believe in one God the Father Almighty, and in the Lord Jesus Christ his Son, who was begotten of him before all ages, God the Word through whom all things were made, both things in heaven and on earth; who descended, and became human, and suffered, and rose again, ascended into heaven, and will again come to judge the living and the dead.</p> <p>We believe also in the Holy Spirit, and in the resurrection of the flesh, and in the life of the coming age, and in the kingdom of the heavens, and in one catholic church of God, extending from one end of the earth to the other.</p> <p>1.26.4 This faith we have received from the holy gospels, in which the Lord says to his disciples: “Go and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit.”</p> <p>1.26.5 If we do not so believe and do not truly receive the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit, as the whole catholic church and the holy Scriptures teach (in which we believe in every respect), may God judge us both now, and in the coming judgment.</p> <p>1.26.6 Wherefore we (who have been consecrated to the ministry, and hold the faith and opinions of the church and of the holy Scriptures) encourage your piety, most devout emperor, that we may be reunited to our mother, the church, by your peace-loving and devoted piety, avoiding all superfluous questions and disputes.</p> <p>1.26.7 Then both we and the whole church will be at peace and will offer in common our accustomed prayers for your tranquil reign, and also for your whole family.¹</p>		
	<p>2.27.11 Many considered this declaration of faith an artful compilation, appearing to be different only in expression. In reality, however, it supported the doctrine of Arius. The terms in which it was expressed were so</p>	

¹ Translation from NPNF2 vol. 2, p. 28, adapted by AJW, <http://www.fourthcentury.com/index.php/urkunde-30>.

Socrates	Sozomen	Theodoret
	vague that it was open to diverse interpretations.	
June 8. 328 – Athanasius replaces Alexander		
<p>1.15.1 After this, Alexander bishop of Alexandria died, and Athanasius was set over that church.</p>	<p>2.17.1 About this period Alexander, bishop of Alexandria, was about to depart this life, and he left Athanasius as his successor, in accordance, I am convinced, with the Divine will directing the vote upon him. It is said that Athanasius at first sought to avoid the honor by flight, but that he, although unwilling, was afterwards compelled by Alexander to accept the bishopric.</p> <p>2.17.2 This is testified by Apolinarius, the Syrian, in the following terms: ‘In all these matters much disturbance was excited by impiety, but its first effects were felt by the blessed teacher of this man, who was at hand as an assistant and behaved as a son would to his father. Afterwards this holy man himself underwent the same experience, for when appointed to the episcopal succession he fled to escape the honor. But he was discovered in his place of concealment by the help of God, who had told his whereabouts by Divine revelations to his blessed predecessor and that the succession was to be conferred upon him.</p> <p>2.17.3 For when Alexander was on the point of death, he called upon Athanasius, who was then absent. One who bore the same name and who happened to be present, on hearing him call this way, answered him. But to him Alexander was silent, since he was not summoning this man. Again he called and, as it often happens, the one present kept still. Thus the absent one was disclosed. Moreover, the blessed Alexander prophetically exclaimed, ‘O Athanasius, you think to escape, but you will not escape’; meaning that Athanasius would be called to the conflict.</p> <p>2.17.4 Such is the account given by Apolinarius respecting Athanasius. The Arians claim that after the death of Alexander the respective followers of that bishop and of Meletius held communion together. Fifty-four</p>	<p>1.26.1a Alexander, that admirable bishop, who had successfully withstood the blasphemies of Arius, died five months after the council of Nicaea and was succeeded in the episcopate of the church of Alexandria by Athanasius.</p>

Socrates	Sozomen	Theodoret
	<p>bishops from Thebes and other parts of Egypt assembled together and agreed by oath to choose by a common vote the man who could advantageously administer the Church of Alexandria. But seven of the bishops, in violation of their oath and contrary to the opinion of all, secretly ordained Athanasius. And on this account many of the people and many of the Egyptian clergy seceded from communion with him.</p>	
	<p>2.17.5 For my part I am convinced that it was by Divine appointment that Athanasius succeeded to the high-priesthood. For he was eloquent and intelligent and capable of opposing plots, and of such a man the times had the greatest need. He displayed great aptitude in the exercise of the ecclesiastical functions and fitness for the priesthood and was, so to speak, from his earliest years, self-taught.</p>	<p>1.26.1b Trained from his youth in sacred studies, Athanasius had attracted general admiration in each ecclesiastical office that he filled. 1.26.2 He had at the general council so defended the doctrines of the apostles that, while he won the approbation of all the champions of the truth, its opponents learned to look on their antagonist as a personal foe and public enemy. 1.26.3a He had attended the council as one of the retinue of Alexander. Although he was the principal deacon, he was then a very young man.</p>
<p>[The Alexandrian church refuses to admit Arius] 1.27.1 Arius thus satisfied the emperor and returned to Alexandria. But his craftiness for suppressing the truth did not succeed. When he arrived at Alexandria, Athanasius would not receive him, turning away from him as a pest. Arius then attempted to instigate a fresh commotion in that city by spreading his heresy.</p>	<p>[The Alexandrian church refuses to admit Arius] 2.29a After the Synod of Jerusalem Arius went to Egypt, but because he could not obtain permission to hold communion with the Church of Alexandria, he returned to Constantinople.</p>	
<p>[Eusebians slander Athanasius to the emperor] 1.27.2 Then the followers of Eusebius wrote to the emperor and persuaded him also to write to Athanasius, that Arius and his supporters might be readmitted into the church. 1.27.3 Nevertheless, Athanasius wholly refused to receive them and replied to the emperor that it was impossible for those who had once rejected the faith and had been anathematized to be again received into communion on their return.</p>	<p>[Eusebians slander Athanasius to the emperor] 2.22.1 The various calamities which befell Athanasius were primarily occasioned by Eusebius and Theognis. Because they possessed great freedom of speech and influence with the emperor, they strove for the recall of Arius, with whom they were on terms of concord and friendship, to Alexandria, and at the same time the expulsion from the Church of him who was opposed to them. They accused him before Constantine of being the author of all the seditions and troubles that agitated the</p>	

Socrates	Sozomen	Theodoret
	<p>Church and of excluding those who were desirous of joining the Church. They also alleged that unity would be restored were he alone to be removed.</p> <p>2.22.2 The accusations against him were supported by many bishops and clergy who were with John and who persistently obtained access to the emperor. They pretended to be very orthodoxy and charged to Athanasius and the bishops of his party all the bloodshed, bonds, unjust blows, wounds, and struggles of churches.</p>	
	<p>[Constantine threatens to remove Athanasius]</p> <p>2.22.3 But when Athanasius demonstrated to the emperor the illegality of the ordination of John's followers, their changes to the decrees of the Nicæan Council, the unsoundness of their faith, and the insults offered to those who held right opinions about God, Constantine was at a loss to know whom to believe.</p> <p>2.22.4 Since there were such mutual assertions and many accusations were frequently stirred up by each party, and since he was earnestly anxious to restore the like-mindedness of the people, he wrote to Athanasius that no one should be shut out. If this should be betrayed to the last, he would send regardless of consequences one who should expel him from the city of Alexandria. If anyone should desire to see this letter of the emperor's, he will here find the portion of it relating to this affair:</p>	
<p>1.27.4 But the emperor, angered at this answer, menaced Athanasius in these terms: Since you have been informed of my will, give unhindered access into the church to all those who are desirous of entering it. For if it shall be spoken to me that you have prohibited any of those claiming to be reunited to the church, or have hindered their admission, I will immediately send someone who at my command shall depose you and drive you into exile.</p>	<p>2.22.5 'As you are now acquainted with my will, which is, that to all who desire to enter the Church you should offer an unhindered entrance. For should I hear that any who are willing to join the Church, have been debarred or hindered therefrom by you, I shall send at once an officer who shall remove you, according to my command, and shall transfer you to some other place.</p>	
<p>1.27.5 The emperor wrote thus from a desire of promoting the public good and because he did not wish to see the</p>		

Socrates	Sozomen	Theodoret
church ruptured. He labored earnestly to bring them all into harmony.		
1.27.6 Then indeed the partisans of Eusebius, ill-disposed towards Athanasius, imagined they had found a seasonable opportunity and welcomed the emperor's displeasure as an aid to their own purpose. On this account they raised a great disturbance, endeavoring to eject him from his bishopric. For they hoped that the Arian doctrine would prevail upon the removal of Athanasius.		
330 - Arians and Meletians join forces		
		1.26.3 When those who had denied the only-begotten Son of God heard that the helm of the Church of Alexandria had been entrusted to his hands. knowing as they did by experience his zeal for the truth, they thought that his rule would prove the destruction of their authority. They, therefore, resorted to the following machinations against him.
1.27.7a The chief conspirators against him were Eusebius bishop of Nicomedia, Theognis of Nicaea, Maris of Chalcedon, Ursacius of Singidnum in Upper Moesia, and Valens of Mursa in Upper Pannonia. These people bribed certain members of the Meletian heresy to fabricate various charges against Athanasius.	2.21.3 When the Arians perceived that the Meletians were introducing changes to the faith, they also harassed the churches. For, as frequently occurs in similar disturbances, some applauded the opinion of Arius, while others contended that those who had been ordained by Meletius ought to govern the churches. These two bodies of separtists had until then been opposed to each other, but when they perceived that the priests of the Catholic Church were followed by the multitude, 2.21.4 they became jealous and formed an alliance together, displaying a common enmity to the clergy of Alexandria. Their measures of attack and defense were so long carried on in concert that after awhile the Meletians were generally called Arians in Egypt, although they only differed on questions of the presidency of the churches, while the Arians hold the same opinions concerning God as Arius. 2.21.5 Although they individually denied one another's tenets, they disguised this, in contradiction of their own view, in order to attain an underhanded agreement in the	

