

Council of Nicaea Documents (English) – Part 3

Sources Used

Excerpts from the *Die Griechischen Christlichen Schriftsteller* (GCS) and *Athanasius Werke* series are used by permission. Most other texts and translations are in the public domain. Click [here](#) for a key to the FCC (fourthcentury.com) translators.

This work is licensed under [CC BY-NC-SA 4.0](#)

Anonymous Church History (pseudo-Gelasius) (CPG 6034)

Greek text: *Anonyme Kirchengeschichte (Galezius Cyzicenus, CPG 6034)*, ed. Günther Christian Hansen. GCS N.F. 9 (Walter de Gruyter: Berlin, 2002).
English translation by FCC (NJ and RR).

Athanasius, Letter to the Bishops of Africa (CPG 2133)

Greek text: *Athanasius Werke*, vol. 2.8, ed. H.C. Brennecke et al. (Berlin, 2000).
English translation by A. Robertson (NPNF² 4:488-494), updated by FCC (AGC).

On the Nicene Definition (de Decretis) (CPG 2120)

Greek text: *Athanasius Werke*, vol. 2.1-2:1-45, ed. H.-G. Opitz (Berlin, 1935).
English translation by J. H. Newman and A. Robertson (NPNF² 4:149-172), updated by FCC (AGC).

On the Synods of Ariminum and Seleucia (de Synodis) (CPG 2128)

Greek text: *Athanasius Werke*, vol. 2.6-7, ed. H.-G. Opitz (Berlin, 1940).
English translation by J. H. Newman and A. Robertson (NPNF² 4:48-480), updated by FCC (AGC).

Eusebius of Caesarea, Life of Constantine (CPG 3496)

Greek text: *Eusebius Werke 2. Die Kirchengeschichte*, ed. E. Schwartz. GCS 9.1 (Leipzig, 1903).
English translation by A.C. McGiffert (NPNF² 1:73-404), updated by FCC (AGC).

Gelasius of Caesarea, Ecclesiastical History (CPG 3521)

Greek Text and English translation: *Ecclesiastical History: The Extant Fragments With an Appendix containing the Fragments from Dogmatic Writings*. GCS, ed. M. Wallraff, J. Stutz, and N. Marinides. Translated by N. Marinides. (De Gruyter, 2018).

Jerome, Dialogue Against the Luciferians (CPL 608)

Latin Text: *Patrologia Latina* vol. 23, coll. 153-182B. ed. J.P. Migne, (Paris, 1883).
English translation by W.H. Fremantle (NPNF², 6:319-34), updated by FCC (AGC).

Philostorgius, Ecclesiastical History (CPG 6032)

Greek Text: *Philostorgius Kirchengeschichte.*, ed. J. Bidez. GCS 21 (Leipzig, 1913).
English translation by FCC (AGC).

Rufinus of Aquileia, Ecclesiastical History

Latin text: *Eusebius Werke 2.2. Die Kirchengeschichte*, ed. E. Schwartz and T. Mommsen (Leipzig, 1908).
English translation by FCC (AGC).

Socrates, Ecclesiastical History (CPG 6028)

Greek Text: ed. G.C. Hansen. GCS N.F. 1, Berlin, New York: De Gruyter, 1995.
English translation by A.C. Zenos (NPNF² 2:1-178).

Sozomen, Ecclesiastical History (CPG 6030)

Greek Text: G.C. Hansen, *Sozomenus Kirchengeschichte*, 2nd ed., GCS N.F. 4. (Berlin 1995)
English translation by C. Hartranft (NPNF² 2:179-427).

Theodoret, Ecclesiastical History (CPG 6222)

Greek Text: *Theodoret: Kirchengeschichte*. ed. Parmentier, Léon, GCS N.F. 5. Berlin, New York: De Gruyter, 1998.
English translation by B. Jackson (NPNF² 3:33-159).

The Council makes its decision						
Athanasius, <i>de Synodis</i>	Gelasius	Rufinus	Socrates	Sozomen	Theodoret	Anonymous Church History
<p>5b. [The council] took place then, and the Syrians submitted, and the Fathers pronounced the Arian heresy to be the forerunner of Antichrist and drew up a suitable formula against it. And yet in this, many as they are, they ventured on nothing like the proceedings of these three or four men. Without prefixing consulate, month, and day, they wrote concerning Easter, “It seemed good as follows,” for it did then seem good that there should be a general compliance. But about the faith they wrote not, “It seemed good,” but “Thus believes the catholic church;” and thereupon they confessed how they believed, in order to show that their own sentiments were not novel, but apostolic; and what they wrote down was no discovery of theirs, but it is the same as was taught by the Apostles.</p>	<p>F12e (p. 97) Therefore they were busy every day examining together many matters concerning the faith, being of the opinion that they ought not to effect anything hasty or rash with regard to such a great question, and they summoned Arius frequently and studied his propositions with repeated inquisitions, and with much consideration they reasoned as to how they should decide and counterargue so as to overturn his iniquitous tenets.</p> <p>F12f (p. 99) So after the discussion had reached broad agreement, it seemed to all together that the <i>homoousios</i> must be enshrined as a definition in the ecclesiastical confession of faith, that is, that the Son should be confessed as also of the same being as the Father.</p> <p>F12a (p. 77) Now as for the belief of Arius, it was supported by Eusebius of Nicomedia, as mentioned earlier, Theognis of Nicaea, and Maris of Chalcedon. Bravely fighting against these were our fathers among the saints, Alexander of Constantinople, who was then a presbyter, and Athanasius the deacon of the church of the Alexandrians. Therefore malice armed itself against them, as we will tell later. They summoned Arius to the synod, directing him to present his doctrines.</p>	<p>10.5c After a long time and much work, all agreed and declared with one mouth and heart that <i>homoousios</i> should be written, that is, that they confess the Son is of the same substance as the Father. This was proclaimed most strongly by the consent of all.</p>	<p>1.8.23 By spurring everyone on into unity, [Constantine] succeeded in bringing them into similar judgments and conformity of opinion on all the disputed points. There was not only unity in the confession of faith, but also a general agreement as to the time for the celebration of the feast of Salvation. At this time the doctrines which had common agreement were confirmed by the signature of each individual.’</p>	<p>1.20.1b Finally all the priests agreed with one another and conceded that the Son is <i>homoousios</i> with the Father. At the conclusion of the conference there were only seventeen who praised the opinion of Arius, but eventually the majority of these yielded and agreed with the general view.</p> <p>1.20.2 The emperor deferred to this ruling. He regarded the unanimity of the conference to be a divine approval and he declared that anyone who rebelled against it would be immediately sent into banishment as guilty of trying to overthrow the divine definitions.</p>	<p>1.7.13 These and similar exhortations he, like an affectionate son, addressed the bishops like fathers, working to bring about their unanimity in the apostolic doctrines. Most of the members of the council, won over by his arguments, established concord among themselves and embraced sound doctrine.</p>	<p>2.7.42b Of the bishops gathered in council there, who numbered 318, 300 were persuaded by what he said, and they embraced harmony with each other and sound doctrine.</p> <p>2.11.11 After much consideration and prayer to God, they made the following decision. As is proper, they wisely refuted the lawless doctrine of Arius and his supporters, utterly uprooting and obliterating their abominable blasphemies against the Son of God.</p> <p>2.25.3 Therefore, after extensive pious deliberation finished, all our people saw the need to define the <i>homoousios</i> of God within the church’s faith, as our holy fathers who came after the apostles also passed down this faith, namely, confessing that the Son and the Holy Spirit have the same essence as the Father.</p> <p>2.25.4 All the holy bishops assembled at Nicaea affirmed this faith. The assembled holy priests and confessors, the praiseworthy, God-loving emperor, and the whole multitude of believers who were gathered there gladly accepted the confession of faith.</p> <p>2.27.10 So the council communicated its decisions to the pious, praiseworthy emperor—the condemnation of those who fought against God and the exposition of the orthodox faith. He gladly received them with extreme reverence like they had been presented by God. He condemned his enemies to exile because they opposed God.</p>

