

SOME ACCOUNT
OF THE
COUNCIL OF NICÆA,
IN CONNEXION WITH THE
LIFE OF ATHANASIUS.

BY
JOHN KAYE, D.D.

LORD BISHOP OF LINCOLN.

LONDON:
FRANCIS & JOHN RIVINGTON,
ST. PAUL'S CHURCH YARD, AND WATERLOO PLACE.
1853.

9212
A 11

LONDON :
GILBERT AND RIVINGTON, PRINTERS,
ST. JOHN'S SQUARE.

GIFT OF
JAMES G. PHELPS STOKES

ADVERTISEMENT.

It is generally known that the death of the learned and pious Dr. Kaye took place at the commencement of the present year. In consequence of that event the publication of this work was postponed, partly because the revision of the Preface had not been completed by the Author, and partly because the Publishers had been led to expect that an Appendix would be found among his papers. As this expectation has not been realized, it is concluded, either that the Author had abandoned his intention, or had not the leisure to carry it into effect. The work is therefore presented to the public in the state in which it was left at the time of his decease. The Preface has been submitted to his learned and very intimate friend, the Rev. J. A. Jeremie, D.D., Regius Professor of Divinity in the University of Cambridge, with the view of correcting verbal errors, should any have occurred, in that portion of the work which had not received the final revision of the Author.

July, 1853.

P R E F A C E.

THE following work is designed for the use of the Theological Student,—to assist him in arriving at a just judgment respecting the history and nature of the Arian controversy. As far as that controversy affected the temporal interests of the Christians, its history forms a part of the history of the Roman empire, and, in consequence, occupies the twenty-first chapter of Gibbon's great work. That chapter displays, in common with every other part of his history, the indefatigable industry of the author in collecting his materials, and his consummate skill in arranging them, so as to give the reader a clear and comprehensive view of the subject. I think, too, that on the whole he is not chargeable with unfairness. The controversy was not between Christians and heathen philosophers; there was, therefore nothing to call forth the expression of that personal resentment which he has been accused of entertaining against Christianity. Both parties were Christians; and

he is content to look down upon them with contemptuous impartiality. I must, however, add that I know no part of the history in which the student requires to be more on his guard against that which I conceive to be his greatest danger in perusing it,—the danger of becoming insensibly inoculated with the sceptical and sneering spirit of the author.

The history of the controversy has also been written by Mr. Newman, in “*The Arians of the Fourth Century.*” The reader will find occasional references to the work, as well as to the author’s notes in the Oxford translation of the treatises of Athanasius. No one can read them without admiring the extensive reading and the subtlety of the writer, nor without feeling a conviction that he was, when he wrote them, contemplating the step which he afterwards took,—that of secession to Rome.

Prefixed to the Translation of the Historical Tracts is a Dissertation on certain chronological difficulties connected with the life of Athanasius. The design of my work did not render it necessary for me to aim at minute accuracy on these points. I have, therefore, adopted the dates assigned by Montfaucon, the Benedictine editor, with whom I concur in thinking that only one council was held at Rome in the case of Athanasius.

I have referred to the *Philosophumena* under the name of Origen. In making that reference, I do not mean to pronounce an opinion on the disputed question respecting the authorship of the work; I have not examined it with that accuracy which would justify me in pronouncing one. For the purpose for which I refer to the work it matters little whether Origen or Hippolytus, Bishop of Portus, was the author. I will add the dates of the principal works of Athanasius, as assigned by Montfaucon:—

Oratio contra Gentes . . .	} Before the rise of the Arian Controversy, probably }	} A. D. 318
De Incarnatione Verbi Dei		
Encyclica ad Episcopos Epistola		A. D. 341
Apologia contra Arianos		about A. D. 350
De Decretis Synodi Nicænæ		A. D. 352
De Sententia Dionysii		A. D. 352
Epistola ad Episcopos Ægypt. et Lib.		A. D. 356
Apologia ad Constantium		A. D. 356
Apologia de Fugâ		A. D. 357, 358
Epistola ad Monachos		A. D. 358
Orationes contra Arianos		A. D. 358
Epistola ad Serapionem de Spiritu Sancto		A. D. 358
De Synodis		A. D. 359
De Incarnatione Dei Verbi et contra Arianos . . .		A. D. 365
Epistola ad Afros		A. D. 369
—— ad Epictetum Episcopum Corinthium . . .		A. D. 371
Contra Apollinarium		A. D. 372

CONTENTS.

	PAGE
ACCOUNT OF THE COUNCIL OF NICÆA	1
SOME ACCOUNT OF THE FOUR ORATIONS OF ATHANASIUS AGAINST THE ARIANS	152
SOME ACCOUNT OF THE TRACT DE INCARNATIONE CHRISTI	282

SOME ACCOUNT
OF THE
COUNCIL OF NICÆA,

&c. &c. &c.

NEXT to the conversion of Constantine to Christianity, the calling of the Council of Nicæa was the event of his reign most productive of important consequences to the Church. We might, therefore, reasonably expect to find in the pages of the Historian of the Church and the Panegyrist of the Emperor, a full account of the causes which gave occasion to it, of the discussions which took place during its continuance, and of the decrees by which the assembled Fathers decided the disputed points and settled the Christian Creed. If, however, we turn to the pages of Eusebius with this expectation, we shall be disappointed. The subject was one on which he evidently felt little disposition to dwell, whether from dissatisfaction with the course which the proceedings took, or with the Confession of Faith which the Council finally propounded. Nothing can be more meagre than his account. We

must, therefore, draw our information from other sources, of which the principal are the writings of Athanasius, who, though he attended the Council only as the deacon of the Bishop of Alexandria, spent his life in the uncompromising assertion of its decrees; and the works of three historians, one a bishop, ¹Theodoret, the other two laymen, ²Socrates, and ³Sozomen, who lived in the fifth century.

¹ Bishop of Cyrus in Syria. He bore a prominent part in the Councils of Ephesus and Chalcedon. See Cave's *Historia Literaria*, Sæc. V.