Socrates	Sozomen	Theodoret
	fellowship of their enmity. At the same time each one expected to prevail easily in what he desired. From this period, however, the Meletians, after the discussion on those topics, received the Arian doctrines and held the same opinion as Arius concerning God. This revived the original controversy concerning Arius, and some of the laity and clergy seceded from communion with the others.	
	[Athanasius satisfies Constantine by letter] 2.22.6 Athanasius, however, wrote to the emperor and convinced him that the Arians ought not to be received into communion by the Catholic Church. Eusebius, perceiving that his schemes could never be carried into execution while Athanasius strove in opposition, determined to resort to any means in order to get rid of him. But because he could not find a sufficient pretext for carrying out his plan, he promised the Meletians to persuade the emperor and those in power in their favor, if they would bring an accusation against Athanasius.	
[Athanasius accused of imposing unauthorized taxes] 1.27.7b First they accused him through the Meletians Ision, Eudaemon and Callinicus, of ordering the Egyptians to pay a linen garment as tribute to the church at Alexandria.	[Athanasius accused of imposing unauthorized taxes] 2.22.7a Accordingly, the first charge came: that he had imposed upon the Egyptians a tax on linen tunics, and that such a tribute had been exacted from the accusers.	[Athanasius accused of imposing unauthorized taxes] 1.26.4 In order to avert suspicion they bribed some of the adherents of Meletius, who, although deposed by the council of Nicaea, had continued to cause disturbances in the Thebaid and in the adjacent part of Egypt, and persuaded them to go to the emperor and to accuse Athanasius of levying a tax upon Egypt and giving the gold collected to a certain man who was preparing to usurp the imperial power.
1.27.8a But this accusation was immediately disproved by Alypius and Macarius, presbyters of the Alexandrian church, who happened then to be at Nicomedia. They convinced the emperor that these prejudiced statements against Athanasius were false.	2.22.7b Alypius and Macarius, presbyters of the Church of Athanasius, who then happened to be at court, clearly proved the persistent accusation to be false.	
c. 331-332 - Constantine summons Athanasius and pardons him		
1.27.8b Therefore the emperor by letter severely reprimanded his accusers but urged Athanasius to come to him. 1.27.9 But before he came the Eusebian faction,	2.22.8 When he was summoned to answer for the offense, Athanasius was further accused of conspiring against the emperor and of sending, for this purpose, a casket of gold to one Philumen. The emperor detected the	1.26.5 Because the emperor was deceived by this story, Athanasius was brought to Constantinople. Upon his arrival he proved that the accusation was false and had the charge given him by God restored to him. This is

Socrates	Sozomen	Theodoret
<p>anticipating his arrival, added to their former accusation the charge of another crime of a still more serious nature than the former: that Athanasius plotted against his sovereign sent for treasonable purposes a chest full of gold to one named Philumenus.</p> <p>1.27.10 When, however, the emperor had himself investigated this matter at Psamathia, which is in the suburbs of Nicomedia, and had found Athanasius innocent, he dismissed him with honor. The emperor wrote with his own hand to the church at Alexandria to assure them that their bishop had been falsely accused.</p>	<p>lie of his accusers, sent Athanasius home, and wrote to the people of Alexandria to testify that their bishop possessed great moderation and a correct faith, that he had gladly met him, and that he recognized him to be a man of God, and that, as envy had been the sole cause of his indictment, he had appeared to better advantage than his accusers;</p> <p>2.22.9 And because he heard that the Arian and Meletian separtists had stirred dissensions in Egypt, the emperor, in the same epistle, encouraged the multitude to look to God, to take heed unto his judgments, to be well disposed toward one another, and to prosecute with all their might those who plotted against their like-mindedness. Thus the emperor wrote to the people, exhorting them all to like-mindedness, and striving to prevent divisions in the Church.</p>	<p>shown by a letter from the emperor to the Church of Alexandria, which I shall transcribe only the concluding paragraph:</p> <p>1.27 Believe me, my brethren, the wicked men were unable to effect anything against your bishop. They surely could have had no other design than to waste our time and to leave themselves no place for repentance in this life. Do you, therefore, help yourselves, and love that which wins your love. Exert all your power in the expulsion of those who wish to destroy your concord. Look unto God and love one another. I joyfully welcomed Athanasius your bishop and I have conversed with him as with one whom I know to be a man of God.</p>
334 - Strange accusations against Athanasius		
<p>1.27.11 It would indeed have been both proper and desirable to have passed over in silence the subsequent attacks which the Eusebians made upon Athanasius, lest from these circumstances the Church of Christ should be judged unfavorably by those who are opposed to its interests.</p> <p>1.27.12 But since they are already in writing, they have become known to everybody, Because of this I deemed it necessary to make as brief a mention of these things as possible, the particulars of which would require a special treatise. From where the slanderous accusation originated, and the character of those who devised it, I shall now state in brief.</p>		<p>1.28.1 The accusers of Athanasius, however, did not desist from their attempts. On the contrary, they devised so bold a fiction against him that it surpassed every invention of the ancient writers of the tragic or comic stage. They again bribed individuals of the same party and brought them before the emperor, noisily accusing that champion of virtue of many abominable crimes. The leaders of the party were Eusebius, Theognis, and Theodorus, bishop of Perinthus, a city now called Heraclea.</p>
<p>[Athanasius accused of breaking a chalice and burning books]</p> <p>1.27.13 Marcotes is a district of Alexandria. There are contained in it very many villages and an abundant population, with numerous splendid churches. These churches are all under the jurisdiction of the bishop of Alexandria and are subject to his city as parishes.</p> <p>1.27.14 There was in this region a person named Ischyras,</p>	<p>[Athanasius accused of breaking a chalice and burning books]</p> <p>2.23.1a The Meletians, on the failure of their first attempt, secretly paned another accusation against Athanasius. On the one hand, they charged him with breaking a sacred chalice.</p>	

Socrates	Sozomen	Theodoret
<p>who had been guilty of an act deserving of many deaths. Although he had never been admitted to holy orders, he had the audacity to assume the title of presbyter and to exercise sacred functions belonging to the priesthood.</p> <p>1.27.15 But when his sacrilegious career got out, he made his escape from there and sought refuge in Nicomedia, where he begged for the protection of the party of Eusebius, telling them made up stories about Athanasius. Because of their hatred for Athanasius they not only received him as a presbyter but even promised to confer upon him the dignity of the episcopacy, if he would frame an accusation against Athanasius. He spread a report that he had suffered dreadfully in consequence of an assault and that Macarius had rushed furiously toward the altar, had overturned the table, and broken a mystical cup. He added also that he had burnt the sacred books.</p> <p>1.27.16 As a reward for this accusation the Eusebian faction, as I have said, promised him a bishopric. The Eusebians foresaw that the charges against Macarius would involve, along with the accused party, Athanasius, under whose orders he would seem to have acted.</p> <p>1.27.17 But this charge they formulated later. Before it they devised another accusation full of the most bitter hatred, to which I shall now advert. on the following account.</p>		
<p>[Athanasius is accused of murder and magical deeds with a severed hand]</p> <p>1.27.18 Having somehow, I know not how, obtained a man's hand, whether they themselves had murdered any one and cut off his hand or had severed it from some dead body, God and the authors of the deed know, but be that as it may, they publicly exposed it as the hand of Arsenius, a Meletian bishop, while they kept the alleged owner of it concealed. This hand, they asserted, had been used by Athanasius to perform certain magic arts.</p>	<p>[Athanasius is accused of murder and magical deeds with a severed hand]</p> <p>2.23.1b On the other they charged that he had slain one Arsenius, cut off his arm, and retained it for magical purposes. It is said that this Arsenius was one of the clergy but that, having committed some crime, he fled to a place of concealment for fear of being convicted and punished by his bishop.</p>	<p>[Athanasius is accused of murder and magical deeds with a severed hand]</p> <p>1.30.1a Arsenius was a bishop of the Meletian faction. The men of his party put him in a place of concealment and charged him to remain there as long as possible. They then cut off the right hand of a corpse, embalmed it, placed it in a wooden case, and carried it about everywhere, declaring that it was the hand of Arsenius, who had been murdered by Athanasius.</p>
<p>1.27.19 Therefore it was made the gravest ground of accusation which these accusers had arranged against him. And, as it generally happens, all those who held any grudge</p>	<p>2.23.2 The enemies of Athanasius devised the most serious attack for this occurrence. They sought Arsenius with great diligence and found him. They showed him</p>	