Athanasius, <i>de Decretis</i>	Theodoret	Anonymous Church History
<p>19 The council wished to do away with the irreligious phrases of the Arians and to use instead the acknowledged words of the Scriptures, that the Son is not from nothing but “from God,” and is “Word” and “Wisdom,” and not creature or work, but a proper offspring from the Father. But Eusebius and his fellows, led by their inveterate heterodoxy, understood the phrase “from God” as belonging to us, as if in respect to it the Word of God did not differ from us in any way, and that because it is written, “There is one God, from whom, all things” [1 Cor. 8:6] and again, “Old things are passed away, behold, all things are become new, and all things are from God” [2 Cor. 5:17]. But the Fathers, perceiving their craft and the cunning of their irreligion, were forced to express more distinctly the sense of the words “from God.” Accordingly, they wrote “from the essence of God,” in order that “from God” might not be considered common and equal in the Son and in things originate, but that all others might be acknowledged as creatures, and the Word alone as from the Father. For though all things be said to be from God, yet this is not in the sense in which the Son is from him. As to the creatures, “of God” is said of them on this account, in that they exist not at random or spontaneously, nor come to be by chance, according to those philosophers who refer them to the combination of atoms and to elements of similar structure —nor as certain heretics speak of a distinct Framer—nor as others again say that the constitution of all things is from certain angels—but in that (whereas God is) it was by him that all things were brought into being through his Word, not existing before. But as to the Word, since he is not a creature, he alone is both called and is “from the Father.” It is significant in this sense to say that the Son is “from the essence of the Father,” for to nothing originate does this attach. In truth, when Paul says that “all things are from God,” he immediately adds, “and one Lord Jesus Christ, through whom all things,” in order to show all men that the Son is other than all these things which came to be from God (for the things which came to be from God, came to be through his Son); and that he had used his foregoing words with reference to the world as framed by God, and not as if all things were from the Father as the Son is. For other things are not like the Son, nor is the Word one among others. He is Lord and framer of all. On account of this did the holy council declare expressly that he was of the essence of the Father, that we might believe the Word to be other than the nature of things originate, being alone truly from God; and that no subterfuge should be left open to the irreligious. This then was the reason why the council wrote “of the essence.”</p> <p>20 Eusebius and his companions were put to shame by the arguments against them and did not dare to contradict when the bishops said that the Word must be described as the true power and image of the Father, in all things exact and like the Father, and as unalterable, and as always, and as in him without division (for never was the Word not, but he was always, existing everlastingly with the Father, as the radiance of light). Nevertheless, they were caught whispering to each other and winking with their eyes, that “like,” and “always,” and “power,” and “in him,” were, as before, common to us and the Son, and that it was no difficulty to agree to these. As to “like,” they said that it is written of us, “Man is the image and glory of God” [1 Cor. 11:7]; “always,” that it was written, “For we who live are always” [2 Cor. 4:11]; “in him,” “In him we live and move and have our being” [Acts 17:28]; “unalterable,” that it is written, “Nothing shall separate us from the love of Christ” [Rom. 8:35]; as to “power,” that the caterpillar and the locust are called “power” and “great power,” and that it is often said of the people, for instance, “All the power of the Lord came out of the land of Egypt” [Exod. 12:41]; and there are others also, heavenly ones, for Scripture says, “The Lord of powers is with us, the God of Jacob is our refuge” [Ps. 46:7]. Indeed Asterius, by title the sophist, had said the like in writing, having learned</p>	<p>1.13.1a Eusebius clearly testifies that the aforesaid term <i>homoousios</i> is not a new one nor the invention of the fathers assembled at the council, but that from the very first it has been handed down from father to son. He states that all those then assembled unanimously received the creed then published.</p>	<p>2.11.12 Our bishops opposed their assertion that the Son of God is “not from God” by saying that he is “God from God.” They opposed their assertion that he is “not true God” by writing that he is “true God from true God.” They opposed their assertion that he is a “created being” by defining that he is “begotten, not made.” They opposed their assertion that he is “of a different essence” by saying that “the Son is <i>homoousios</i> with the Father, that is, begotten from the being of the Father.” They declared that he is creator and craftsman of the visible and the invisible in keeping with the apostolic faith entrusted to the church from the beginning after they had provided evidence from Scripture, as this account will show.</p> <p>2.11.13 Rendering the deadly poisons ineffective with this antidote, they proceeded to write down the apostolic faith they had agreed upon even more clearly.</p> <p>2.12.1 The holy, great, ecumenical council of our holy fathers gathered at Nicaea spoke through the blessed, holy Bishop Hosius of Corduba in Spain, who was also representing the bishop of Rome along with the previously named priests from his see. Through an interpreter, he said:</p> <p>2.12.2 “The deity is not one person as the Jews think, but three persons in true substance, not merely in name. Both the Old and New Testament proclaim this in many passages.</p> <p>2.12.3 The Old Testament, speaking rather physically, treats the Word as a spoken word. The New Testament, however, shows that the Word is God: ‘In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God’ [John 1:1]. It also shows that he is a perfect person from what is perfect, for the Son is not partially God, but wholly God, just like the Father is, for he is of the same essence as the Father, who begot him in an inexpressible way.</p>

<p>it from them, and before him Arius having learned it also, as has been said. But the bishops discerning in this too their dissimulation, and whereas it is written, “Deceit is in the heart of the irreligious who imagine evil” [Prov. 12:20], were again compelled on their part to collect the sense of the Scriptures, and to re-say and re-write what they had said before, more distinctly still, namely, that the Son is <i>homoousios</i> with the Father. This was to signify that the Son was from the Father, and not merely like, but the same in likeness, and to show that the Son’s likeness and unalterableness was different from that which is ascribed to us, which we acquire from virtue on the ground of observance of the commandments. For bodies which are like each other may be separated and become at distances from each other, as are human sons relatively to their parents (as it is written concerning Adam and Seth, who was begotten of him “like him after his own pattern” [Gen. 5:3]). But the generation of the Son from the Father is not according to the nature of men, and not only like, but also inseparable from the essence of the Father. He and the Father are one, as he himself has said, and the Word is ever in the Father and the Father in the Word, as the radiance stands towards the light (as this the phrase itself indicates). Therefore the council, understanding this, suitably wrote “<i>homoousios</i>” that they might both defeat the perverseness of the heretics and show that the Word was other than created things. For, after thus writing, they at once added, “But they who say that the Son of God is from nothing, or created, or alterable, or a work, or from other essence—these the holy catholic church anathematizes.” And by saying this, they showed clearly that “of the essence,” and “<i>homoousios</i>” are destructive of those catchwords of irreligion, such as “created,” and “work,” and “originated,” and “alterable,” and “he was not before his generation.” And he who holds these contradicts the council; but he who does not hold with Arius must hold and intend the decisions of the council, suitably regarding them to signify the relation of the radiance to the light, and from there gaining the illustration of the truth.</p>		<p>2.12.4 In the same way, the Holy Spirit coexists with the Father and the Son, for he is of the same essence and the same substance as the Father and the Son.</p> <p>2.12.5 Therefore, we must confess that the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit have one will, one reign, one authority, one lordship over all created beings, both perceivable and only conceivable, one divine nature, and one essence. We must not mix or divide the indescribable, blessed Trinity.</p> <p>2.12.6 Rather, we must proclaim the Father, who always truly exists and subsists as Father of the true Son, the Son, who always truly exists and subsists as Son of the true Father, and the Holy Spirit, who always truly exists and subsists as Holy Spirit—an inseparable, indescribable, truly incomprehensible, inexpressible Trinity—with the conviction that there is one deity which has one divine essence.</p> <p>2.12.7 We confess this deity in accordance with the true accurate doctrine of the faith, which the Lord entrusted to us from the beginning through his holy apostles and our holy fathers of old who faultlessly guarded the holy faith. We are ready, with the Holy Spirit’s goodwill, to prove this with many passages from the Holy Scriptures.”</p>
<p>The Arians resist the Council’s decision</p>		
<p>Gelasius</p>	<p>Anonymous Church History</p>	
<p>F12f (p. 99) And everyone confirmed it wholeheartedly, except for some, seventeen in number, who apostatized together with Arius in saying that the Son had been created externally by God from some non-existent substances and that he was not born from the divinity itself.</p>	<p>2.12.8 When they had said this (or rather, the Holy Spirit had said this through them), the defenders of Arius’s godlessness muttered, distressed. (They were the followers of Eusebius of Nicomedia and Theognis of Nicaea whom we previously mentioned.) They glanced at Arius’s mercenary philosophers—highly learned men whom Arius had hired as advocates for his depravity, with whom he had come to the holy ecumenical council.</p> <p>2.12.10 For the blasphemous heart of Arius, who fought against God, and of those who participated in his godlessness truly turned away from the Lord. They dared to call the Son of God a creature and a product even though he is the creator of all things and the craftsman of visible and invisible created beings.</p>	