² Socrates says himself, that he was born and bred at Constantinople (L. 5. c. 24), where, while very young, he received instruction from Helladius and Ammonius, heathen grammarians, who had fled from Alexandria after the commotion excited by the attempt of Theophilus the Bishop, to destroy the heathen temples. L. 5. c. 16. This tumult took place in the eleventh year of the reign of Theodosius, A.D. 389. Valesius assigns reasons for concluding, that he studied rhetoric under the Sophist Troilus. He afterwards pleaded as an advocate at Constantinople, and on that account received the title of Scholasticus. He has been charged with being a Novatian. Valesius thinks that he was not himself a member of their sect, though he might not be disinclined to their tenets.

³ The grandfather of Sozomen had been converted to Christianity, by witnessing a miraculous cure performed upon an inhabitant of the town in which he dwelt, by the monk Hilarion. L. 5. c. 15. His family appears to have been settled at Maiuma, the port of Gaza, in Palestine, where he was probably born. L. 7. c. 28. He afterwards pleaded as an advocate at Constantinople, L. 2. c. 3, and was present at the ceremony which took place, during the episcopate of Proclus, in honour of the forty martyrs who suffered death during the reign of Licinius, and whose relics had been discovered. L. 9. c. 2. He always speaks favourably of the monastic life. He had composed, in

According to ¹ Socrates, Alexander, Bishop of Alexandria, in discoursing on the doctrine of the Holy Trinity before the presbyters and other clergy, insisted so strongly on the Unity in Trinity, that ² Arius, a man skilled in dialectics, charged him with introducing Sabellianism, and running into the opposite extreme, contended that, ³ if the Father begat the Son, He who was begotten had a commencement of subsistence: that there was consequently a time when the Son was not; and ⁴ He derived His substance from things which were not. ⁵ Sozomen's account differs in some respect from that of Socrates. According to him, Arius caused the disturbance of the peace of the Church by broaching his opinions: and Alexander was charged with remissness, because he did not immediately notice them. He then

two books, an Epitome of Ecclesiastical History, from the Ascension of Christ to the deposition of Licinius, L. 1. c. 1. p. 327 C: this work has perished.

¹ L. 1. c. 5. Theodoret, L. 1. c. 2, accuses Arius of being actuated by envy of Alexander's elevation to the Episcopal throne.

² In his letter to Eusebius of Nicomedia, Arius says that Alexander used expressions such as the following: ἄμα πατήρ, ἄμα υἱός· συνυπάρχει ἀγεννήτως ὁ υἱὸς τῷ Θεῷ· ἀγεννητογενής ἐστίν· οὔτε ἐπινοία, οὔτε ἀτόμῳ τινὲ προάγει ὁ Θεὸς τοῦ υἱοῦ· ἐξ αὐτοῦ ἐστὶ τοῦ Θεοῦ ὁ υἱός. Theodoret, L. 1. c. 5.

³ εἰ ὁ πατὴρ ἐγέννησε τὸν υἱόν, ἀρχὴν ὑπάρξεως ἔχει ὁ γεννηθείς· καὶ ἐκ τούτου ἐῆλον· ὅτι ἦν ὅτε οὐκ ἦν ὁ υἱός· ἀκολουθεῖ τε ἐξ ἀνάγκης ἐξ οὐκ ὄντων ἔχειν αὐτὸν τὴν ὑπόστασιν.

⁴ In other words, He was a created Being, made out of things which were not. Theodoret, L. 1. c. 2.

⁵ L. 1. c. 15.

summoned the two parties before him, and required them to state their respective arguments, in hearing which he exhibited great impartiality: but at last decided in favour of those who held the Consubstantiality and Co-eternity of the Son. ¹ Mr. Newman adopts the account of Alexander's remissness, and says that much mischief ensued from his misplaced meekness. Yet it may be urged in his behalf, that the questions raised by Arius were ² new, and turned upon points beyond the reach of human comprehension: points, upon which a man, conscious of his own fallibility, might well pause before he pronounced an authoritative decision. It may be doubted also, whether Alexander's meekness did not conciliate many who might have been alienated from him, if he had at once assumed a peremptory and dogmatic tone. Arius appears to have been a man of unstable mind. ³ He at first

¹ History of Arians, c. 3. sect. 1. According to Socrates, Alexander became excited, *πρὸς ὀργὴν ἐξάπτεται*, by hearing that many bishops sided with Arius. L. 1. c. 6.

² *εἰς ζήτησιν ἄγουσαι τὰ πρότερον ἀνεξέταστα*. Sozomen, ubi supra.

³ Sozomen, ubi s. Philostorgius tells us, that on the occasion of the election into the vacant see of Alexandria, after the death of Achilles, Arius caused the suffrages, which were going in his own favour, to be transferred to Alexander, whose election he thus secured. Theodoret, as we have seen, makes a very different statement. The same writer adds, that a presbyter of the name of Alexander, who was next in rank to Arius, and called Baucalis, on account of an excrescence on his back, caused the dispute between the bishop and Arius, respecting the consubstantiality of the Son. L. 1. cc. 3, 4.

attached himself to Meletius, of whom we shall hear more in the account of the proceedings of the Council, and whom he afterwards quitted. He was then ordained deacon by Peter, Bishop of Alexandria; but when Meletius was excommunicated, again joined him, and was involved in the same sentence of excommunication. After the Martyrdom of Peter, having asked pardon for his offence, he was permitted by Achillas, who succeeded Peter, to officiate. He was afterwards admitted to the presbyterate, and greatly esteemed by Alexander. ¹ Epiphanius describes him as tall in stature, with a downcast look, his figure composed like that of a subtle serpent, to deceive the guileless by his crafty exterior; his dress was simple; his address soft and smooth, calculated to persuade and attract, so that he had drawn away seven hundred virgins from the Church to his party.

² The flame kindled by the dissensions at Alexandria quickly spread through the whole of Ægypt, Libya, and the Upper Thebais, and extended itself

¹ Hæresis lxix. c. 3. This is the passage referred to and praised by Gibbon, c. 21. In his letter to Eusebius of Nicomedeæ, Arius calls Ammonius, by whom he sent it, his father; but the Benedictine Editor thinks that the title was given to testify respect, not to express the actual relationship between the parties. Epiphanius says, that he was by birth a Libyan, and presbyter of a church in Alexandria, called Baucaleus.