Socrates	Sozomen	Theodoret
<p>against Athanasius came forward at the same time with a variety of other charges.</p>	<p>great kindness, promised to secure for him every goodwill and safety, and conducted him secretly to Patrines, a presbyter of a monastery, who was one of their confederates and of the same interest as themselves. After having thus carefully concealed him, they diligently spread the report in the market-places and public assemblies that he had been slain by Athanasius. They also bribed John, a monk, to corroborate the accusation.</p>	
<p>1.27.20 When the emperor was informed of these proceedings, he wrote to his nephew Dalmatius the censor, who then had his residence at Antioch in Syria, directing him to order the accused parties to be brought before him and, after due investigation, to inflict punishment on whomever might be convicted.</p>	<p>2.23.3 As this evil report was universally circulated and had even reached the ears of the emperor, Athanasius, being apprehensive that it would be difficult to defend his cause before judges whose minds were prejudiced by such false rumors, resorted to tactics similar to those of his adversaries. He did everything in his power to prevent truth from being obscured by their attacks.</p>	
<p>1.27.21 He also sent there Eusebius and Theognis, that the case might be tried in their presence. When Athanasius knew that he was to be summoned before the censor, he sent into Egypt to make a strict search after Arsenius. Athanasius discovered indeed that he was hiding there, but Athanasius was unable to apprehend him, because he often changed his place of concealment.</p>	<p>2.23.4 But the multitude could not be convinced, on account of the absence of Arsenius. Reflecting, therefore, that the suspicion which rested upon him could not be removed except by proving that Arsenius, who was said to be dead, was still alive, he sent a most trustworthy deacon in quest of him. The deacon went to Thebes and discovered from the testimony of some monks where he was living. And when he came to Patrines, with whom he had been concealed, he found that Arsenius was not there. For on the first notice of the arrival of the deacon he had been conveyed to Lower Egypt.</p>	
	<p>2.23.5 The deacon arrested Patrines and conducted him to Alexandria, as also Elias, one of his associates, who was said to have been the person who conveyed Arsenius elsewhere. He delivered them both to the commander of the Egyptian forces, and they confessed that Arsenius was still alive, that he had been secretly concealed in their house, and that he was now living in Egypt.</p>	<p>1.30.1b But the all-seeing eye did not permit Arsenius to remain long in concealment.</p>
	<p>[Athanasius reports to Constantine] 2.23.6 Athanasius took care that all these facts should be reported to Constantine. The emperor wrote back to him, desiring him to attend to the due performance of the</p>	

Socrates	Sozomen	Theodoret
	<p>priestly functions and the maintenance of order and piety among the people. The emperor also said to not be unsettled by the conspiracy of the Meletians. For it was evident that envy alone was the cause of the disturbance in the churches of the false indictments which were circulated against him and</p> <p>2.23.7 The emperor added that, for the future, he should not give place to such reports; and that, unless the accusers preserved the peace, he should certainly subject them to the rigor of the state laws, add let justice have its course, as they had not only unjustly plotted against the innocent, but had also shamefully abused the good order and piety of the Church. Such was the strain of the emperor's letter to Athanasius; and he further commanded that it should be read aloud before the public, in order that they might all be made acquainted with his intentions.</p> <p>2.23.8 The Meletians were alarmed at these menaces and became more quiet for a while, because they viewed with anxiety the threat of the ruler. The churches throughout Egypt enjoyed profound peace and, directed by the presidency of this great priest, daily increased in numbers by the conversion of multitudes of pagans and other heretics.</p>	
May 335 - Council of Tyre		
	<p>2.25.1 The plots of the enemies of Athanasius involved him in fresh troubles, excited the hatred of the emperor against him, and stirred up a multitude of accusers. Wearied by their petitions, the emperor convened a council at Caesarea in Palestine. Athanasius was summoned there; but fearing the plots of Eusebius, bishop of the city, of Eusebius, bishop of Nicomedia, and of their party, he refused to attend and for thirty months, although pressed to attend, persisted in his refusal.</p>	<p>1.28.2 After having accused Athanasius of crimes which they described as too shocking to be tolerated or even listened to, they persuaded the emperor to convene a council at Caesarea in Palestine, where Athanasius had many enemies, and to command that his cause should be there tried. The emperor, utterly ignorant of the plot that had been devised, was persuaded by them to give the required order.</p> <p>1.28.3 But the holy Athanasius, well aware of the malevolence of those who were to try him, refused to appear at the council. This served as a pretext to those who opposed the truth to accuse him still further, and they accused him before the emperor of disobedience and</p>

Socrates	Sozomen	Theodoret
<p>1.28.1 The emperor had ordered a Synod of bishops to be present at the consecration of the church which he had erected at Jerusalem. He therefore directed that, as a secondary matter, they should on their way first assemble at Tyre. He wanted them to examine the charges against Athanasius in order that all cause of contention might be removed there and that they might more peacefully perform the inaugural ceremonies in the dedication of the church of God.</p> <p>1.28.2 This was the thirtieth year of Constantine's reign. Sixty bishops thus gathered at Tyre from various places on the summons of Dionysius the consul.</p> <p>1.28.3 As to Macarius the presbyter, he was conducted from Alexandria in chains under a military escort.</p> <p>1.28.4 Athanasius was unwilling to go there, not so much from dread, but because he was innocent of the charges made and because he feared that new changes might be made to the decisions of the council at Nicaea. He was, however, forced to be present by the menacing letters of the emperor. For it had been written him that if he did not come voluntarily, he would be brought by force.</p>	<p>2.25.2 At the end of that period, however, he was forced more urgently and repaired to Tyre, where a great number of the bishops of the East were assembled, who commanded him to undergo the charges of those who accused him.</p>	<p>arrogance. Nor were their hopes altogether frustrated.</p> <p>1.28.4 For the emperor, although exceedingly patient, became exasperated by their appeals and wrote to him in an angry manner, commanding him to repair to Tyre. Here the council was ordered to assemble, from the suspicion, as I think, that Athanasius had an apprehension of Caesarea on account of its bishop. The emperor wrote also to the council in a style consistent with his devoted piety. His letter is as follows:</p>
		<p>[Constantine's letter of instruction to the council of Tyre]</p> <p>1.29.1 Constantius Augustus, to the holy council assembled in Tyre.</p> <p>In the general prosperity, which distinguishes the present time, it seems right that the Catholic Church should likewise be exempt from trouble and that the servants of Christ should be freed from every reproach. But certain individuals, incited by the mad desire of contention, not to say leading a life unworthy of their profession, are endeavoring to throw all into disorder. This appears to me to be the greatest of all possible calamities. I beseech you, therefore, in post haste, as the phrase goes, to assemble together, without any delay, in formal synod; so that you may support those who require your assistance, heal the</p>

Socrates	Sozomen	Theodoret
		<p>brethren who are in danger, restore unanimity to the divided members, and rectify the disorders of the Church while time permits; and thus restore to those great provinces the harmony which, alas! the arrogance of a few men has destroyed.</p> <p>1.29.2 I believe everyone would admit that you could not perform anything so pleasing in the sight of God, so surpassing all my prayers as well as your own, or so conducive to your own reputation, as to restore peace.</p> <p>1.29.3 Do not therefore delay, but when you have come together with all that sincerity and fidelity which our Savior demands of all His servants, almost in words that we can hear, endeavor with redoubled eagerness to put a fitting end to these dissensions. Nothing shall be omitted on my part to further the interests of our religion. I have done all that you recommended in your letters.</p> <p>1.29.4 I have sent to those bishops whom you specified, directing them to repair to the council for the purpose of deliberating with you upon ecclesiastical matters. I have also sent Dionysius, a man of consular rank, to counsel those who are to sit in synod with you and to be himself an eye witness of your proceedings, and particularly of the order and regularity that is maintained.</p> <p>1.29.5 If anyone should dare on the present occasion also to disobey our command and refuse to come to the council, which, however, I do not anticipate, an officer will be dispatched immediately to send him into banishment by imperial order, that he may learn not to oppose the decrees enacted by the emperor for the support of truth.</p> <p>1.29.6 All that now devolves upon your holinesses is to decide with unanimous judgment, without partiality or prejudice, in accordance with the ecclesiastical and apostolical rule, and to devise suitable remedies for the offences which may have resulted from error, in order that the Church may be freed from all reproach, that my anxiety may be diminished, that peace may be restored to</p>

Socrates	Sozomen	Theodoret
		those now at variance, and that your renown may be increased. May God preserve you, beloved brethren.
		<p>[Bishops convene at Tyre] 1.29.7 The bishops accordingly repaired to the council of Tyre. Amongst them were those who were accused of holding heterodox doctrines, of whom Asclepas, bishop of Gaza, was one. The admirable Athanasius also attended. I shall first dwell on the tragedy of the accusation and shall then relate the proceedings of this celebrated tribunal.</p>
	<p>[The charge against Athanasius at Tyre] 2.25.3 Callinicus, a bishop, and a certain Ischurias, both of John's party, accused him of breaking a mystical chalice, of throwing down an episcopal chair, and of often binding Ischurias, although he was a presbyter, in chains. They also falsely informing Hyginus, governor of Egypt that he had cast stones at the statues of the emperor, that Athanasius caused Ischurias to be through into prison, 2.25.4 that he deposed Callinicus, bishop of the Catholic Church at Pelusium, and that he said he would deny Callinicus from fellowship unless Callinicus could remove certain suspicions about Athanasius having broken a mystical chalice, that he committed the Church of Pelusium to Mark, a deposed presbyter, and that he placed Callinicus under a military guard, 2.25.5 They also said that Athanasius had put Callinicus under judicial tortures. Euplus, Pachomius, Isaac, Achillas, and Hermaeon, bishops of John's party, accused him of inflicting blows. 2.25.6 They all agreed that he obtained the episcopal dignity by means of the perjury of certain individuals, for it had been decreed that no one should receive ordination who could not clear himself of any crime laid to his charge. They further alleged that because they had been deceived by him, they had separated themselves from communion with him and that, so far from satisfying their grievances, he had treated them with violence and thrown</p>	