	<p>2.25.5 But the seventeen bishops about whom we have spoken above did not [subscribe]. Arius seemed to be delighted with them. He was convicted with them, his followers, for they said with him that God created the Son from substances which did not exist, as something exterior, and that the Son was not begotten from the divine essence of the Father.</p>		
<p>Some of Arius’ former supporters abandon his position</p>			
<p>Athanasius, <i>de Decretis</i></p>	<p>Philostorgius</p>	<p>Theodoret</p>	<p>Anonymous Church History</p>
<p>3.2 Since all subscribed to it, Eusebius and his fellows subscribed to it also in those very words of which they are now complaining: “of the essence” and “one in essence” and that “the Son of God is neither creature nor work, nor one of the originated things, but that the Word is an offspring from the substance of the Father.” And what is strange indeed, Eusebius of Caesarea in Palestine, who had denied the day before but later subscribed, sent a letter to his church, saying that this was the church’s faith and the tradition of the Fathers and made a public profession that they were before in error and were rashly contending against the truth. For though he was ashamed at that time to adopt these phrases and excused himself to the church in his own way, nevertheless he certainly means to imply all these things in his letter by his not denying the <i>homoousios</i> and “of the essence.” By doing so he got himself in trouble, for while he was making excuses, he went on to attack the Arians as stating that “the Son was not before his generation,” and therefore rejecting his existence before his birth in the flesh. And this Acacius is aware of also, though he too, through fear, may pretend otherwise because of the times and deny that fact. Accordingly I have included the letter of Eusebius at the end, that you may understand the disrespect which the enemies of Christ, particularly Acacius, showed to their teachers.</p> <p>18.1 Now Eusebius and his companions were previously examined at great length and convicted themselves, as I said before. On this they subscribed, and after this change of mind they kept quiet and retired.</p>	<p>1.9 He also agrees that all were of one mind at Nicaea concerning the definition of the faith, except for Secundus of Ptolemais and Theonas of Marmarica, who followed him. The band of Arian leaders, including Eusebius the bishop of Nicomedia (whom he glorifies as ‘the Great’), Theognis of Nicaea, Maris of Chalcedon, and the rest of their troop defected to the council. But they did so in trickery, he says, and concealed <i>homoiousios</i> in the word <i>homoousios</i>. Nevertheless, at the urging of Constantine’s sister Constantina, they agreed to the synodical resolutions.</p>	<p>1.7.15b So great was the uproar raised against them and so many were the reproaches cast on them for having betrayed religion that they all, with the exception of Secundus and Theonas, stood up and took the lead in publicly renouncing Arius.</p>	<p>2.27.12 But eleven feared that the God-loving emperor and the multitude of bishops of the council would banish them. So they hypocritically subscribed to the <i>homoousios</i> with their hand, not out of conviction.</p> <p>2.27.13 The leader of this deceit was Eusebius of Nicomedia, who demonstrably represented both opinions until his death, just as Eustathius of Antioch, Eusebius Pamphili, Athanasius the Great, and all writers who report the events of the council describe that in his hypocrisy he seemed to favor our opinion but actually fought for the opponents’ faction.</p>
<p>The Creed of Nicaea</p>			
<p>Athanasius, <i>de Decretis</i></p>	<p>Socrates</p>	<p>Sozomen</p>	<p>Anonymous Church History</p>
<p>37a They passed judgment against the Arian heresy, and they defeated those around Arius. Therefore they drew up in writing the faith of the church for the refutation against every heresy:</p>	<p>1.8.28b But the agreement of faith, produced by the great council in Nicaea and praised with a loud voice by Eusebius, is this:</p>	<p>1.20.3 I had thought it necessary to reproduce the actual document concerning the matter, as an example of the truth, in order that those who follow might possess in a fixed and clear form the symbol of the faith which provided some peace at the time. But since some pious friends, who understood such matters, recommended that these truths ought to be spoken of and heard by the initiated and their initiators only, I agreed with their advice. It is not unlikely that some of the uninitiated may read this book. While I have concealed the portion of material that I ought to keep silent</p>	<p>2.26.4 All the bishops unanimously summarized the content of the orthodox faith briefly to accommodate the simplicity of the multitude of faithful people. They formulated the symbol of the catholic faith in writing as follows: 2.27.1a “The exposition of the catholic apostolic faith, presented by the council of Nicaea under the God-loving Emperor Constantine, during the consulate of the illustrious men Paulinus and Julian, in the year 636 after Alexander [the</p>