² Socrates, L. 1. c. 6.

to other provinces. Bishops, according to the lively description of ¹ Eusebius, were engaged in wordy warfare with bishops: the people were divided into parties; while the Heathen, taking advantage of the folly and madness of the Christians, ² made the most awful mysteries of Faith subjects of profane ridicule in the theatre. Several bishops sided with Arius, among them Eusebius, formerly Bishop of Berytus, then of ³ Nicomedia in Bithynia, to whom he addressed a letter, in which he complained of being persecuted by Alexander; and stated that Eusebius of Cæsarea, Theodotus of Laodicea, Paulinus of Tyre, Athanasius of Anazarbus, Gregory of Berytus, Aetius of Lydda, indeed all the Eastern bishops, with the exception of ⁴ Philogonius, Hellanicus, and

¹ De vitâ Constantini, L. 2. c. 61. See Theodoret, L. 1. c. 6.

² Athanasius charges the Arians with making the disputed points subjects of common and irreverent talk among women and children. Oratio 1, contra Arianos, c. 22. Alexander makes a similar charge in his letter to his namesake of Constantinople. Theodoret, L. 1. c. 4. p. 9 D.

³ The Bishops of Ægypt, in their encyclical letter, animadvert severely on Eusebius on account of this translation, which was contrary to the Canons. Apologia contra Arianos, c. 6. See also c. 25. Athanasius charges him also with plotting to procure the ejection of Paul from Constantinople, in order that he might himself occupy the See. Ad Monachos, c. 7. Theodoret, L. 1. c. 19, and Philostorgius, L. 2. c. 12, say erroneously, that Eusebius succeeded Alexander in the See of Constantinople.

⁴ Theodoret, L. 1. c. 5. Arius charges Philogonius, who was Bishop of Antioch, with calling the Son *ἐρυνγή*, a word which I do not attempt to translate; Hellanicus, who was Bishop of

Macarius, whom he styles heretical, uninstructed (*ἀκατηχήτων*) men, maintained that ¹God, being Himself unoriginate, existed before the Son. He himself maintained that the Son was not ingenerate, nor in any respect a part of *the* Ingenerate, nor from any subject matter, but from things which were not: He subsisted by the will and counsel (of the Father) before all times and ages, perfect God, only begotten, unchangeable; and He *was* not, before He was ²begotten, or created, or predestined, or founded. For holding this opinion, Arius complains that he was persecuted.

To this letter ³Eusebius replied in one of encouragement, in which he expressed his entire concurrence with the opinions of Arius; saying, that what is made could not be before it was made, and must have a beginning of existence. ⁴He also addressed a letter to Paulinus of Tyre, who, though numbered by Arius among those who agreed with him, appears to have abstained from openly giving an opinion. Eusebius, therefore, urged Paulinus to

Tripolis, with calling Him *προβολή*, an emission; and Macarius, who was Bishop of Jerusalem, with saying that He was co-ingenerate *συναγέννητος* with the Father.

¹ ὅτι προϋπάρχει ὁ Θεὸς τοῦ υἱοῦ ἀνάρχως.

² οὐκ ἦν πρὶν γεννηθῆναι, ἢτοι κτισθῆναι, ἢ ὁρισθῆναι, ἢ θεμελιωθῆναι.

³ De Synodis, c. 17.

⁴ Theodoret, L. 1. c. 6. It appears from this letter, that Eusebius of Cæsarea had at one time expressed himself more openly in favour of Arius.

declare himself, and to write to Alexander, with whom his authority would have great weight. Finding that Arius and his friends were thus active in circulating their sentiments, Alexander, ¹as we have seen, was roused to anger, and wrote ²letters to the bishops of the Universal Church to put them on their guard against the misrepresentations of Eusebius and the other supporters of the Arian cause. ³He also addressed a letter to Alexander, Bishop of Constantinople, in which he entered fully into the tenets of Arius, whom he charges with being actuated by the desire of power. He describes the Arians as selecting those passages of Scripture which speak of the humiliation of Christ, and passing over those which declare His Godhead, and thus insidiously instilling their opinions into the minds of those who frequented their assemblies. Ebion, he says, Artemas, and Paul of Samosata were the forerunners of Arius; but he derived his doctrine immediately from ⁴Lucian, who had adopted the cause

¹ See note 1, p. 4.

² Socrates, L. 1. c. 6.

³ Theodoret, L. 1. c. 4, who states that Alexander wrote also to Philogonius and Eustathius, Bishops of Berrhœa, and to other orthodox bishops. According to Epiphanius, he wrote nearly seventy letters to different bishops, among whom were Eusebius of Cæsarea, Macarius of Jerusalem, Asclepas of Gaza, Longinus of Ascalon, Macrinus of Iamnia. He wrote also to Zeno, an aged man of Tyre. Hæres. lxi. c. 4.

⁴ Jerome in *Catalogo* says, that Lucian was a presbyter of Antioch, a man of great eloquence: that an edition of the Septuagint, which was generally received in the Eastern Church,

of Paul, and had remained out of the communion of the Church during the incumbency of three successive bishops of Antioch. Alexander adds, that three Syrian Bishops, supposed by Valesius to be Eusebius of Cæsarea, Theodotus, and Paulinus, had espoused the cause of Arius, and confirmed him in his error. In the encyclical letter, Alexander speaks of the Arians as transgressors of the law, and authors of an apostasy which might be justly called the forerunner of Antichrist ¹.

bore his name : that he suffered martyrdom at Nicomedia in the persecution of Maximin, and was buried at Helenopolis, in Bithynia. See Eusebius H. E. L. 9. c. 6. According to Epiphanius, he lived in the time of Constantine, and was numbered by the Arians among their martyrs. Hæresis, xliii. c. 1. Eusebius of Nicomedia, and Leontius of Antioch were intimate with him. Hæresis, lxix. c. 5. The same may be inferred with respect to Arius, who addresses Eusebius by the title of *συλλογικαριστά*. Philostorgius, who gives an account of the tortures to which he was subjected during his imprisonment, and of the remarkable manner in which he nevertheless continued to celebrate the Eucharist, names among his disciples Leontius, Maris of Chalcedon, Theognius of Nicæa, Anthony of Tarsus, Menophantus, Numenius, Eudoxius, Alexander, and Asterius the Cappadocian. L. 2. cc. 3. 13, 14, 15. As we find all these persons engaged in the support of the opinions of Arius, Alexander appears to have been justified in considering Lucian as in some measure the author of the heresy. Philostorgius further tells us, that the memory of Lucian was held in so great reverence by Helena, the mother of Constantine, that she chose as the site of the city, called after her Helenopolis, the spot to which the corpse of Lucian was conveyed, after his martyrdom, by a dolphin. c. 12.