Socrates	Sozomen	Theodoret
	<p>them into prison.</p> <p>2.25.7 Further, the affair of Arsenius was again brought up. And as generally happens in such a cleverly devised plot, many even of those considered his friends loomed up unexpectedly as accusers. A document was then read containing popular complaints, that the people of Alexandria could not continue their attendance at church on his account.</p> <p>2.25.8 Athanasius, having been urged to justify himself, presented himself repeatedly before the tribunal, successfully repelled some of the allegations, and requested delay for investigation as to the others. He was exceedingly perplexed when he reflected on the favor in which his accusers were held by his judges, on the number of witnesses belonging to the sects of Arius and Meletius who appeared against him, and on the courtesy that was manifested towards the informers whose allegations had been overcome. He was especially perplexed in the accusation concerning Arsenius, whose arm he was charged with having cut off for purposes of magic, and in the charge concerning a certain woman to whom he was charged with having given gifts for uncleanness and with having slept with her by night, although she was unwilling.</p>	
July 335 - Arsenius is found and brought to Tyre		
<p>1.29.1 The special providence of God drove Arsenius also to Tyre. Disregarding the instructions he had received from the accusers who had bribed him, he went there disguised to see what would be done.</p>		<p>1.30.2a He was first seen alive in Egypt; then in the Thebaid; afterwards he was led by Divine Providence to Tyre, where the hand of tragic fame was brought before the council.</p>
<p>1.29.2 Somehow it happened that the servants of Archelaus, the governor of the province, heard some people at an inn affirm that Arsenius, who was reported to have been murdered, was concealed in the house of one of the citizens.</p> <p>1.29.3 Having heard this and marked the individuals by whom this statement was made, they communicated the information to their master. Their master caused a strict search to be made for the man immediately. Thus they</p>		<p>1.30.2b The friends of Athanasius hunted him up and brought him to an inn, where they compelled him to lie hid for a time. Early in the morning the great Athanasius came to the council.</p>

Socrates	Sozomen	Theodoret
<p>discovered and properly secured him. After this he gave notice to Athanasius that he need not be under any alarm, because Arsenius was alive and there present.</p> <p>1.29.4 When Arsenius was apprehended, he at first denied that he was the person. But Paul, bishop of Tyre, who had formerly known him, established his identity.</p>		
Athanasius defends himself against fornication		
	<p>2.25.9 Both these indictments were proved to be ridiculous and full of false espionage. When this female made the deposition before the bishops, Timothy, a presbyter of Alexandria, who stood by Athanasius, approached her according to a plan he had secretly concerted, and said to her, "Did I then, O woman, violate your chastity?" She replied, "But did you not?" and mentioned the place and the attendant circumstances in which she had been forced.</p>	<p>1.30.3 First of all a woman of lewd life was brought in, who proclaimed in a loud and impudent manner that she had vowed perpetual virginity, but that Athanasius, who had lodged in her house, had violated her chastity. After she had made her charge, the accused came forward, and with him a presbyter worthy of all praise, by name Timothy.</p> <p>1.30.4 The court ordered Athanasius to reply to the charge, but he was silent, as if he had not been Athanasius. Timothy, however, addressed her thus: "Have I, O woman, ever conversed with you, or have I entered your house?" She replied with still greater brazenness, screaming aloud in her dispute with Timothy and, pointing at him with her finger, she exclaimed, "It was you who robbed me of my virginity; it was you who stripped me of my chastity." She also added other indelicate expressions which are used by shameless women.</p> <p>1.30.5 The devisers of this accusation were put to shame, and all the bishops who were privy to it blushed. The woman was now being led out of the Court, but the great Athanasius protested that instead of sending her away they ought to examine her and learn the name of the hatcher of the plot.</p>
Athanasius defends himself against using a severed hand for magical deeds		
<p>1.29.5 When Divine Providence thus took care of matters, Athanasius was shortly after summoned by the Synod. And as soon as he presented himself, his accusers exhibited the hand and pressed their charge.</p> <p>1.29.6 He managed the affair with great prudence, for he</p>	<p>2.25.10 He likewise led Arsenius into the midst of them, showed both his hands to the judges, and requested them to make the accusers account for the arm which they had exhibited. For it happened that Arsenius, either driven by a Divine influence or, as it is said, having been concealed</p>	<p>1.30.6 After this his accusers yelled and shouted that he had perpetrated other viler crimes, of which it was utterly impossible that he could by any art or ingenuity be cleared, that eyes, not ears, would decide on the evidence. After saying this, they exhibited the famous box</p>

Socrates	Sozomen	Theodoret
<p>enquired of those present, as well as of his accusers, who were the people who knew Arsenius? After several answered that they knew him, he caused Arsenius to be introduced with his hands covered by his cloak.</p> <p>1.29.7 Then he again asked them, ‘Is this the person who has lost a hand?’ All were astonished at the unexpectedness of this procedure, except those who knew from where the hand had been cut off. The rest thought that Arsenius was really deficient of a hand and expected that the accused would make his defense in some other way.</p> <p>1.29.8 But Athanasius turned back the cloak of Arsenius on one side and showed one of the man’s hands. Again, while some were supposing that the other hand was missing, Athanasius permitted them to remain a short time in doubt. After this he turned back the cloak on the other side and exposed the other hand.</p> <p>1.29.9 Then addressing himself to those present, he said, ‘Arsenius, as you see, is found to have two hands: let my accusers show the place from where the third was cut off.’</p>	<p>by the plans of Athanasius when the danger to that bishop on his account was announced, escaped by night and arrived at Tyre the day before the trial.</p> <p>2.25.11 But when these allegations had been thus summarily dismissed, so that no defense was necessary, no mention of the first was made in the transactions. Most probably, I think, because the whole affair was considered too improper and absurd for insertion.</p> <p>2.25.12 As to the second, the accusers strove to justify themselves by saying that a bishop under the jurisdiction of Athanasius, named Plusian, had at the command of his chief burnt the house of Arsenius, fastened him to a column, maltreated him with thongs, and then chained him in a cell. They further stated that Arsenius escaped from the cell through a window and, while he was sought for, remained for a time in concealment. Because he did not appear, they naturally supposed him to be dead. The reputation he had acquired as a man and confessor had endeared him to the bishops of John’s party. They sought for him and applied on his behalf to the magistrates.</p>	<p>and exposed the embalmed hand to view.</p> <p>1.30.7 At this sight all the spectators uttered a loud cry. Some believed the accusation to be true; the others had no doubt of the falsehood, and thought that Arsenius was lurking somewhere or other in concealment. When at length, after some difficulty, a little silence was obtained, the accused asked his judges whether any of them knew Arsenius.</p> <p>1.30.8 When several of them replied that they knew him well, Athanasius gave orders that he should be brought before them. Then he again asked them, “Is this the right Arsenius? Is this the man I murdered? Is this the man those people mutilated after his murder by cutting off his right hand?” When they had confessed that it was the same individual, Athanasius pulled off his cloak, and exhibited two hands, both the right and the left, and said, “Let no one seek for a third hand, for man has received two hands from the Creator and no more.”</p>
Athanasius’ accusers are surprised and slip out in the turmoil		
<p>1.30 When the matter was brought to this state with regard to Arsenius, the authors of this plot were reduced to perplexity. Achab, who was also called John, one of the principal accusers, slipped out of court in the tumult and escaped. Thus Athanasius cleared himself from this charge without having recourse to any pleading. He was confident that the sight only of Arsenius alive would confound his accusers.</p>		
Sept. 335 - Athanasius flees to Constantinople		
<p>1.31.1 However, when he was refuting the false charges against Macarius, he made use of legal forms. First of all he took issue with Eusebius and his party as his enemies, protesting against the injustice of any man’s being tried by his adversaries. He next insisted that his accuser Ischyras prove that he had really obtained the dignity of presbyter, for</p>		