		about, I have not altogether left the reader ignorant of the opinions held by the council.	Great], on the 19th of June, 13 days before the Kalends of July, in Nicaea, capital of Bithynia:
Athanasius, <i>de Decretis</i>	Rufinus	Socrates	Anonymous Church History
37b “We believe in one God, the Father Almighty, maker of all things, seen and unseen. We believe in one Lord, Jesus Christ, the Son of God, begotten of the Father as only-begotten, that is, from the essence of the Father, God from God, Light from Light, true God from true God, begotten, not made, <i>homoousios</i> with the Father. Through him all things were made, in heaven and on earth. For us men and for our salvation he came down, was incarnate, and became human. He suffered and rose on the third day. He ascended into heaven. He will come again to judge the living and the dead. We believe in the Holy Spirit. The catholic apostolic church anathematizes those who say, ‘He did not always exist,’ or ‘Before he was begotten he did not exist,’ or ‘He was made from things which did not exist,’ or who claim that the Son of God is of a different substance or essence, or is created, changeable, or mutable.”	10.6a “We believe in one God, the Father Almighty, maker of all things, seen and unseen. We believe in our one Lord, Jesus Christ, the Son of God, begotten of the Father as only-begotten, that is, from the essence of the Father, God from God, Light from Light, true God from true God, begotten, not made, <i>homoousios</i> with the Father, that is, of the same essence as the Father. Through him all things were made, in heaven and on earth. For us men and for our salvation he came down, was incarnate, and became human. He suffered and rose on the third day. He ascended into heaven. From there he will come again to judge the living and the dead. We believe in the Holy Spirit. The catholic apostolic church anathematizes those who say, ‘He did not always exist,’ and ‘Before he was begotten he did not exist,’ and that he was made from things which did not exist, or who claim that the Son of God is of a different substance or essence, or is changeable or mutable.”	1.8.29 “We believe in one God, the Father Almighty, maker of all things, seen and unseen. We believe in one Lord, Jesus Christ, the Son of God, begotten of the Father as only-begotten, that is, from the essence of the Father, God from God, Light from Light, true God from true God, begotten, not made, <i>homoousios</i> with the Father. Through him all things were made, in heaven and on earth. For us men and for our salvation he came down, was incarnate, and became human. He suffered and rose on the third day. He ascended into heaven. He will come again to judge the living and the dead. We believe in the Holy Spirit. 1.8.30 The catholic apostolic church anathematizes those who say, ‘He did not always exist,’ or ‘Before he was begotten he did not exist,’ or ‘He was made from things which did not exist,’ or who claim that the Son of God is of a different substance or essence, or is created, changeable, or mutable.”	2.27.1b We believe in one God, the Father Almighty, maker of all things, seen and unseen. 2.27.2 We believe in one Lord, Jesus Christ, the Son of God, begotten of the Father as only-begotten, that is, from the essence of the Father, God from God, Light from Light, true God from true God, begotten, not made, <i>homoousios</i> with the Father. Through him all things were made, in heaven and on earth. 2.27.3 For us men and for our salvation he came down, was incarnate, and became human. 2.27.4 He suffered, was buried, and rose on the third day. He ascended into heaven and is seated at the right hand of the Father. He will come again to judge the living and the dead. 2.27.5 We believe in his Holy Spirit. 2.27.6 The catholic apostolic church anathematizes those who say, ‘He did not always exist,’ ‘Before he was begotten he did not exist,’ and that he was made from things which did not exist, or who claim that the Son of God is of a different substance or essence, or is created, changeable, or mutable.”
Anonymous Church History			
2.27.7 This is the faith which our holy fathers at Nicaea, the orthodox bishops, set forth primarily against Arius, who blasphemously said that the Son of God is a creature. 2.27.8 With it they also rejected Sabellius, Photinus, Paul of Samosata, Mani, Valentinus, Marcion, and every heresy which arose against the catholic apostolic church. 2.27.9 The council of orthodox saints gathered at Nicaea, whose names and provinces have been appended, condemned them.			

Reception of the Creed and exile of the dissenters					
Socrates	Sozomen		Theodoret	Anonymous Church History	
1.8.31a This creed was recognized and affirmed by three hundred and eighteen [bishops]; and because they were, as Eusebius says, unanimous in expression and sentiment, they signed it.	1.21.1 It ought to be known that they affirmed the Son to be <i>homoousios</i> with the Father and that those are to be excommunicated and voted aliens to the catholic church who assert that there was a time in which the Son existed not, and before he was begotten he was not, and that he was made from what had no existence, and that he is of another hypostasis or substance from the Father, and that he is subject to change or mutation.		1.7.13 Most members of the council, won over by his arguments, established concord among themselves and embraced sound doctrine.	2.26.1 For this reason, all our holy fathers in turn unanimously decided to banish them from the catholic church together with Arius. They anathematized them, their ungodly opinion, and the blasphemous words and thoughts which they had directed against the Son of God, saying that he is from things which did not exist, that he did not always exist, that the Son of God is capable of choosing evil or good, and that he is a creature and a product. 2.26.2 The holy council anathematized them and all these thoughts, refusing to listen to their ungodly opinion, their insanity, and their blasphemous words. 2.26.3 The council forthwith tore up their document, which they had dared to submit, full of their ungodliness. This was the end of their cause at the holy council. 2.27.11 Therefore, six of the bishops on Arius’s side were content to be exiled with Arius himself and his supporters.	
Gelasius	Rufinus	Philostorgius	Socrates	Sozomen	Anonymous Church History
F12f (p. 99) The decision of the synod was referred to the pious Constantine, who revered and accepted it as divinely decreed and decided that those who contradicted it should suffer exile as adversaries of God. So six remained to be expelled along with Arius; for the other eleven recanted and subscribed to the <i>homoousios</i> with their hand but not their will. The leader of this deceit	10.5d It is said that there were only seventeen who agreed rather with the faith of Arius that the Son had been created externally by God out of no substance and was not begotten from the very deity of the Father. The statement of the priestly council was brought to Constantine, who revered it as if it had come from God himself. He decreed that if someone should try to oppose it, he would do so at the cost of exile, as if he were protesting against a divine statute. Therefore only six were expelled along with Arius, while the remaining eleven, considering it amongst themselves, acquiesced to subscribe, though they did so with hand alone and not heart.	1.10 He says that Secundus, as he was being banished, said to Eusebius, “Eusebius, you subscribed in order to avoid banishment. By God I believe that it is necessary for you to be banished on account of me.” And that very thing happened to Eusebius. Three months after the council, just as Secundus had foretold, he was	1.8.31b Only five would not receive it, objecting to the term <i>homoousios</i> : these were Eusebius bishop of Nicomedia, Theognis of Nicaea, Maris of Chalcedon, Theonas of Marmarica, and Secundus of Ptolemais. 1.8.32 “For,” they said, “something that is <i>homoousios</i> comes from something else either by partition, derivation, or germination (by germination, as a shoot from roots; by derivation, as children from their parents; by division, as two or three pieces of gold from a mass), and the Son is from the Father by none of these modes.” Therefore, they declared themselves unable to assent to this creed. Those, then, who scoffed at the term <i>homoousios</i> would not subscribe to the deposition of Arius. 1.8.33 When they had heard this, the council anathematized Arius and all who adhered to his opinions and prohibited Arius from entering. At the same time an edict of the emperor sent Arius himself	1.21.2 This decision was sanctioned by Eusebius, bishop of Nicomedia; by Theognis, bishop of Nicaea; by Maris, bishop of Chalcedon; by Patrophilus, bishop of Scythopolis; and by Secundus, bishop of Ptolemais in Libya. Eusebius Pamphilus, however, withheld his assent for a little while, but on further examination assented. 1.21.3 The council excommunicated Arius and his adherents and prohibited his entering Alexandria. The words in which his opinions were couched were likewise condemned, and also a work entitled Thalia, which he had written on the subject. I have not read this book, but	2.33.5 This happened at the holy great ecumenical council gathered at Nicaea in Bithynia. But Eusebius, Theognis, and the Arians in their circle could not bear the victorious confirmation of the true faith, nor would they anathematize Arius. Once again caught, they were exiled by decision of the God-loving emperor and by judgment of the holy council of bishops. Others were installed to replace them in their parishes by vote of the council as well as the clergy and laity of their respective parishes. 2.33.6 Amphion took over leadership of the church of Nicomedia; Chrestus of the church