¹ The title of Forerunner of Antichrist is frequently applied to the Arian heresy by Athanasius. *Apologia contra Arianos* sub fine. *Oratio* 1, *contra Arianos*, cc. 1. 7. *De Synodis*, c. 5.

In the same letter he gives ¹ the following account of the opinions of Arius and his followers. They affirmed “that God was not always a Father: that there was a time when He was not a Father: that the Word of God did not always exist, but was made out of things ² which were not. The self-existing God having made Him who was not out of things which were not, there was consequently a time when He did not exist. The Son is a ³ Being created and made; neither is He ⁴ like in essence to the Father; nor the true Word of the Father by nature, nor His true Wisdom, but one of the things made and generated. The titles ‘Word and Wisdom’ are improperly applied to Him, inasmuch as He Himself was made by the proper Word (or Reason) of God, and by the Wisdom in God, in which God made both Him and all things. He is, therefore, ⁵ by nature

¹ Compare ad Ep. Ægypt. et Lib. c. 12; De Dec. Syn. Nic. c. 6; Oratio I. contra Arianos, cc. 5, 6; De Synodis, cc. 15, 16; and the letter written by Arius from Nicomedia to Alexander. Epiphanius, Hæres. lxi. c. 7.

² ἐξ οὐκ ὄντων. Hence the Arians were called ἐξουκόντιοι, De Synodis, c. 31.

³ κτίσμα καὶ ποίημα· ἄνθρωποι κτίσμα λέγοντες εἶναι τὸν Θεοῦ λόγον, καὶ, ὡς οἱ Ἕλληνες, λατρεύοντες τῇ κτίσει παρὰ τὸν κτίσαντα Θεόν. Ad Ep. Ægypt. et Lib. cc. 4. 13. Oratio II. contra Arianos, c. 14. In order, however, to soften the startling sound of this assertion, they made a distinction and said that the Son was a creature, but not as one of the creatures; κτίσμα, ἀλλ’ οὐχ ὡς ἐν τῶν κτισμάτων, De Synodis, c. 23.

⁴ Hence the title of Anomæans, De Synodis, c. 31; Ad Afros, c. 7.

⁵ αὐτεξουσιότητι κακίας καὶ ἀρετῆς δεκτικὸν τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ.

liable to change, like all other rational creatures. The Word is also extraneous to and separate from the essence of God. Moreover, the Father is ineffable by the Son; for the Son neither perfectly nor accurately knows the Father, nor can perfectly see Him. The Son does not even know His own essence as it is; for He was made for our sakes, that God might use Him as an instrument in creating us: He would not have subsisted if God had not thought fit to create us. The Arians do not appear to have shrunk from the consequences of their opinions; for when asked whether the Word of God might be perverted as the devil was, they answered in the affirmative, since He is by nature liable to change."

We learn from the letter not only the tenets of Arius, but also the manner in which Alexander refuted them by appealing to Scripture.

To the assertion that there was a time when the Word was not, Alexander opposed John i. 1: "In the beginning was the Word."

To the assertion that the Son was one of the things made, the title of Only-Begotten, and the declaration of St. John, i. 3, that all things were

Socrates, L. 1. c. 9. p. 23 D; Sozomen, L. 1. c. 15. p. 347 D; Ad Jovianum, c. 1.

made by Him. He who was the Maker could not be on a level with the things which He made, nor could He who was the Only-Begotten be numbered with them.

To the assertion that the Word of God was made from things that were not, Alexander opposed Psalm¹ xlv. 1; cx. 3.

To the assertion that the Son is unlike in essence to the Father, Colossians i. 15, where the Son is called the Image; and Hebrews i. 3, where He is called the radiance of the glory of the Father; and John xiv. 9, where Christ says to Philip, "He who hath seen Me, hath seen the Father."

How, Alexander asks, if the Son is the Word or Reason and Wisdom of God, can it be said that there was a time when He was not? for that were to say that God was then without the Word or Reason (*ἄλογος*) and without Wisdom. How can He be liable to variation or change, who says of Himself, "I am in the Father and the Father in Me" (John xiv. 10); and "I and the Father are one"

¹ In the Septuagint version, *ἐξηρέύξατο ἡ καρδία μου λόγον ἀγαθόν*, and *ἐκ γαστροῦ πρὸ Ἑωσφόρου ἐγέννησά σε*. These passages are quoted repeatedly by the orthodox Fathers, in proof of the co-essentiality and co-eternity of the Word: a reference to the Hebrew original would have deprived them of these supports of their cause. We have seen that Arius accused Philogonius of

(John x. 30); and of whom it is said by the 'prophet, "I am, and I change not?" Alexander refers also to Hebrews xii. 13; "Jesus Christ, the same yesterday, to-day, and for ever."

To the assertion that the Son was made for us, Alexander opposes 1 Cor. viii. 6, where St. Paul says that all things are by Him: and to the assertion that He did not perfectly know the Father, the declaration of Christ Himself, John x. 15; "As the Father knoweth me, even so know I the Father." If the Son's knowledge of the Father is imperfect, so must also be the Father's knowledge of the Son; such is the impiety to which the assertions of Arius lead².

From the foregoing extracts from³ the Encyclical

calling the Son *ἐρυνή*. Perhaps because he alleged the former of the above passages. In his letter to his namesake of Constantinople Alexander quotes the latter, to prove that Christ is by nature, not by adoption, the Son of God; and uses the following extraordinary language: *τῆς πατρικῆς μαριεύσεως φυσικὴν ἐνδείκνυται νιότητα, οὐ τρόπου ἐπιμελεία καὶ προκοπῆς ἀσκήσει, ἀλλὰ φύσεως ιδιώματι ταύτην λαχόντος*, Theodoret, *L.* 1. c. 4. p. 14 D.

¹ Malachi iii. 6: *διότι ἐγὼ Κύριος ὁ Θεὸς ὑμῶν, καὶ οὐκ ἡλλοίωμαι*. Alexander says that some perhaps will contend that this text applies to the Father rather than to the Son. The Hebrew original here would lend some countenance to his own interpretation.