Socrates	Sozomen	Theodoret
<p>so he had been labeled in the indictment.</p> <p>1.31.2 But because the judges would not allow any of these objections, the case of Macarius was taken up. When the informers had little of proof, the hearing of the matter was postponed until some people could go into Mareotis, in order that all doubtful points might be examined on the spot.</p> <p>1.31.3 When Athanasius saw that those very people were to be those whom he had discredited (for the persons sent were Theognis, Maris, Theodorus, Macedonius, Valens, and Ursacius), he exclaimed that their procedure was both treacherous and fraudulent. He said it was unjust that the presbyter Macarius should be detained in bonds while the accuser together with the judges who were his adversaries were permitted to go, in order that an <i>ex parte</i> collection of the facts in evidence might be made.’</p>		
<p>1.31.4a When Athanasius made this protest before the whole Synod and Dionysius the governor of the province and saw that no one paid any attention to his appeal,...</p>	<p>2.25.13 Athanasius was filled with apprehension when he reflected on these subjects and began to suspect that his enemies were secretly scheming to bring about his ruin. After several sessions, when the Synod was filled with tumult and confusion and the accusers and a multitude of persons around the tribunal were crying aloud that Athanasius ought to be deposed as a sorcerer and a ruffian, as being utterly unworthy of the priesthood, the officers, who had been appointed by the emperor to be present at the Synod for the maintenance of order, compelled the accused to quit the judgment hall secretly. For they were afraid that they might become his murderers, as is apt to be the case in the rush of a tumult.</p>	<p>1.30.9 Even after this plain proof the accusers and the judges who were privy to the crime, instead of hiding themselves or praying that the earth might open and swallow them up, raised an uproar and commotion in the assembly and declared that Athanasius was a sorcerer, that he had by his magical incantations bewitched the eyes of men.</p>
<p>1.31.4b ...he privately withdrew.</p> <p>1.31.5 Those, therefore, who were sent to Mareotis made an <i>ex parte</i> investigation, They held that what the accuser said was true.</p>	<p>2.25.14 On finding that he could not remain in Tyre without peril of his life and that there was no hope of obtaining justice against his numerous accusers, from judges who were unfavorable to him, he fled to Constantinople.</p>	<p>1.30.10 The very men who a moment before had accused him of murder now strove to tear him in pieces and to murder him.</p> <p>1.30.11 But those whom the emperor had entrusted with the preservation of order saved the life of Athanasius by dragging him away and hurrying him on board a ship.</p>
<p>At Tyre, Athanasius is condemned, and Arsenius is received into communion</p>		

Socrates	Sozomen	Theodoret
<p>1.32.1 Thus Athanasius departed, hastening to the emperor, and the Synod in the first place condemned him in his absence.</p>	<p>2.25.15 The Synod condemned him during his absence, deposed him from the bishopric, and prohibited his residing at Alexandria, so that, they said, he didn't excite disturbances and seditions. John and all his adherents were restored to communion, as if they had been unjustly suffering wrongs, and each was reinstated in his own clerical rank.</p>	
<p>1.32.2 And when the re-suit of the enquiry which had been instituted at Mareotis was presented, they voted to depose him. They loaded him with disgraceful names in their sentence of deposition, but were wholly silent respecting the disgraceful defeat of the charge of murder brought by his accusers.</p> <p>1.32.3 Moreover, they received into communion Arsenius, who was reported to have been murdered. And he who had formerly been a bishop of the Meletian heresy subscribed to the deposition of Athanasius as bishop of the city of Hypselopolis. Thus, by an extraordinary course of circumstances, the alleged victim of assassination by Athanasius was found alive to assist in deposing him.</p>		
	<p>2.25.16 The bishops then gave an account of their proceedings to the emperor and wrote to the bishops of all regions, urging them not to receive Athanasius into fellowship and not to write to him or receive letters from him. For he had been convicted of the crimes which they had investigated and, on account of his flight, was also guilty of those charges which had not been tried.</p> <p>2.25.17 They likewise declared in this epistle that they had been obliged to pass such condemnation upon him because, when commanded by the emperor the preceding year to travel to the bishops of the East, who were assembled at Caesarea, he disobeyed the injunction, kept the bishops waiting for him, and did not listen to the commands of the ruler.</p> <p>2.25.18 They also declared that when the bishops had assembled at Tyre, he went to that city, attended by a large retinue, for the purpose of exciting disturbances and</p>	

Socrates	Sozomen	Theodoret
	<p>tumults in the Synod. And when there he sometimes refused to reply to the charges leveled against him. He sometimes insulted the bishops individually when summoned by them, sometimes not obeying, at others not deigning to be judged.</p> <p>2.25.19 They specified in the same letter that he was manifestly guilty of breaking a mystical chalice. his fact was attested by Theognis, bishop of Nicaea; by Maris, bishop of Chalcedonia; by Theodore, bishop of Heraclea; by Valentinus and Ursacius; and by Macedonius, who had been sent to the village in Egypt, where the chalice was said to have been broken, in order to ascertain the truth. Thus did the bishops report successively each of the allegations against Athanasius with the same art to which sophists resort when they desire to heighten the effect of their accusations.</p>	
Many priests object to the wicked assembly at Tyre, including two confessors		
	<p>2.25.20 Many of the priests, however, who were present at the trial perceived the injustice of the accusation. It is related that Paphnutius, the confessor, who was present at the Synod, arose and took the hand of Maximus, the bishop of Jerusalem, to lead him away, as if those who were confessors and had their eyes dug out for the sake of piety ought not to participate in an assembly of wicked men.</p>	
Sept. 13-30, 335 – Bishops summoned to Jerusalem, churches consecrated		
<p>1.33.1a In the meantime letters were brought from the emperor directing those who made up the Synod to hasten to the New Jerusalem. Therefore they immediately left Tyre and set forward with all haste to Jerusalem where, after celebrating a festival in connection with the consecration of the place,</p>	<p>2.26.1 The temple, called the “Great Martyrium,” which was built in the place of the skull at Jerusalem, was completed about the thirtieth year of the reign of Constantine. Marianus, an official who was a short-hand writer of the emperor, came to Tyre and delivered a letter from the emperor to the council, commanding them to hasten quickly to Jerusalem, in order to consecrate the temple.</p>	<p>1.31.1 All the bishops who were present at the council of Tyre, with all others from every quarter, were commanded by the emperor to proceed to Aelia to consecrate the churches which he had there erected.</p>
	<p>2.26.2 Although this had been previously determined, the emperor deemed it necessary that the disputes which prevailed among the bishops who had been convened at</p>	<p>1.31.3 The holy altar was decorated with imperial hangings and with golden vessels set with gems. When the splendid festival was concluded, each bishop returned</p>

Socrates	Sozomen	Theodoret
	<p>Tyre should be first addressed and that the bishops should be purged of all discord and grief before going to the consecration of the temple. For it is fitting to such a festival for the priests to be like-minded.</p> <p>2.26.3 When the bishops arrived at Jerusalem, the temple was consecrated, Numerous ornaments and gifts, which were sent by the emperor, are still preserved in the sacred edifice. Their costliness and magnificence is such that they cannot be looked upon without exciting wonder.</p>	<p>to his own diocese. The emperor was highly gratified when informed of the splendor and magnificence of the function and blessed the Author of all good for having thus granted his petition.</p>
	<p>2.26.4 Since that period the anniversary of the consecration has been celebrated with great pomp by the church of Jerusalem; the festival continues eight days. Initiation by baptism was administered, and people from every region under the sun traveled to Jerusalem during this festival and visited the sacred places.</p>	<p>1.31.2 The emperor sent also a number of officials of the kindest disposition, remarkable for piety and fidelity, whom he ordered to furnish abundant supplies of provisions, not only to the bishops and their followers, but to the vast multitudes who flocked from all parts to Jerusalem.</p>
Arius and Euzoius received into communion at Jerusalem		
	<p>2.27.1 The bishops who had embraced the sentiments of Arius found a favorable opportunity of restoring him and Euzoius to communion by zealously striving to have a council in the city of Jerusalem. They effected their design in the following manner...</p>	
<p>1.33.1b they readmitted Arius and his adherents into communion. This was done in obedience, as they said, to the wishes of the emperor, who had signified in his communication to them that he was fully satisfied respecting the faith of Arius and Euzoïus.</p>	<p>2.27.12 The emperor imagined that Arius and Euzoius were of the same belief as the bishops of the council of Nicaea and was delighted over the affair [their letter of recantation from several years prior]. He did not, however, attempt to restore them to communion without the judgment and approval of those who are, by the law of the Church, masters in these matters.</p> <p>2.27.13 He, therefore, sent them to the bishops who were then assembled at Jerusalem and wrote, desiring them to examine the declaration of faith submitted by Arius and Euzoius. He did this so the Synod would find out whether they found that their doctrine was orthodox and that the jealousy of their enemies had been the sole cause of their condemnation, or that without having reason to blame those who had condemned them they had</p>	

Socrates	Sozomen	Theodoret
	changed their minds, A humane decision might, in either case, be accorded them.	
1.33.2 They moreover wrote to the church at Alexandria and stated that because all envy was now banished, the affairs of the church were established in peace. They also stated that since Arius had acknowledged the truth by his recantation and was therefore a member of the church, he should also be therefore received by them, alluding to the banishment of Athanasius [in their statement that ‘all envy was now banished’]. At the same time they sent information of what had been done to the emperor, in terms nearly to the same effect.	2.27.14 Those who had long been zealous for this seized the opportunity under cover of the emperor’s letter and received him into fellowship. They wrote immediately to the emperor himself, to the Church of Alexandria, and to the bishops and clergy of Egypt, of Thebes, and of Libya, earnestly exhorting them to receive Arius and Euzoius into communion, since the emperor bore witness to the correctness of their faith in one of his own epistles, and since the judgment of the emperor had been confirmed by the vote of the Synod. These were the subjects which were zealously discussed by the Synod of Jerusalem.	
A sham fact finding committee is sent to Alexandria		
		1.30.11b When he [Athanasius] appeared before the emperor, he described all the dramatic plots which were intended to ruin him. The accusers sent bishops connected to their faction into Mareotis, viz., Theognis, bishop of Nicaea, Theodorus, bishop of Perinthus, Maris, bishop of Chalcedon, Narcissus of Cilicia, with others of the same sentiments. 1.30.12 Mareotis is a district near Alexandria and derives its name from the lake Maria. Here they invented other falsehoods and, forging the reports of the trial, mixed up the charges which had been shown to be false with fresh accusations, as if they had been true, and sent them to the emperor.
6 Nov. 335 – Constantine summons bishops from Jerusalem to Constantinople to reexamine Council of Tyre		
1.33.3 But while the bishops were engaged in this affair, other letters came unexpectedly from the emperor, stating that Athanasius had fled to him for protection and that it was necessary for them on his account to come to Constantinople. This unanticipated communication from the emperor was as follows.	2.28.1 Athanasius, after he fled from Tyre, traveled to Constantinople. When he came to the emperor Constantine, he complained of what he had suffered, in presence of the bishops who had condemned him, and implored him to permit the decrees of the council of Tyre to be submitted for examination before the emperor. Constantine regarded this request as reasonable and wrote in the following terms to the bishops assembled at Tyre:	1.31.4 Because Athanasius complained of his unjust condemnation, the emperor commanded the bishops against whom this complaint was directed to present themselves at court.