<p>was Eusebius the bishop of Nicomedia, who even to the end is proven to have adhered to both opinions—I mean to ours by his dissembling and to those of our opponents by his lawless obstructions.</p>	<p>The most preeminent of these insincere subscribers was Eusebius the bishop of Nicomedia. Meanwhile subscriptions were given in every way, some truthfully, some insincerely, as things afterwards demonstrated.</p>	<p>exiled, since he had obviously reverted to his impiety.</p>	<p>into exile, together with Eusebius and Theognis and their followers. 1.8.34a Eusebius and Theognis, however, a short time after their banishment, delivered a written declaration of their change of opinion and agreement with the faith of the <i>homoousios</i>, as we will show in what follows here.</p>	<p>I understand that it is of a loose character, resembling Sotadus in licentiousness. It ought to be known that although Eusebius, bishop of Nicomedia, and Theognis, bishop of Nicaea, assented to the document of this faith set forth by the council, they neither agreed nor subscribed to the deposition of Arius.</p>	<p>of Nicaea itself; others of the churches of those in agreement with them. Once again resorting to their usual tricks, Eusebius and Theognis found in the emperor’s kindness an opportunity for deception, so they kept trying to reverse the decision and regain their former power.</p>
<p>Sozomen</p>			<p>Theodoret</p>		
<p>1.21.4 The emperor punished Arius with exile and dispatched edicts to the bishops and people of every country, denouncing him and his adherents as ungodly and commanding that their books should be destroyed, in order that no remembrance of him or of the doctrine which he had taught might remain. Whoever was found hiding his writings and who did not burn them immediately on the accusation would undergo the penalty of death and suffer capital punishment. The emperor wrote letters to every city against Arius and those who had received his doctrines. 1.21.5 He commanded Eusebius and Theognis to leave the cities in which they were bishops. He addressed himself in particular to the church of Nicomedia, urging it to adhere to the faith which had been set forth by the council, to elect orthodox bishops, to obey them, and to let the past fall into oblivion. He threatened with punishment those who should venture to speak well of the exiled bishops or to adopt their sentiments. In these and in other letters, he made clear his resentment against Eusebius, because he had previously adopted the opinions of the tyrant and had engaged in his plots. In accordance with the imperial edicts, Eusebius and Theognis were expelled from the churches which they held, and Amphion received that of Nicomedia, and Chrestus that of Nicaea.</p>			<p>1.7.16 In this way the ungodly man was expelled, and, with unanimous agreement, an official confession of faith was drawn up. To this day, it is still received by the churches. As soon as it was signed, the council was dissolved. The bishops named above, however, did not sincerely consent to it; only in appearance. 1.7.17 This was shown later by their plotting against those who were champions of zeal for the religion, as well as by what the following have written about them. 1.7.18 For instance, Eustathius, the famous bishop of Antioch, who has been already mentioned, when explaining the text in the Proverbs, ‘The Lord created me in the beginning of his way, before his works of old,’ [Prov. 8:22] wrote against them and refuted their blasphemy. Athanasius’s treatise also agrees with this refutation from the great Eustathius.</p>		
<p>Eusebius of Caesarea explains his subscription to the Creed</p>					
<p>Socrates</p>			<p>Theodoret</p>		
<p>1.8.34b At this time during the session of the council, Eusebius, surnamed Pamphilus, bishop of Caesarea in Palestine, after listening attentively for a short time and carefully considering whether he ought to receive this definition of the faith, finally consented to it and subscribed to it with all the rest. He also sent to the people under his charge a copy of the Creed, with an explanation of the word <i>homoousios</i>, so that no one would suspect his motives on account of his previous hesitation. Now this is what was written by Eusebius in his own words:</p>			<p>1.11.7 I will insert here the letter concerning the faith, written by Eusebius, bishop of Caesarea. It describes the indecency of the Arians, who not only despise our fathers, but reject their own. It contains a convincing proof of their madness. 1.11.8 For even though they honor Eusebius as having the same opinions as them, they openly contradict his writings. He wrote this epistle to some of the Arians, who were accusing him, it seems, of treachery. The letter itself explains the writer’s purpose. Epistle of Eusebius, Bishop of Caesarea, which he wrote from Nicaea when the great council was assembled.</p>		

Geladius	Socrates	Theodoret	Anonymous Church History
<p>F13c (p. 109) “Beloved, since rumors usually travel faster than accurate information, you have probably learned from other sources what happened concerning the church’s faith at the great council assembled at Nicaea. As we do not want the facts to be misrepresented by such reports, we have been obliged to transmit to you, first, the formula of faith which we ourselves [i.e. Eusebius] presented, and next, the second, which the assembled fathers put forth with some additions to our words. Our own letter, which was read in the presence of our most pious emperor and declared to be good and free from objectionable statements, reads as follows:</p>	<p>1.8.35 “Beloved, since rumors usually travel faster than accurate information, you have probably learned from other sources what happened concerning the church’s faith at the great council assembled at Nicaea. 1.8.36 As we do not want the facts to be misrepresented by such reports, we have been obliged to transmit to you, first, the formula of faith which we ourselves [i.e. Eusebius] presented, and next, the second, which the assembled fathers put forth with some additions to our words. 1.8.37a Our own letter, which was read in the presence of our most pious emperor and declared to be good and free from objectionable statements, reads as follows:</p>	<p>1.12.1 “Beloved, since rumors usually travel faster than accurate information, you have probably learned from other sources what happened concerning the church’s faith at the great council assembled at Nicaea. As we do not want the facts to be misrepresented by such reports, we have been obliged to transmit to you, first, the formula of faith which we ourselves [i.e. Eusebius] presented, and next, the second, which the assembled fathers put forth with some additions to our words. 1.12.2 Our own letter, which was read in the presence of our most pious emperor and declared to be good and free from objectionable statements, reads as follows:</p>	<p>2.35.1 “Beloved, since rumors usually travel faster than accurate information, you have probably learned from other sources what happened concerning the church’s faith at the great council assembled at Nicaea. As we do not want the facts to be misrepresented by such reports, we have been obliged to transmit to you, first, the formula of faith which we ourselves [i.e. Eusebius] presented, and next, the second, which the assembled fathers put forth with some additions to our words. 2.35.2 Our own letter, which was read in the presence of our most pious emperor and declared to be good and free from objectionable statements, reads as follows:</p>
<p>F13c (p. 109) ““We report now to you our faith, which we have received from the bishops who preceded us when we were first instructed and received the washing [of baptism], which we have also come to know from the divine Scriptures; as we believed and taught in the priesthood, and in the episcopate itself, and as we also believe at the present time:</p>	<p>1.8.37b ““[We report now to you our faith,] which we have received from the bishops who preceded us when we were first instructed and received the washing [of baptism], which we have also come to know from the divine Scriptures; as we believed and taught in the priesthood, and in the episcopate itself, and as we also believe at the present time:</p>	<p>1.12.3 ““We report now to you our faith, which we have received from the bishops who preceded us when we were first instructed and received the washing [of baptism], which we have also come to know from the divine Scriptures; as we believed and taught in the priesthood, and in the episcopate itself, and as we also believe at the present time:</p>	<p>2.35.3 ““We report now to you our faith, which we have received from the bishops who preceded us when we were first instructed and received the washing [of baptism], which we have also come to know from the divine Scriptures; as we believed and taught in the priesthood, and in the episcopate itself, and as we also believe at the present time:</p>
<p>F13c (p. 109) ““We believe in one God, the Father Almighty, the Maker of all things visible and invisible. And in one Lord Jesus Christ, the Word of God, God from God, Light from Light, Life from Life, Only-begotten Son, firstborn of every creature, begotten from the Father before all the ages, by whom also all things were made; who for our salvation was made flesh, and lived among men, and</p>	<p>1.8.38 ““We believe in one God, the Father Almighty, the Maker of all things visible and invisible. And in one Lord Jesus Christ, the Word of God, God from God, Light from Light, Life from Life, Only-begotten Son, firstborn of every creature, begotten from the Father before all the ages, by whom also all things were made; who for our salvation was made flesh, and lived among men, and suffered, and rose again the</p>	<p>1.12.4 ““We believe in one God, the Father Almighty, the Maker of all things visible and invisible. And in one Lord Jesus Christ, the Word of God, God from God, Light from Light, Life from Life, Only-begotten Son, firstborn of every creature, begotten from the Father before all the ages, by whom also all things were made; who for our salvation was made flesh, and lived among men, and suffered, and rose again the third</p>	<p>2.35.4 ““We believe in one God, the Father Almighty, the Maker of all things visible and invisible. And in one Lord Jesus Christ, the Word of God, God from God, Light from Light, Life from Life, Only-begotten Son, firstborn of every creature, begotten from the Father before all the ages, by whom also all things were made; who for our salvation was made flesh, and lived among men, and suffered, and rose again the</p>