² Compare ad Ep. Ægypt. et Lib. c. 16.

³ In his letter to his namesake of Constantinople Alexander enters much more fully into the subject; and sometimes uses expressions which, in the opinion of Valesius, require a lenient construction. He seems, for instance, to speak of the nature of

Letter of Alexander, the reader will be able to form some idea of the points on which the controversy turned, and of the manner in which it was conducted. But as this representation of the opinions of the Arians is made by an adversary, he may wish to know whether they admitted its correctness; I will, therefore, add ¹ the Profession of Faith which they addressed to Alexander. They state in it, that God begat His Only-Begotten Son before eternal times, and by Him made the ages and the universe; that God begat Him not in ² appearance, but in truth, unchangeable and unalterable because He ³ so willed; perfect creature of God, but not as one of the creatures; offspring of God, but not as one of things generated. They then reject the notions of Valentinus, Manichæus, Sabellius, and ⁴ Hieracas, and

the Only-Begotten as something intermediate between the Increate God and created things: ὧν μεσιτεύνουσα φύσις μοτογενής, δι' ἧς τὰ ὅλα ἐξ οὐκ ὄντων ἐποίησεν ὁ πατήρ τοῦ Θεοῦ λόγου, ἢ ἐξ αὐτοῦ τοῦ ὄντος πατρὸς γεγέννηται, Theodoret, L. 1. c. 4. p. 17 A. Valesius supposes him to use *nature* in the sense of *person*. He may have intended to refer to the mediatorial office of Christ, for the execution of which two natures, the Divine and Human, the increate and created, were united in Him.

¹ De Synodis, cc. 16, 17. Athanasius says that similar statements were made before the Nicene Council by Narcissus of Neronias, Patrophilus, Maris, Paulinus, Theodotus, Athanasius of Anazarbus, both the Eusebii, and George of Laodicea.

² οὐ δόκησει, in allusion to the Docetæ.

³ τῷ ἰδίῳ θελήματι, τῷ ἰδίῳ αὐτεξουσίῳ, ad Ep. Ægypt. et Lib. c. 12.

⁴ Hieracas seems to have compared the generation of the Son to the lighting of a lamp from a lamp; or to the division of one

a notion which they assert to have been publicly condemned by Alexander—that the Son, having previously existed, was generated or newly created into a Son. They proceed to state their own belief to be, that the Son was created by the “will of God before times and ages; that He received life and being from the Father, the Father substantially ¹ communicating to Him His own glory; not that the Father, in giving Him the inheritance of all things, deprived Himself of that which He has ² uningenerately in Himself, inasmuch as He is the fountain of all things. There are, therefore, three ³ Subsistences: God, the cause of all things, alone, without ⁴ beginning, or unoriginate. The Son, begotten by the Father, ⁵ not in time, created and ⁶ founded before the ages, was not before He was begotten; but begotten, not in time, before all things, alone ⁷ subsisted by the Father; for He is neither eternal, nor co-eternal, nor co-ingenerate with the Father; nor has He existence together with the Father—as is the language of some who, in speaking of their relation to each other, introduce ⁸ two ingenerate principles or origins. But as God

lamp into two. The heresy of the Hieracitæ is the sixty-seventh in Epiphanius; he does not mention this notion.

¹ συνυποστήσαντος.

² ἀγεννήτως.

³ ὑποστάσεις.

⁴ ἀναρχος.

⁵ ἀχρόνως.

⁶ θεμελιωθείς.

⁷ μόνος ὑπὸ τοῦ πατρὸς ὑπέστη.

⁸ δύο ἀγεννήτους ἀρχάς, Alexander indignantly repels the

is the One and the origin of all things, He is before all things, and, therefore, ¹ before the Son. As, therefore, the Son has being from the Father, and glory, and life, and all things are delivered to Him, God is His origin or principle, and being His God and before Him, has dominion over Him. They who interpret the expressions *from Him*, and ² *from the womb*, and *I came forth from the Father*, and *I am come*, as implying a part of the same substance, or an emission (προβολή), make the Father compounded, divisible, liable to alteration, corporeal; and, as far as in them lies, subject the incorporeal God to the accidents of the body.

To this letter, as given by ³ Epiphanius, are

charge that he held two ingenerate principles. Theodoret, L. 1. c. 6. p. 168. We have seen that Arius charged Macarius of Jerusalem with holding that the Son was co-ingenerate, συναγεννητός, with the Father.

¹ They affirm that Alexander had himself held this language in the Church.

² This is a reference to the interpretation of Psalm cx. 3, on which I have remarked in note 1, p. 12.

³ Hæresis lxix. c. 7. Socrat. L. 1. c. 6. Theodoret speaks of Arius as a presbyter, of the rest as deacons; but omits the names of Carponas and Gaius. L. 1. c. 4. p. 20 B. In the Letter to the Presbyters and Deacons of Alexandria, and the Mareotis, Alexander names the Presbyters Charis and Pistus; the Deacons, Serapion, Parammon or Ammon, Zosimus and Irenæus as siding with Arius. Athanasius, p. 396. See the Encyclical Letter to the Bishops, c. 7. The names of Marcus and

affixed the names of Arius, Æthales, ¹Achilles, ²Carponas, Sarmates, another ³Arius, presbyters; ⁴Euz-

Sisinnius are also mentioned. *Ad Monachos*, c. 71. Sozomen mentions six presbyters and five deacons. *L. 1. c. 15.* Epiphanius seven presbyters and twelve deacons. *Hæres. lxi. c. 3.* Jerome mentions Arius, Euzoius, and Achilles, whom he calls a leader, as the authors of the heresy. *Adv. Luciferianos*, p. 99 C. He mentions also a Libyan presbyter of the name of Seras. *Compare de Synodis*, c. 12.

¹ In the letter to Alexander, Arius and Achilles are said to have gone beyond Colluthus, a presbyter of Alexandria, in their lust of power, and to have been accused by him. If the account of Epiphanius is to be trusted, much rivalry existed among the presbyters of Alexandria, and their congregations called themselves by the names of their several ministers. He says that Colluthus taught some heretical doctrines which quickly died away. *Hæresis, lxi. c. 2.* The name of Colluthus stands first in the list of presbyters who signified their assent to the deposition of Arius. He appears to have assumed Episcopal functions, and to have ordained, among others, Ischyras, who figures in the history of Athanasius. See the Encyclical Letter of the Egyptian Bishops, *Apologia contra Arianos*, c. 12, where they speak of him as dead. The Presbyters of Marcotis say, in their letter to the Prefect Philagrius, that his pretensions to the Episcopate were examined in a Synod in which Hosius presided, and disallowed; that he was reduced to the presbyterate, and his ordinations annulled. *Apologia contra Arianos*, c. 75.