Socrates	Sozomen	Theodoret
Constantine's letter to the bishops at Tyre		
<p>1.34.1 Victor Constantine Maximus Augustus, to the bishops convene at Tyre. I am indeed ignorant of the decisions which have been made by your Council with so much turbulence and storm: but the truth seems to have been perverted by some tumultuous and disorderly proceedings: because, that is to say, in your mutual love of contention, which you seem desirous of perpetuating, you disregard the consideration of those things which are acceptable to God.</p> <p>1.34.2 It will, however, I trust, be the work of Divine Providence to dissipate the mischiefs resulting from this jealous rivalry, as soon as they shall have been detected; and to make it apparent to us, whether ye who have been convened have had regard to truth, and whether your decisions on the subjects which have been submitted to your judgment have been made apart from partiality or prejudice.</p> <p>1.34.3 Wherefore it is indispensable that you should all without delay attend upon my piety, that you may yourselves give a strict account of your transactions.</p> <p>1.34.4 For what reason I have deemed it proper to write thus, and to summon you before me, you will learn from what follows.</p> <p>1.34.5 As I was making my entry into the city which bears our name, in this our most flourishing home, Constantinople,—and it happened that I was riding on horseback at the time,—suddenly the Bishop Athanasius, with certain ecclesiastics whom he had around him, presented himself so unexpectedly in our path, as to produce an occasion of consternation.</p> <p>1.34.6 For the Omniscient God is my witness that at first sight I did not recognize him until some of my attendants, in answer to my enquiry, informed me, as was very natural, both who he was, and what injustice he had suffered.</p> <p>1.34.7 At that time indeed I neither conversed, nor held any communication with him. But as he repeatedly entreated an audience, and I had not only refused it, but almost</p>	<p>[This letter is also found in Sozomen 2.28.2-12]</p>	

Socrates	Sozomen	Theodoret
<p>ordered that he should be removed from my presence, he said with greater boldness, that he petitioned for nothing more than that you might be summoned hither, in order that in our presence, he, driven by necessity to such a course, might have a fair opportunity afforded him of complaining of his wrongs.</p> <p>1.34.8 Wherefore as this seems reasonable, and consistent with the equity of my government, I willingly gave instructions that these things should be written to you. My command therefore is, that all, as many as composed the Synod convened at Tyre, should forthwith hasten to the court of our clemency, in order that from the facts themselves you may make clear the purity and integrity of your decision in my presence, whom you cannot but own to be a true servant of God.</p> <p>1.34.9 It is in consequence of the acts of my religious service towards God that peace is everywhere reigning; and that the name of God is sincerely had in reverence even among the barbarians themselves, who until now were ignorant of the truth. Now it is evident that he who knows not the truth, does not have a true knowledge of God also:</p> <p>1.34.10 yet, as I before said even the barbarians on my account, who am a genuine servant of God, have acknowledged and learned to worship him, whom they have perceived in very deed protecting and caring for me everywhere. So that from dread of us chiefly, they have been thus brought to the knowledge of the true God whom they now worship.</p> <p>1.34.11 Nevertheless we who pretend to have a religious veneration for (I will not say who guard) the holy mysteries of his church, we, I say, do nothing but what tends to discord and animosity, and to speak plainly, to the destruction of the human race.</p> <p>1.34.12 But hasten, as I have already said, all of you to us as speedily as possible: and be assured that I shall endeavor with all my power to cause that what is contained in the Divine Law may be preserved inviolate, on which neither</p>		

Socrates	Sozomen	Theodoret
<p>stigma nor reproach shall be able to fasten itself; and this will come to pass when its enemies, who under cover of the sacred profession introduce numerous and diversified blasphemies, are dispersed, broken to pieces, and altogether annihilated.²</p>		
7 Nov. 335 - Athanasius accused of threatening the grain supply, banished to Gaul		
<p>1.35.1 This letter rendered those who attended the Synod very fearful. Therefore most of them returned to their respective cities.</p>	<p>2.28.13a This letter of the emperor so excited the fears of some of the bishops that they set off on their journey homewards.</p>	
<p>1.35.2a But Eusebius, Theognis, Maris, Patrophilus, Ursacius, and Valens, having gone to Constantinople, would not permit any further enquiry to be instituted concerning the broken cup, the overturned communion table, and the murder of Arsenius.</p>	<p>2.28.13b But Eusebius, bishop of Nicomedia, and his partisans went to the emperor and claimed that the Synod of Tyre had enacted no decrees against Athanasius but what were founded on justice. They brought forward as witnesses Theognis, Maris, Theodore, Valens, and Ursacius, and deposed that he had broken the mystical cup and, after uttering many other charges, they prevailed with their accusations.</p>	<p>1.31.5a Upon their arrival they stopped pushing any of their former accusations, because they knew how clearly they could be refuted.</p>
<p>1.35.2b But they tried another accusation, informing the emperor that Athanasius had threatened to prohibit the sending of corn which was usually conveyed from Alexandria to Constantinople. They affirmed also that these menaces were heard from the lips of Athanasius by the bishops Adamantius, Anubion, Arbathion and Peter, for slander is most prevalent when of the assessor of it appears to be a person worthy of credit.</p>		<p>1.31.5b But they made it appear that Athanasius had threatened to prevent the exportation of corn. The emperor believed what they said and banished him to a city of Gaul called Treves. This occurred in the thirtieth year of the emperor's reign.</p>
<p>1.35.3 The emperor was deceived and moved to indignation against Athanasius by this charge. He at once condemned him to exile, ordering him to reside in the Gauls.</p>	<p>2.28.14 The emperor, either believing their statements to be true, or imagining that unity would be restored among the bishops if Athanasius were removed, exiled him to Treves, in Western Gaul; and to there, therefore, he was conducted.</p>	

² A translation for this letter from the works of Athanasius can be found on fourthcentury.com, <http://www.fourthcentury.com/constantine-to-the-bishops-at-tyre/>.

Socrates	Sozomen	Theodoret
<p>1.35.4 Now some declare that the emperor came to this decision with a view to the establishment of unity in the church, since Athanasius was immoveable in his refusal to hold any communion with Arius and his adherents. He accordingly took up his abode at Treves, a city of Gaul.</p>		
<p>Early 336 - Alexandria still refuses to admit Arius</p>		
<p>1.37.1 While these things were taking place, the thirtieth year of Constantine's reign was completed. Arius with his adherents returned to Alexandria and again disturbed the whole city. The people of Alexandria were exceedingly indignant both at the restoration of this irredeemable heretic with his supporters and also because their bishop Athanasius had been sent to exile.</p> <p>1.37.2 When the emperor was informed of the perverse disposition of Arius, he once more ordered him to come to Constantinople to give an account of the commotions he had afresh endeavored to excite.</p>	<p>2.29.1a After the Synod of Jerusalem, Arius went to Egypt. But because he could not obtain permission to hold communion with the Church of Alexandria, he returned to Constantinople.</p>	
<p>Summer 336 – Eusebians arrange for Arius to be communed in Constantinople, opposed by Alexander of Constantinople</p>		
<p>1.37.3 It happened at that time that Alexander, who had some time before succeeded Metrophanes, presided over the church at Constantinople.</p>	<p>2.29.1b Because all those who had embraced his sentiments and those who were attached to Eusebius, bishop of Nicomedia, had assembled cunningly in that city for the purpose of holding a council, Alexander, who was then ordering the see of Constantinople, used every effort to dissolve the council.</p>	
<p>1.37.4 This bishop was a man of devoted piety as was distinctly made evident by the conflict he entered into with Arius. When Arius arrived, the people were divided into two factions and the whole city was thrown into confusion, some insisting that the Nicene Creed should be by no means infringed on, while others contended that the opinion of Arius was in agreement with reason. In this state of affairs, Alexander was driven to straits; more especially since Eusebius of Nicomedia had violently threatened that he would cause him to be immediately deposed unless he admitted Arius and his followers to communion.</p>	<p>2.29.2 But when his endeavors were frustrated, he openly refused all communion with Arius, affirming that it was neither just nor according to ecclesiastical canons to make powerless their own voice and that of those bishops who had been assembled at Nicaea, from nearly every region under the sun. When the partisans of Eusebius perceived that their arguments produced no effect on Alexander, they resorted to abuse and threatened that unless he would receive Arius into communion on a stated day, he should be expelled from the church, and that another should be elected in his place who would be willing to hold communion with Arius.</p>	