<p>suffered, and rose again the third day, and ascended to the Father, and will come again in glory to judge the living and the dead. And we believe in one Holy Spirit as truly Holy Spirit, as also our Lord said when he sent forth his disciples to preach, “Go teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit” [Matt. 28:19].</p>	<p>third day, and ascended to the Father, and will come again in glory to judge the living and the dead. 1.8.39 And we believe also in one Holy Spirit. We believe each of these to be and to exist, the Father truly Father, and the Son truly Son, and the Holy Spirit truly Holy Spirit, as also our Lord said when he sent forth his disciples to preach, “Go teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit” [Matt. 28:19].</p>	<p>day, and ascended to the Father, and will come again in glory to judge the living and the dead. And we believe also in one Holy Spirit. 1.12.5a We believe each of these to be and to exist, the Father truly Father, and the Son truly Son, and the Holy Spirit truly Holy Spirit, as also our Lord said when he sent forth his disciples to preach, “Go teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit” [Matt. 28:19].</p>	<p>third day, and ascended to the Father, and will come again in glory to judge the living and the dead. 2.35.5a We believe in one Holy Spirit as truly Holy Spirit. This is just as also our Lord said when he sent forth his disciples to preach, “Go teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit” [Matt. 28:19].</p>
<p>Gelasius</p>	<p>Socrates</p>	<p>Theodoret</p>	<p>Anonymous Church History</p>
<p>F13c (p. 109) “Concerning which things we confidently affirm that this is what we maintain, how we think, and what we have held up until now, and that we will maintain this faith unto death, anathematizing every ungodly heresy. We testify that we have ever thought these things from our hearts and souls, from earliest memory, and now think and confess the truth before God Almighty and our Lord Jesus Christ. We are able to provide evidence that will assure you that even in times past we have believed and preached the same.’ There was nothing to contradict in this statement of faith we put forward. In fact our most pious emperor, before anyone else, testified that it was comprised of most orthodox statements. He even confessed that such were his own sentiments, and he advised all present to agree to it, and to subscribe and agree with its articles, with the insertion of the single word, <i>homoousios</i>.</p>	<p>1.8.40 “Concerning which things we confidently affirm that this is what we maintain, how we think, and what we have held up until now, and that we will maintain this faith unto death, anathematizing every ungodly heresy. We testify that we have ever thought these things from our hearts and souls, from earliest memory, and now think and confess the truth before God Almighty and our Lord Jesus Christ. We are able to provide evidence that will assure you that even in times past we have believed and preached the same.’ 1.8.41 There was nothing to contradict in this statement of faith we put forward. In fact our most pious emperor, before anyone else, testified that it was comprised of most orthodox statements. He even confessed that such were his own sentiments, and he advised all present to agree to it, and to subscribe and agree with its articles, with the insertion of the single word, <i>homoousios</i>.</p>	<p>1.12.5b “Concerning which things we confidently affirm that this is what we maintain, how we think, and what we have held up until now, and that we will maintain this faith unto death, anathematizing every ungodly heresy. 1.12.6 We testify that we have ever thought these things from our hearts and souls, from earliest memory, and now think and confess the truth before God Almighty and our Lord Jesus Christ. We are able to provide evidence that will assure you that even in times past we have believed and preached the same.’ 1.12.7a There was nothing to contradict in this statement of faith we put forward. In fact our most pious emperor, before anyone else, testified that it was comprised of most orthodox statements. He even confessed that such were his own sentiments, and he advised all present to agree to it, and to subscribe and agree with its articles, with the insertion of the single word, <i>homoousios</i>.</p>	<p>2.35.5b “Concerning which things we confidently affirm that this is what we maintain, how we think, and what we have held up until now, and that we will maintain this faith unto death, anathematizing every ungodly heresy. 2.35.6 We testify that we have ever thought these things from our hearts and souls, from earliest memory, and now think and confess the truth before God Almighty and our Lord Jesus Christ. We are able to provide evidence that will assure you that even in times past we have believed and preached the same.’ 2.35.7a There was nothing to contradict in this statement of faith we put forward. In fact our most pious emperor, before anyone else, testified that it was comprised of most orthodox statements. He even confessed that such were his own sentiments, and he advised all present to agree to it, and to subscribe and agree with its articles, with the insertion of the single word, <i>homoousios</i>.</p>
<p>F13c (p. 111) “He gave his interpretation of this word, saying that the Son was not <i>homoousios</i> according to what we experience in our bodies, as if</p>	<p>1.8.42 “He gave his interpretation of this word, saying that the Son was not <i>homoousios</i> according to what we experience in our bodies, as if the Son had come to be</p>	<p>1.12.7b “He gave his interpretation of this word, saying that the Son was not <i>homoousios</i> according to what we experience in our bodies, as if the Son had come to be</p>	<p>2.35.7b “He gave his interpretation of this word, saying that the Son was not <i>homoousios</i> according to what we experience in our bodies, as if the Son had</p>

<p>the Son had come to be by dividing or breaking off from the Father. For his nature could not be subjected to any bodily experiences, as it does not consist of matter, exists in a spiritual realm, and has no body. Therefore such things must be thought of in divine, unspeakable concepts. Such were the theological remarks of our most wise and most pious emperor. But they were intent on adding the word <i>homoousios</i> and drew up the following statement. ‘The faith which was dictated at the council:</p>	<p>by dividing or breaking off from the Father. For his nature could not be subjected to any bodily experiences, as it does not consist of matter, exists in a spiritual realm, and has no body. Therefore such things must be thought of in divine, unspeakable concepts. 1.8.43 Such were the theological remarks of our most wise and most pious emperor. But they were intent on adding the word <i>homoousios</i> and drew up the following statement. ‘The faith which was dictated at the council:</p>	<p>by dividing or breaking off from the Father. For his nature could not be subjected to any bodily experiences, as it does not consist of matter, exists in a spiritual realm, and has no body. Therefore such things must be thought of in divine, unspeakable concepts. Such were the theological remarks of our most wise and most pious emperor. But they were intent on adding the word <i>homoousios</i> and drew up the following statement. ‘The faith which was dictated at the council:</p>	<p>come to be by dividing or breaking off from the Father. For his nature could not be subjected to any bodily experiences, as it does not consist of matter, exists in a spiritual realm, and has no body. Therefore such things must be thought of in divine, unspeakable concepts. Such were the theological remarks of our most wise and most pious emperor. But they were intent on adding the word <i>homoousios</i> and drew up the following statement: 2.35.8a ‘The faith which was dictated at the council:</p>
<p>Gelasius</p>	<p>Socrates</p>	<p>Theodoret</p>	<p>Anonymous Church History</p>
<p>F13c (p. 111) ‘We believe in one God, the Father Almighty, maker of all things visible and invisible; and in one Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of God, begotten of the Father, Only-begotten, that is, from the essence of the Father, God from God, Light from Light, true God from true God, begotten not made, <i>homoousios</i> with the Father, by whom all things were made, both things in heaven and things on earth, who for us men and for our salvation came down and was made flesh, was made man, suffered, and rose again the third day, ascended into heaven, and will come to judge the living and the dead; and we believe in the Holy Spirit. But those who say, “Once he did not exist,” and “He did not exist before he was begotten,” and “He came to be from nothing,” or those who pretend that the Son of God is “of another subsistence or being,” or “created,” or “alterable,” or “changeable,” the catholic and apostolic church anathematizes.’</p>	<p>1.8.44 ‘We believe in one God, the Father Almighty, maker of all things visible and invisible; and in one Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of God, begotten of the Father, Only-begotten, that is, from the essence of the Father, God from God, Light from Light, true God from true God, begotten not made, <i>homoousios</i> with the Father, by whom all things were made, both things in heaven and things on earth, who for us men and for our salvation came down and was made flesh, was made man, suffered, and rose again the third day, ascended into heaven, and will come to judge the living and the dead; and we believe in the Holy Spirit. 1.8.45 But those who say, “Once he did not exist,” and “He did not exist before he was begotten,” and “He came to be from nothing,” or those who pretend that the Son of God is “of another subsistence or being,” or “created,” or “alterable,” or “changeable,” the holy catholic and apostolic church of God anathematizes.’</p>	<p>1.12.8 ‘We believe in one God, the Father Almighty, maker of all things visible and invisible; and in one Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of God, begotten of the Father, Only-begotten, that is, from the essence of the Father, God from God, Light from Light, true God from true God, begotten not made, <i>homoousios</i> with the Father, by whom all things were made, both things in heaven and things on earth, who for us men and for our salvation came down and was made flesh, was made man, suffered, and rose again the third day, ascended into heaven, and will come to judge the living and the dead; and we believe in the Holy Spirit. But those who say, “Once he did not exist,” and “He did not exist before he was begotten,” and “He came to be from nothing,” or those who pretend that the Son of God is “of another subsistence or being,” or “created,” or “alterable,” or “changeable,” the holy catholic and apostolic church anathematizes.’</p>	<p>2.35.8b ‘We believe in one God, the Father Almighty, maker of all things visible and invisible; and in one Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of God, begotten of the Father, Only-begotten, that is, from the essence of the Father, God from God, Light from Light, true God from true God, begotten not made, <i>homoousios</i> with the Father, by whom all things were made, both things in heaven and things on earth, who for us men and for our salvation came down and was made flesh, was made man, suffered, and rose again the third day, ascended into heaven, and will come to judge the living and the dead; and we believe in the Holy Spirit. But those who say, “Once he did not exist,” and “He did not exist before he was begotten,” and “He came to be from nothing,” or those who pretend that the Son of God is “of another subsistence or being,” or “created,” or “alterable,” or “changeable,” the catholic and apostolic church anathematizes.’</p>