² Carponas and Sarmates are mentioned by Epiphanius as presbyters of Alexandria. The former is said, in the letter of Julius, Bishop of Rome, to have been excommunicated by Alexander, and afterwards to have been sent by Gregory on a mission to Rome. *Apologia contra Arianos*, c. 24.

³ The second Arius appears to have become Bishop of Petraë, and to have quitted the Arian party at the Council of Sardica. He was, in consequence, together with Asterius, an Arabian bishop, banished into the Upper Libya by the Arians, when they obtained the upper hand. *Ad Monachos*, cc. 15. 18.

⁴ Euzoius was degraded from the diaconate, and afterwards

sius, ¹Lucius, Julius, Menas, Helladius, Gaius, deacons; ²Secundus, Bishop of Pentapolis, Theonas, a Libyan, and Pistus, whom the Arians afterwards made Bishop of Alexandria.

³Alexander now, with the concurrence of nearly one hundred bishops of Ægypt and Libya, proceeded to deprive Arius and his followers. According to

joined Arius in the Profession of Faith which the latter presented to Constantine, Socrates, L. 1. c. 25. The Arians appointed him Bishop of Antioch, and he administered the rite of baptism to Constantius, Jerome Adv. Luciferianos, p. 99 C; Ad Monachos, c. 71, where Athanasius calls him *ὁ Χαραταῖος*, De Synodis, c. 31. He appears to have presented a petition in favour of the Arians to Jovian, p. 784.

¹ The names of Secundus and Theonas frequently occur in the history of the Arian controversy. Secundus was excommunicated by the Council of Nicæa, Ad Ep. Ægypt. et Lib. cc. 7. 19; Ad Monachos, cc. 5. 71. It appears from the letter of Julius that he consecrated Pistus, whom the Arians placed in the See of Alexandria after the banishment of Athanasius, Apologia contra Arianos, c. 24. See also De Synodis, c. 12.

Athanasius mentions a presbyter of Barca, of the name of Secundus, whose death was occasioned by the ill treatment of the Arians, Ad Monachos, c. 65.

² Julius is said by Athanasius to have been ejected from the Church by Alexander, Ad Monachos, c. 71.

³ Socrates, L. 1. c. 6: καὶ συνέδριον πολλῶν ἐπισκόπων καθίσας τὸν μὲν Ἀρειὸν καὶ τοὺς ἀποδεχομένους τὴν δόξαν αὐτοῦ καθαιρεῖ. See Theodoret, L. 1. c. 4. Athanasius says: ὁ τοίνυν μακαρίτης Ἀλέξανδρος ἐπίσκοπος ἐξέβαλε τὸν Ἀρειὸν τῆς ἐκκλησίας, Ad Ep. Ægypt. et Lib. cc. 12. 18. 22. The last passage marks the time at which the Synod was held: πρὸ τριάκοντα καὶ ἑξ ἐτῶν ἀπεδείχθησαν αἰρετικοί. The epistle was written about the year 356; Arius, therefore, was condemned by Alexander about the year 320. Apologia contra Arianos, c. 23.

¹ Epiphanius, Arius, after his deprivation, went into Palestine, and afterwards to Nicomedia, to confer with Eusebius, who warmly espoused his cause, and addressed letters both to Alexander, strongly urging that prelate to receive Arius into communion, and to the brethren at Alexandria, exhorting them not to side with Alexander. In order to give effect to his remonstrances, he called a synod in ² Bithynia, which entered into his views. Alexander, however, ³ persevered in his resolution not to receive Arius. The mutual exasperation of the parties continually increased, and the greatest confusion prevailed; the ⁴ laity, as well as the clergy, taking part violently in the contest.

It happened unhappily that at this time the Alexandrian Church was distracted by another schism, the Meletian, which, though at first wholly unconnected with the Arian controversy, was at last mixed up with it, and exercised a very prejudicial influence on the personal fortunes of Athanasius.

¹ Hæresis, lxix. cc. 4, 5.

² Sozomen, L. 1. c. 15.

³ The Arians supposed that Athanasius by his advice confirmed Alexander in this resolution; hence their bitter dislike to him, *Apologia contra Arianos*, c. 6.

⁴ Socrates, L. 1. c. 6. p. 12 C. The letters written on the one hand by the opponents of Arius, on the other by his supporters, were collected; and the latter were afterwards used by the Macedonians and Eunomians in defending their opinions, p. 13 B.

During the ¹episcopate of Peter, who suffered martyrdom in the persecution of Diocletian, Meletius, Bishop of Lycopolis, in Ægypt, was deposed because he had offered sacrifice. Having induced many to join him, he formed a sect, and was in a state of opposition to the Church when the Arian controversy arose. Such is the account given by Athanasius, who charges the Meletians with having evinced hostility towards his predecessors Peter, Achillas, and Alexander, as well as towards himself.

² Epiphanius, however, ascribes the origin of the schism to a cause much less discreditable to Meletius. According to him, Peter and Meletius were fellow-sufferers during the persecution, and differed respecting the mode of dealing with the clergy, who had fallen away during its continuance. Meletius contended that they should be prevented, not only from resuming their clerical functions, but even from being present at the assemblies for public worship, until they had given satisfactory proof of their penitence. Peter advised a more lenient course. A division in consequence took place among the clergy and monks, and the majority sided with Meletius.

¹ De vitâ Constantini, L. 2. c. 12; Apologia contra Arianos, cc. 11. 59; Ad Ep. Ægypt. et Lib. cc. 22, 23; Ad Monachos, c. 78; Oratio I. contra Arianos, c. 3. The Benedictine editor assigns 301 as the probable date of the rise of the Meletian schism.

² Hæresis, lxviii.