Socrates	Sozomen	Theodoret
Alexander of Constantinople prays for divine intervention		
<p>1.37.5 Alexander, however, was far less troubled at the thought of his own deposition as he was fearful of the subversion of the principles of the faith, which they were so anxious to effect. Regarding himself as the established guardian of the doctrines recognized and the decisions made by the council at Nicaea, he exerted himself to the utmost to prevent their being violated or defiled.</p>		
<p>1.37.6 Reduced to this extremity, he bade farewell to all logical resources and made God his refuge, devoting himself to continued fasting and never ceased from praying.</p> <p>1.37.7 Communicating his purpose to no one, he shut himself up alone in the church called Irene. Going up to the altar and prostrating himself on the ground beneath the holy communion table, he poured forth his fervent prayers weeping; and this he ceased not to do for many successive nights and days.</p>	<p>2.29.3 The partisan of Eusebous then separated to await the time they had fixed for carrying their menaces into execution. Alexander went to pray that the words of Eusebius might be prevented from being carried into deed. His chief source of fear arose from the fact that the emperor had been persuaded to give way. On the day before the appointed day he prostrated himself before the altar, and continued all the night in prayer to God, that his enemies might be prevented from carrying their schemes into execution against him.</p>	
<p>1.37.8 What he thus earnestly asked from God, he received, for his petition was such a one:</p> <p>1.37.9 'If the opinion of Arius were correct, he might not be permitted to see the day appointed for its discussion; but that if he himself held the true faith, Arius, as the author of all these evils, might suffer the punishment due to his impiety.'</p>		
Summer 336 - Marcellus of Ancyra also deposed; he opposed Asterius the Sophist		
<p>1.36.1 The bishops assembled at Constantinople deposed also Marcellus bishop of Ancyra, a city of Galatia Minor, on this account:</p>	<p>2.33.1 At the same time Marcellus, bishop of Ancyra in Galatia, was deposed and cast out of the Church by the bishops who were assembled at Constantinople. He had introduced some new doctrines, teaching that the Son of God began to exist when He was born of Mary and that His kingdom would have an end. He drew up a written document explaining these things. So Basil, a very learned and eloquent man, was entrusted with the bishopric of the parish of Galatia. The bishops also wrote to the churches in the nearby regions, asking them to search for copies of the book written by Marcellus, to destroy them, and to</p>	

Socrates	Sozomen	Theodoret
	guide back those who had embraced his views, if any could be found.	
	2.33.2 They explained that the writing was so lengthy that they could not put all of it in their letter, but they did quote certain passages from it to show that the doctrines they had condemned were actually presented there. Some people, however, claimed that Marcellus had merely presented a few questions which had been misconstrued by the followers of Eusebius and presented to the emperor as actual confessions. Eusebius and his party were very irritated with Marcellus, because he had not agreed with the definitions presented by the Synod in Phoenicia or with the regulations which had been made in favor of Arius at Jerusalem. He had also refused to attend the consecration of the Great Martyrium, to avoid being in communion with them.	
	2.33.3 In their letter to the emperor they focused on this incident and brought it forward as an accusation. They claimed it was a personal insult to him to refuse to attend the consecration of the temple which he had constructed at Jerusalem.	
1.36.2 A certain rhetorician of Cappadocia named Asterius, abandoning his art and professing himself a convert to Christianity, undertook the composition of some treatises, which are still extant, in which he commended the dogmas of Arius, He asserted that Christ is the power of God in the same sense as the locust and the palmer-worm are said by Moses to be the power of God, and with other similar utterances.	2.33.4 The reason Marcellus wrote this document was a certain Asterius, a sophist from Cappadocia. Asterius had written a treatise defending Arian doctrines and had it read in various cities, to bishops, and at several synods which Marcellus had attended. But when speaking against his arguments Marcellus, either deliberately or unintentionally, fell into the opinions of Paul of Samosata. Later, however, he proved that he did not hold those beliefs, and the Synod of Sardis reinstated him as bishop.	
<p>[Marcellus recants his statement at Jerusalem]</p> <p>1.36.5 When the bishops then convened at Jerusalem had knowledge of these things, they took no notice of Asterius, because he was not enrolled even in the catalogue of ordained priests. But they insisted that Marcellus, as a priest, should give an account of the book which he had written.</p> <p>1.36.6 Finding that he entertained Paul of Samosata's</p>		

Socrates	Sozomen	Theodoret
<p>sentiments, they required him to retract his opinion. He was thoroughly ashamed of himself and promised to burn his book.</p> <p>[Eusebians condemns Marcellus and install Basil into Ancryra]</p> <p>1.36.7 But because the convention of bishops was hastily dissolved by the emperor's summon to Constantinople, the Eusebians on their arrival at that city again took the case of Marcellus into consideration,</p> <p>1.36.8 When Marcellus refused to fulfil his promise of burning his untimely book, those present deposed him and sent Basil into Ancyra in his stead.</p> <p>1.36.9 Moreover Eusebius wrote a refutation of this work in three books, in which he exposed its erroneous doctrine. Marcellus however was afterwards reinstated in his bishopric by the Synod at Sardica, on his assurance that his book had been misunderstood and on that account he was thought to favor the Samosatene's views. But of this we shall speak more fully in its proper place.</p>		
Constantine examines Arius in Constantinople		
<p>1.38.1 Such was the supplication of Alexander. Meanwhile the emperor desired to personally examine Arius and sent for him to the palace. He asked him whether he would consent to the decisions of the Synod at Nicaea.</p> <p>1.38.2 He, without hesitation, replied in the affirmative and subscribed the declaration of the faith in the emperor's presence, acting with dishonesty.</p> <p>1.38.3 The emperor, surprised at his ready compliance, obliged him to confirm his signature by an oath. This also he did with equal concealment. The way he evaded, as I have heard, was this:</p> <p>1.38.4 He wrote his own opinion on paper and carried it under his arm, so that he then swore truly that he really held the sentiments he had written. That this is so, however, I have written from hearsay. But the fact that he added an oath to his subscription I have myself ascertained from an</p>		

Socrates	Sozomen	Theodoret
<p>examination of the emperor's own letters.</p> <p>1.38.5 The emperor was thus convinced and ordered that he should be received into communion by Alexander, bishop of Constantinople.</p>		
The death of Arius		
<p>1.38.6 It was then Saturday, and Arius was expecting to assemble with the church on the following day following. However, divine retribution overtook his daring atrocities.</p>		
<p>1.38.7 For going out of the imperial palace, attended by a crowd of Eusebian supporters like guards, he paraded proudly through the midst of the city, attracting the notice of all the people. As he approached the place called Constantine's Forum, where the column of Porphyry is erected, a terror arose from the remorse of conscience and seized Arius. With the terror of a violent relaxation of the bowels, he enquired whether there was a convenient place near, was directed to the back of Constantine's Forum, and hastened there.</p> <p>1.38.8 Soon after a faintness came over him, and together with the evacuations his bowels protruded, followed by a copious hemorrhage and the descent of the smaller intestines, moreover portions of his spleen and liver were brought off in the effusion of blood, he almost immediately died.</p>	<p>2.29.4 Late in the afternoon Arius, being seized suddenly with pain in the stomach, was compelled to repair to the public place set apart for emergencies of this nature. As some time passed away without his coming out, some persons, who were waiting for him outside, entered and found him dead and still sitting upon the seat.</p>	
<p>1.38.9 The scene of this catastrophe still is shown at Constantinople, as I have said, behind the shambles in the colonnade. Because people continually go by and point the finger at the place, there is a perpetual remembrance preserved of this extraordinary kind of death.</p> <p>1.38.10 So disastrous an occurrence filled the party of Eusebius, bishop of Nicomedia, with dread and alarm. The report of it quickly spread itself over the city and throughout the whole world.</p> <p>1.38.11 As the king grew more earnest in Christianity and confessed that the confession at Nicaea was attested by God, he rejoiced at the occurrences.</p>	<p>2.29.5 When his death became known, all people did not view the occurrence under the same aspect. Some believed that he died at that very hour, seized by a sudden disease of the heart, or suffering weakness from his joy over the fact that his matters were falling out according to his mind. Others imagined that this mode of death was inflicted on him in judgment, on account of his impiety. Those who held his sentiments were of opinion that his death was brought about by magical arts.</p>	