<p>As this formula was being debated, we made sure to inquire in what sense they introduced ‘from the essence of the Father’ and ‘<i>homoousios</i> with the Father.’ Through intense questioning and explaining, the meaning of the words was examined closely. They explained that the phrase ‘of the same being as’ indicated that the Son is truly from the Father, but he is not a part of him. We felt we could agree to this word when used in this sense, to teach, as it did, that the Son was from the Father, not however a part of his essence. On this account we agreed to the sense ourselves, without denying even the term, since maintaining peace was our goal, provided we did not depart from the orthodox understanding.</p>	<p>1.8.46 As this formula was being debated, we made sure to inquire in what sense they introduced ‘from the essence of the Father’ and ‘<i>homoousios</i> with the Father.’ 1.8.47 Through intense questioning and explaining, the meaning of the words was examined closely. They explained that the phrase ‘of the same being as’ indicated that the Son is truly from the Father, but he is not a part of him. We felt we could agree to this word when used in this sense, to teach, as it did, that the Son was from the Father, not however a part of his essence. 1.8.48 On this account we agreed to the sense ourselves, without denying even the term <i>homoousios</i> since maintaining peace was our goal, provided we did not depart from the orthodox understanding.</p>	<p>1.12.9 As this formula was being debated, we made sure to inquire in what sense they introduced ‘from the essence of the Father’ and ‘<i>homoousios</i> with the Father.’ Through intense questioning and explaining, the meaning of the words was examined closely. They explained that the phrase ‘of the same being as’ indicated that the Son is truly from the Father, but he is not a part of him. 1.12.10 We felt we could agree to this word when used in this sense, to teach, as it did, that the Son was from the Father, not however a part of his essence. On this account we agreed to the sense ourselves, without denying even the term, since maintaining peace was our goal, provided we did not depart from the orthodox understanding.</p>	<p>2.35.9 As this formula was being debated, we made sure to inquire in what sense they introduced ‘from the essence of the Father’ and ‘<i>homoousios</i> with the Father.’ Through intense questioning and explaining, the meaning of the words was examined closely. They explained that the phrase ‘of the same being as’ indicated that the Son is truly from the Father, but he is not a part of him. 2.35.10 We felt we could agree to this word when used in this sense, to teach, as it did, that the Son was from the Father, not however a part of his essence. On this account we agreed to the sense ourselves, without denying even the term, since maintaining peace was our goal, provided we did not depart from the orthodox understanding.</p>
<p>Gelasius</p>	<p>Socrates</p>	<p>Theodoret</p>	<p>Anonymous Church History</p>
<p>F13c (p. 113) In the same way we also accepted the phrase ‘begotten, not made,’ since the council asserted that ‘made’ was a term used to designate other creatures which came to be through the Son, to whom the Son had no similarity. So according to their reasoning, he was not something made that resembled the things which came to exist through him but was of an essence which is too high to be put on the same level as anything which was made. The divine sayings teach us that his essence was begotten from the Father and that the mode of his being begotten is inexpressible and unable to be conceived by any nature which has had a beginning of its existence. So when we considered it, we found that there are grounds for saying that the Son is <i>homoousios</i> with the Father; not like human bodies,</p>	<p>1.8.49 In the same way we also accepted the phrase ‘begotten, not made,’ since the council asserted that ‘made’ was a term used to designate other creatures which came to be through the Son, to whom the Son had no similarity. So according to their reasoning, he was not something made that resembled the things which came to exist through him but was of an essence which is too high to be put on the same level as anything which was made. The divine sayings teach us that his essence was begotten from the Father and that the mode of his being begotten is inexpressible and unable to be conceived by any nature which has had a beginning of its existence. 1.8.50 So when we considered it, we found that there are grounds for saying that the Son is <i>homoousios</i> with the Father; not like human bodies, nor like mortal</p>	<p>1.12.11 In the same way we also accepted the phrase ‘begotten, not made,’ since the council asserted that ‘made’ was a term used to designate other creatures which came to be through the Son, to whom the Son had no similarity. So according to their reasoning, he was not something made that resembled the things which came to exist through him but was of an essence which is too high to be put on the same level as anything which was made. The divine sayings teach us that his essence was begotten from the Father and that the mode of his being begotten is inexpressible and unable to be conceived by any nature which has had a beginning of its existence. 1.12.12 So when we considered it, we found that there are grounds for saying that the Son is <i>homoousios</i> with the Father; not like human bodies, nor like mortal</p>	<p>2.35.11 In the same way we also accepted the phrase ‘begotten, not made,’ since the council asserted that ‘made’ was a term used to designate other creatures which came to be through the Son, to whom the Son had no similarity. So according to their reasoning, he was not something made that resembled the things which came to exist through him but was of an essence which is too high to be put on the same level as anything which was made. The divine sayings teach us that his essence was begotten from the Father and that the mode of his being begotten is inexpressible and unable to be conceived by any nature which has had a beginning of its existence. 2.35.12 So when we considered it, we found that there are grounds for saying that the Son is <i>homoousios</i> with the Father; not like human bodies, nor like</p>