Peter suffered martyrdom, and was succeeded by ¹Alexander. Meletius was banished to the mines, but afterwards returned, and ordained bishops, priests, and deacons, and built churches for his followers, who called themselves the Church of the Martyrs, in opposition to the followers of Peter, who called themselves the Catholic Church. After the death of Meletius, who lived on friendly terms with Alexander, the schism continued; and Alexander, wishing to put an end to it, forbade the Meletians to hold their assemblies. They sent a deputation to Constantinople, at the head of which was John, their bishop, and Callinicus, Bishop of Pelusium, to complain of Alexander, and to obtain permission to resume their meetings. Paphnutius, the anachorite, was also of the party. They at first could not gain access to the emperor: but during their stay at Nicomedia, whither they followed Constantine, they were introduced to Eusebius, and through his influence at court accomplished the object of their mission. Eusebius, however, exacted as the condition of his assistance, that they should receive Arius into communion. Such, according to Epiphanius, was the origin of the union of the Meletians and Arians, which he deplores as having given consistency and strength to the Arian party, many of the Meletians having been induced to depart from

¹ Epiphanius omits Achillas.

the true faith and adopt heretical tenets. ¹ Petavius and the Benedictine editor of Athanasius treat this narrative as a fiction of one of the Meletian party, who succeeded in imposing upon Epiphanius. It contains, undoubtedly, chronological and other errors; but when it is compared with the account given by ² Sozomen, the difference in substance is not very great. It is certain that Meletius was not charged at Nicæa with holding any ³ heretical doctrine. The Council, as we shall hereafter see, only determined that he and those who had been ordained by him should cease to exercise their functions, until vacancies should occur in the number of the clergy ordained by Peter and Alexander, into whose places they were to be substituted. Meletius, shortly before his death, consecrated John as his successor, and thus the schism was revived.

¹ Gibbon says of the Meletian schism: "I have not leisure to pursue the obscure controversy, which seems to have been misrepresented by the partiality of Athanasius, and the ignorance of Epiphanius," c. 21, note 96. Mosheim observes that the reason which occasioned this violent act of authority, the deposition of Meletius by Peter, has not been sufficiently exposed, Cent. iv. Part ii. c. 18.

² L. 2. cc. 21, 22. Nor is this account at variance with that given by Athanasius himself respecting the coalition between the Arians and Meletians, *Apologia contra Arianos*, c. 59.

³ Epiphanius says that Meletius first apprised Alexander of the mischievous character of the teaching of Arius. Athanasius charges the Meletians with avarice and ambition, not with heresy, *Ad Ep. Ægypt. et Lib.* c. 22.

When the news of the unhappy divisions prevailing in the Alexandrian Church reached the ears of Constantine, ¹ he was deeply afflicted, and immediately despatched Hosius, Bishop of Corduba, ² in whom he placed the greatest confidence, with a letter addressed to Alexander and Arius, in the hope of restoring peace between them. He began with stating, that in his administration of the empire he had a twofold object in view,—to bring all men to an agreement in opinion respecting the Deity, and to heal the diseases under which the world had laboured during the reign of his predecessors. After, therefore, that he had accomplished the latter object by the defeat of Licinius, he turned his attention to the former; and hearing that a ³schism had taken place in Africa, he determined to employ the instrumentality of some of the bishops of the East—the quarter from which the light of true religion first shone forth—in putting an end to the dissensions. What then was his surprise, his grief to hear, that those ⁴very Eastern bishops were divided among themselves on a ⁵slight and unimportant question!

¹ Eusebius de vitâ Constantini, L. 2. c. 63. Socrates, L. 1. c. 7. Sozomen, L. 1. c. 16.

² De vitâ Constantini, L. 3. c. 7.

³ The schism of the Donatists, de vitâ Constantini, L. 2. c. 66, with the note of Valesius.

⁴ Ægypt was reckoned not an African, but an Eastern province. De vitâ Constantini, L. 2. c. 67, with the note of Valesius.

⁵ ἄγαρ ἐντελής καὶ οὐδαμῶς ἀξίῳ τῆς τοιαύτης φιλονεικίας. c. 68.

They, by whose aid he intended to heal others, were themselves in need of a physician. The bishop, it appeared, had asked the opinion of the presbyters ¹ on some passage of the law, or rather some idle question, and Arius had returned an ill-considered answer. Thence a difference had arisen: all communion had ceased between them; and the people were divided into two parties, some siding with one, some with the other. Let them mutually forgive each other, and live in unity. Such questions ought neither to be asked nor answered: if discussed for the purpose of intellectual exercise, they ought not to be publicly propounded. For who is sufficient to comprehend those divine mysteries, or worthily to express them if comprehended? There is always danger ² lest the disputants should be unable clearly to explain the matter proposed; or that the hearers, through slowness of understanding, should misapprehend what is said; and that occasion should thus be given to blasphemy and schism. It was the more incumbent upon them to comply with his exhortation to concord, and to put an end to their disputes, because

¹ ὑπὲρ τινος τόπου τῶν ἐν νόμῳ γεγραμμένων, μᾶλλον ὑπὲρ ματαίου τινὸς ζητήσεως μέρους. c. 69.

² Athanasius expresses nearly the same sentiment towards the conclusion of the letter to Serapion, c. 5, καὶ διὰ τοῦτο οὐκ ἔστιν ἀσφαλὲς ἐκδίδοσθαι γράμματα ἰδιώτον· καὶ μάλιστα περὶ τῶν ἀνωτάτων καὶ κορυφαϊοτάτων δογμάτων, μήποτε τὸ διὰ ἀσθένειαν ἢ τὸ ἀδιατράνωτον τῆς γλώττης ἐνδεῶς εἰρημένον βλαβὴν τοῖς ἀναγιγνώσκουσιν ἐμπούσῃ. See also the beginning of the letter ad Monachos, c. 1.

in all that is essential they were of one mind. They differed only about unimportant matters, in which freedom of opinion should be allowed. Let each enjoy his own opinion in silence, and not run the hazard of disturbing the peace of the Church. Constantine concludes with stating, that he had arrived at Nicomedia with the intent of proceeding to Alexandria, when the news of the schism reached him, and diverted him from his design: he was unwilling to be an eye-witness of dissensions of which he had never anticipated the possibility. "Give me back," he says, "my peaceful days, my nights devoid of anxiety; put an end to your disputes, and thus open to me the way to the East; be reconciled to each other, and enable the people to rejoice and give thanks to God for the re-establishment of concord and liberty." It was to be expected that Gibbon would find much to approve, and Mr. Newman much to disapprove in this letter. ¹ The latter particularly censures the Emperor for supposing, that an uninstructed individual like himself, who had not even received the grace of Baptism, could discriminate between great and little questions in theology. But the letter expresses sentiments which would naturally arise in the mind of a person in Constantine's position. "I have exercised," he would say, "the power with which

¹ History of the Arians, c. 3. sect. 1. p. 268.