Socrates	Sozomen	Theodoret
Athanasius' account of the death of Arius		
	2.29.5b It will not be out of place to quote what Athanasius, bishop of Alexandria, stated on the subject. The following is his narrative:	1.14.2b The intrigues upon which he then entered and their punishment by the righteous Judge are all best narrated by the excellent Athanasius in his letter to Apion. I shall therefore now insert this passage in my work. He writes:
	2.30.3 With all men the common end of life is death. We must not blame a man, even if he be an enemy, merely because he died, for it is uncertain whether we shall live to the evening. But the end of Arius was so singular that it seems worthy of some remark.	
		1.14.3a I was not at Constantinople when he died. But Macarius, the presbyter, was there, and from him I learned all the circumstances. The emperor Constantine was persuaded by Eusebius and his party to send for Arius.
	2.30.1 Arius, the author of the heresy and the associate of Eusebius, when he had been summoned before the most blessed Constantine Augustus at the pleading of the partisans of Eusebius, was asked to give in writing an exposition of his faith. He drew up this document with great artfulness and, like the devil, concealed his impious assertions beneath the simple words of Scripture.	1.14.3b Upon his arrival the emperor asked him whether he held the faith of the Catholic church. Arius then swore that his faith was orthodox and presented a written summary of his belief. He was concealing, however, the reasons of his ejection from the Church by the bishop Alexander and making a dishonest use of the language of Holy Scripture.
	2.30.2a The most blessed Constantine said to him, 'If you have no other points in mind than these, render testimony to the truth; for if you perjure yourself, the Lord will punish you.' And the wretched man swore that he neither held nor conceived any sentiments except those now specified in the document, even if he had ever affirmed otherwise.	1.14.4 When, therefore, he had declared upon oath that he did not hold the errors for which he had been expelled from the Church by Alexander, Constantine dismissed him, saying, 'If your faith is orthodox, you have well sworn; but if your faith is impious and yet you have sworn, let God from heaven judge you.' When he left the presence of the emperor, the partisans of Eusebius, with their usual violence, desired to conduct him into the church.
		1.14.5 But Alexander, of blessed memory, bishop of

Socrates	Sozomen	Theodoret
		<p>Constantinople, refused his permission, alleging that the inventor of the heresy ought not to be admitted into communion. Then at last the partisans of Eusebius pronounced the threat: 'As, against your will, we succeeded in persuading the emperor to send for Arius, so now, even if you forbid it, shall Arius join in communion with us in this church to-morrow.' It was on Saturday that they said this.</p> <p>1.14.6 The bishop Alexander, deeply grieved at what he had heard, went into the church and poured forth his lamentations, raising his hands in supplication to God, and throwing himself on his face on the pavement in the sanctuary, prayed. Macarius went in with him, prayed with him, and heard his prayers.</p> <p>1.14.7 He asked one of two things. 'If Arius,' said he, 'is to be joined to the Church to-morrow, let me your servant depart and do not destroy the pious with the impious. If you will spare Church, and I know that you do spare her, look upon the words of the followers of Eusebius, and do not give your heritage over to destruction and to shame. Remove Arius, lest if he come into the Church, heresy seem to come in with him, and impiety be hereafter deemed piety.' Having thus prayed, the bishop left the church deeply anxious, and then a horrible and extraordinary catastrophe ensued.</p>
	<p>2.30.4 The partisans of Eusebius threatened to reinstate him in the church, and Alexander, bishop of Constantinople, opposed their intention. Arius placed his confidence in the power and menaces of Eusebius; for it was the Sabbath, and he expected the next day to be readmitted. The dispute ran high; the partisans of Eusebius were loud in their menaces, while Alexander took refuge in prayer. The Lord was the judge and declared himself against the unjust.</p>	<p>1.14.8a The followers of Eusebius had launched out into threats, while the bishop took refuge in prayer. Arius, emboldened by the protection of his party, delivered many trifling and foolish speeches.</p>
	<p>2.30.4b A little before sunset Arius was compelled by a want of nature to enter the place appointed for such emergencies, and here he lost at once both restoration to</p>	<p>1.14.8b But he was suddenly compelled by a call of nature to retire and immediately, as it is written, 'falling headlong, he burst asunder in the midst,' and gave up the</p>

Socrates	Sozomen	Theodoret
	<p>communion and his life. 2.30.2b Aoon after he went out, and judgment was visited upon him; for he bent forwards and burst in the middle.</p>	<p>ghost, being deprived at once both of communion and of life.</p>
	<p>2.30.5 The most blessed Constantine was amazed when he heard of this occurrence and regarded it as the proof of falsehood. It then became evident to everyone that the menaces of Eusebius were absolutely futile and that the hopes of Arius were vain. It also became manifest that the Arian madness could not be fellowshipped by the Savior both here and in the church of the Firstborn. Is it not then astonishing that some are still found who seek to absolve him whom the Lord condemned and to defend that heresy which the Lord proved to be unworthy of fellowship, by not permitting its author to enter the church? We have been duly informed that this was the mode of the death of Arius.’</p>	<p>1.14.9 This, then, was the end of Arius. The followers of Eusebius were covered with shame, and buried him whose belief they shared. The blessed Alexander completed the celebration, rejoicing with the Church in piety and orthodoxy, praying with all the brethren and greatly glorifying God. This was not because he rejoiced at the death of Arius—God forbid, for ‘it is appointed unto all men once to die,’ but because the event plainly transcended any human condemnation.</p>
		<p>1.14.10 For the Lord Himself passed judgment upon the menaces of the followers of Eusebius and the prayer of Alexander, condemned the Arian heresy, and showed that it was unworthy of being received into the communion of the Church. Thus the Lord made known to all that, even if it received the approval and support of the emperor and of all men, yet by truth itself it stood condemned. 1.14.11 These were the first fruits, reaped by Arius, of those devastating seeds which he had himself sown. They formed the prelude to the punishments that awaited him hereafter. His impiety was condemned by his punishment.</p>
The fate of the spot where Arius died		
	<p>2.30.6 It is said that for a long period subsequently no one would make use of the seat on which he died. Those who were compelled by necessities of nature, as is usually the case in a crowd, to visit the public place, spoke to one another when they entered to avoid the seat. And the place was shunned afterwards, because Arius had there received</p>	

Socrates	Sozomen	Theodoret
	<p>the punishment of his impiety.</p> <p>2.30.7 At a later time a certain rich and powerful man, who had embraced the Arian tenets, bought the place of the public and built a house on the spot, in order that the occurrence might fall into oblivion and that there might be no perpetual memorial of the death of Arius.</p>	
Alexandria is divided, many letters written to Constantine to recall Athanasius		
	<p>2.31.1 The death of Arius did not terminate the doctrinal dispute which he had originated. Those who adhered to his sentiments did not cease from plotting against those who maintained opposite opinions.</p> <p>2.31.2a The people of Alexandria loudly complained of the exile of Athanasius and offered up supplications for his return. Antony, the celebrated monk, wrote frequently to the emperor to entreat him to attach no credit to the accusations of the Meletians, but to reject their accusations as falsehood.</p>	
Constantine refuses to recall Athanasius		
	<p>2.31.2b Yet the emperor was not convinced by these arguments and wrote to the Alexandrians, accusing them of folly and of disorderly conduct. He commanded the clergy and the holy virgins to remain quiet and declared that he would not change his mind nor recall Athanasius whom, he said, he regarded as an exciter of rebellion, justly condemned by the judgment of the Church.</p> <p>2.31.3 He replied to Antony by stating that he ought not to overlook the decree of the Synod; for even if some few of the bishops, he said, were influenced by ill-will or the desire to oblige others, it scarcely seems credible that so many prudent and excellent bishops could have been impelled by such motives. And, he added, Athanasius was brazen and arrogant, the cause of dissension and rebellion. The enemies of Athanasius accused him all the more especially of these crimes, because they knew that the emperor regarded them with peculiar aversion.</p>	
Constantine banishes John from Alexandria		

Socrates	Sozomen	Theodoret
	<p>2.31.4 When he found out that the church had split into two groups, between those who admired Athanasius and those who admired John, he was furious and exiled John. John was the one who succeeded Miletius. He had been restored to communion in the church and given back his clerical duties—both he and those with the same views—by the synod of Tyre.</p> <p>2.31.5 His banishment went against the wishes of Athanasius’ enemies, but it happened anyway. The decisions of those who had gathered in Tyre did nothing to help him. For the emperor was past the point of listening to supplications or excuses of any kind on behalf of someone who was suspected of inciting the Christian people to rise up or protest.</p>	
c. 337-338 - Constantine orders Athanasius returned		
		<p>1.32.2 He ordered that the great Athanasius should return to Alexandria and expressed this decision in the presence of Eusebius, who did all he could to dissuade him.³</p>
Constantine had been deceived by Arians		
		<p>1.33.1 It should not be surprising that Constantine was so far deceived as to send so many great men into exile, for he believed the assertions of bishops of high fame and reputation, who skillfully concealed their malice. Those who are acquainted with the Sacred Scriptures know that the holy David, although he was a prophet, was deceived.</p> <p>1.33.2 And that too not by a priest, but by one who was a menial, a slave, and a rascal. I mean Ziba, who deluded the king by lies against Mephibosheth and thus obtained his land.</p> <p>1.33.3 It is not to condemn the prophet that I thus speak, but that I may defend the emperor by showing the weakness of human nature, to teach that credit should not be given only to those who advance accusations, even</p>

³ It appears Athanasius returned from his first exile after Constantine had died and his son Constntius started ruling.

Socrates	Sozomen	Theodoret
		though they may appear worthy of credit. but that the other party ought also to be heard, and that one ear should be left open to the accused.
Eusebius of Nicomedia and Theognis renew controversies about the Nicene Creed		
	<p>2.32.7 About this time those on the side of Eusebius, bishop of Nicomedia, and of Theognis, bishop of Nicaea, began to change how they would write the confession presented by the Nicæan Council. They did not dare to openly reject that the Son is consubstantial with the Father, because they knew the emperor held to that belief.</p> <p>2.32.8 However, they presented another document, claiming that they had received the terms of the Nicæan doctrine with certain explanations. Their written interpretation caused the old debate to come under discussion again, and what seemed to have been put to rest was set in motion again.</p>	