<p>nor like mortal beings, for he is not ‘of the same being as’ by dividing his essence, or by cutting something off, or by having something done to him, or being altered, or by changing the Father’s essence and power (since the Father’s nature has no beginning to its existence, and therefore none of those descriptions apply to it). ‘<i>Homoousios</i> with the Father’ suggests that the Son of God bears no resemblance to the creatures who came into being, but that he is in every way similar to his Father alone who begat him, and that he is not of any other subsistence and essence, but from the Father. It also seemed good for us to agree to this term, since we were aware that even among the ancients, some learned and eminent bishops and writers have used the term <i>homoousios</i> in their theological teaching concerning the Father and Son.</p>	<p>beings, for he is not ‘of the same being as’ by dividing his essence, or by cutting something off, or by having something done to him, or being altered, or by changing the Father’s essence and power (since the Father’s nature has no beginning to its existence, and therefore none of those descriptions apply to it). ‘<i>Homoousios</i> with the Father’ suggests that the Son of God bears no resemblance to the creatures who came into being, but that he is in every way similar to his Father alone who begat him, and that he is not of any other subsistence and essence, but from the Father. 1.8.51 It also seemed good for us to agree to this term, since we were aware that even among the ancients, some learned and eminent bishops and writers have used the term <i>homoousios</i> in their theological teaching concerning the Father and Son.</p>	<p>beings, for he is not ‘of the same being as’ by dividing his essence, or by cutting something off, or by having something done to him, or being altered, or by changing the Father’s essence and power (since the Father’s nature has no beginning to its existence, and therefore none of those descriptions apply to it). 1.12.13 ‘<i>Homoousios</i> with the Father’ suggests that the Son of God bears no resemblance to the creatures who came into being, but that he is in every way similar to his Father alone who begat him, and that he is not of any other subsistence and essence, but from the Father. It also seemed good for us to agree to this term, since we were aware that even among the ancients, some learned and eminent bishops and writers have used the term <i>homoousios</i> in their theological teaching concerning the Father and Son.</p>	<p>mortal beings, for he is not ‘of the same being as’ by dividing his essence, or by cutting something off, or by having something done to him, or being altered, or by changing the Father’s essence and power (since the Father’s nature has no beginning to its existence, and therefore none of those descriptions apply to it). 2.35.13 ‘<i>Homoousios</i> with the Father’ suggests that the Son of God bears no resemblance to the creatures who came into being, but that he is in every way similar to his Father alone who begat him, and that he is not of any other subsistence and essence, but from the Father. It also seemed good for us to agree to this term, since we were aware that even among the ancients, some learned and eminent bishops and writers have used the term <i>homoousios</i> in their theological teaching concerning the Father and Son.</p>
<p>Gelasius</p>	<p>Socrates</p>	<p>Theodoret</p>	<p>Anonymous Church History</p>
<p>F13c (p. 113) So much then for the Creed which was composed at the council, to which all of us agreed, not without some questioning, but according to a specific sense, brought up before the most pious emperor himself, and qualified by the considerations mentioned above. As far as the condemnation they attached to the end of the Creed, it did not cause us pain, because it forbade the use of words not found in Scripture, from which almost all the confusion and disorder in the church have come. Since, then, no divinely inspired Scripture has used the phrases, ‘out of nothing,’ and ‘once he was not,’ and the rest which follow, there appeared no ground for using or teaching them. We think that this was a good</p>	<p>1.8.52 So much then for the Creed which was composed at the council, to which all of us agreed, not without some questioning, but according to a specific sense, brought up before the most pious emperor himself, and qualified by the considerations mentioned above. As far as the condemnation they attached to the end of the Creed, it did not cause us pain, because it forbade the use of words not found in Scripture, from which almost all the confusion and disorder in the church have come. 1.8.53 Since, then, no divinely inspired Scripture has used the phrases, ‘out of nothing,’ and ‘once he was not,’ and the rest which follow, there appeared no ground for using or teaching them. We think that this</p>	<p>1.12.14 So much then for the Creed which was composed at the council, to which all of us agreed, not without some questioning, but according to a specific sense, brought up before the most pious emperor himself, and qualified by the considerations mentioned above. 1.12.15 As far as the condemnation they attached to the end of the Creed, it did not cause us pain, because it forbade the use of words not found in Scripture, from which almost all the confusion and disorder in the church have come. Since, then, no divinely inspired Scripture has used the phrases, ‘out of nothing,’ and ‘once he was not,’ and the rest which follow, there appeared no ground for using or teaching them. We</p>	<p>2.35.14 So much then for the Creed which was composed at the council, to which all of us agreed, not without some questioning, but according to a specific sense, brought up before the most pious emperor himself, and qualified by the considerations mentioned above. 2.35.15 As far as the condemnation they attached to the end of the Creed, it did not cause us pain, because it forbade the use of words not found in Scripture, from which almost all the confusion and disorder in the church have come. Since, then, no divinely inspired Scripture has used the phrases, ‘out of nothing,’ and ‘once he was not,’ and the rest which follow, there appeared no ground for using or teaching them.</p>

decision, since it has never been our custom to use these terms.	was a good decision since it has never been our custom to use these terms.	think that this was a good decision since it has never been our custom to use these terms.	2.35.16a We think that this was a good decision since it has never been our custom to use these terms.
Gelasius	Socrates	Theodoret	Anonymous Church History
F13c (p. 115) Additionally, it did not seem out of place to condemn the statement, ‘Before he was begotten he did not exist,’ because everyone confesses that the Son of God existed before he was begotten according to the flesh. At this point in the discussion, our most pious emperor maintained that the Son existed before all ages even according to his divinely inspired begetting, since even before the act of begetting was performed, in potentiality he was with the Father, even before he was begotten by him, since the Father is always Father, just as he is always King and always Savior; he has the potentiality to be all things and remains exactly the same forever.		1.12.16 Additionally, it did not seem out of place to condemn the statement, ‘Before he was begotten he did not exist,’ because everyone confesses that the Son of God existed before he was begotten according to the flesh. 1.12.17 At this point in the discussion, our most pious emperor maintained that the Son existed before all ages even according to his divinely inspired begetting, since even before the act of begetting was performed, in potentiality he was with the Father, even before he was begotten by him, since the Father is always Father, just as he is always King and always Savior; he has the potentiality to be all things and remains exactly the same forever.	2.35.16b Additionally, it did not seem out of place to condemn the statement, ‘Before he was begotten he did not exist,’ because everyone confesses that the Son of God existed before he was begotten according to the flesh. 2.35.17 At this point in the discussion, our most pious emperor maintained that the Son existed before all ages even according to his divinely inspired begetting, since even before the act of begetting was performed, in potentiality he was with the Father, even before he was begotten by him, since the Father is always Father, just as he is always King and always Savior; he has the potentiality to be all things and remains exactly the same forever.
F13c (p. 115) We deemed it necessary for us, beloved, to inform you of the care which has characterized both our examination of and unanimity in these things, that on justifiable grounds we resisted to the last moment the introduction of certain objectionable expressions as long as these were not acceptable. We received them without dispute when on mature deliberation as we examined the sense of the words they appeared to agree with what we had originally proposed as a sound confession of faith. We greet you and the	1.8.54 We deemed it necessary for us, beloved, to inform you of the care which has characterized both our examination of and unanimity in these things, that on justifiable grounds we resisted to the last moment the introduction of certain objectionable expressions as long as these were not acceptable. We received them without dispute when on mature deliberation as we examined the sense of the words they appeared to agree with what we had originally proposed as a sound confession of faith.” 1.8.55a Such was the letter addressed by Eusebius Pamphilus to the Christians at Caesarea in Palestine.	1.12.18 We deemed it necessary for us, beloved, to inform you of the care which has characterized both our examination of and unanimity in these things, that on justifiable grounds we resisted to the last moment the introduction of certain objectionable expressions as long as these were not acceptable. We received them without dispute when on mature deliberation as we examined the sense of the words they appeared to agree with what we had originally proposed as a sound confession of faith.”	2.35.18 We deemed it necessary for us, beloved, to inform you of the care which has characterized both our examination of and unanimity in these things, that on justifiable grounds we resisted to the last moment the introduction of certain objectionable expressions as long as these were not acceptable. We received them without dispute when on mature deliberation as we examined the sense of the words they appeared to agree with what we had originally proposed as a sound confession of faith. We greet you and the brothers who are with you. We pray that you are strong in the Lord, dear brothers.” ¹

¹ The text of the Anonymous Church History is not identical in this letter to the other texts; in a handful of locations, the wording has been slightly altered. However, the texts are so similar that we have opted to apply the same translation to the ACH as to the other documents to indicate that the ACH is in almost every way reproducing the same text.

brothers who are with you. We pray that you are strong in the Lord, dear brothers.”			
---	--	--	--

Created by AGC, edited by AGC and RR.