Providence has entrusted me for the benefit of the Christians; I have relieved them from the fear of persecution, and have not only protected them in the exercise of their religion, but have conferred upon them wealth and honour. I was, therefore, entitled to expect that they at least would not disturb the peace of my empire. But I am disappointed: no sooner are they freed from external enemies, than they break out into violent dissensions among themselves; and that too about a question, which even the disputants confess to be beyond the reach of human comprehension." Constantine might be an incompetent judge of theological controversy; but he certainly was justified in hoping, that it would be carried on between Christians in a Christian spirit, in a spirit of mutual charity. The Emperor's conciliatory letter, though enforced by the personal exertions and influence of Hosius, failed to produce the desired effect; and the dissensions quickly spread throughout all the Eastern provinces. In addition also to the Meletian and Arian controversies, ¹ that respecting the observance of Easter still continued to divide the members of the Church. It appears from ² Eusebius, that in the time of Irenæus, the Asiatic Churches terminated the Lent fast on the day on which the Jews kept their Passover, that is,

¹ De vitâ Constantini, L. 3. c. 5. Socrates, L. 1. c. 8. Sozomen, L. 1. c. 16.

² Hist. Eccles. L. 5. cc. 23, 24, 25.

on the fourteenth day of the month, whatever the day of the week on which it might fall. They did this, as appears from the letter of Polycrates, Bishop of Ephesus, on the ground that the custom had been handed down from St. John. All the other Churches of Christendom continued the fast till the Sunday after the Jewish Passover, and then celebrated Easter. Victor, Bishop of Rome, in his zeal for uniformity, threatened to excommunicate the Asiatic Churches; but was restrained by the remonstrances of Irenæus. If we may rely on the authority of a letter of Constantine given by ¹ Socrates, the Asiatic Churches had conformed to the general custom before the Council of Nicæa. He includes, however, those of Cilicia in the number, respecting which, as well as those of Syria and Mesopotamia, ² Athanasius expressly says that they followed the Jewish custom. ³ Mr. Newman supposes, that the Syrians were induced to follow it by Paul of Samosata, who was under the influence of Zenobia, a Jewess, or at least a patroness of the Jews. There is no reason, however, for supposing, that the Quarto Decimans adopted Paul's tenets; no charge of holding erroneous doctrine was brought against them at the Council; and according to the letter of Polycrates the difference of practice occasioned no interruption

¹ L. 1. c. 9. p. 29 A.

² De Synodis, c. 5. Ad Afros, c. 2.

³ C. 1. sect. 1. p. 16.

of communion. ¹Origen also says, that those of his day agreed in all respects with the Apostolic tradition.

²The Emperor, finding that his attempts at reconciling the adherents of Alexander and Arius were wholly unavailing, determined to assemble a ³general council, in order to heal the divisions of the Church by settling authoritatively the different questions by which it was agitated. With this view, he summoned the bishops from every part of the empire to meet at Nicæa in Bithynia, furnishing them with the means of conveyance at the public expense. In obedience to this summons, more than ⁴two hundred and fifty bishops assembled at the

¹ Philosophumena, L. 8. c. 18. See also Epiphanius Hæresis, l. c. 1, and lxx. cc. 1. 9, where, in treating of the Audians, he states that they charged the Nicene Council with having decided the question erroneously, in order to please Constantine. Socrates denies this, L. 5. c. 22. p. 236. If the reader wishes to obtain a full account of the Quarto Decimans, he may consult Socrates, L. 5. c. 22, and Sozomen, L. 7. c. 18.

² To such a length had the mutual exasperation of the parties proceeded, that they were guilty of breaches of the law, and offered insults to the statues of the Emperor. De vitâ Constantini, L. 3. c. 4. See Sozomen, L. 2. c. 25, where Ischyra is said to have been charged by Athanasius with this offence.

³ *σύνοδον οἰκουμένην*. De vitâ Constantini, L. 3. c. 6. Apologia contra Arianos, c. 7.

⁴ This is the number mentioned by Eusebius, L. 3. c. 8. Sozomen makes the number about 320. L. 1. c. 17. The words of Athanasius are *ἦσαν πλεον ἢ ἑλασσον τριακόσιοι*. Ad Monachos, c. 66. De Dec. Nic. c. 3. Julius mentions 300. Apologia contra Arianos, cc. 23. 25. Constantine, more than 300.

place appointed, with an innumerable company of ¹priests and deacons. ²The different and distant countries from which they came, naturally recal to the recollection of Eusebius the description in the Book of Acts, of the multitude assembled at Jerusalem on the day of Pentecost. But, in the estimation of the historian, the comparison was greatly in favour of the Council, inasmuch as it was composed entirely of Ministers of God, whom he compares to a crown of beautiful flowers, collected by the Emperor in the bond of peace, as an offering of gratitude to his Saviour, who had enabled him to triumph over all his enemies. Some of these min-

Socrates, L. 1. c. 9. Athanasius mentions 318. Ad Afros, c. 2. Socrates, L. 1. c. 8. 19 D. This particular number appears to have been suggested by the number of Abraham's company, with which he rescued Lot. Genesis xiv. See Ambrosius de Fide, L. 1, Prologue. Socrates refers on this point to the Synodicum of Athanasius, which is lost. L. 1. c. 13.

¹ ἐπομένων δὲ τούτοις πρεσβυτέρων καὶ διακόνων ἀκολουθῶν τε πλείστων ὕσων ἐτέρων, οὐδ' ἦν ἀριθμὸς εἰς κατάληψιν. De vitâ Constantini, L. 3. c. 8. Valesius translates ἀκολουθῶν, acolythorum: but Bingham observes, that no order of acolyths existed in the Greek Church till the fifth century, Book 3. c. 3. It may be doubted, therefore, whether the word is used as describing an ecclesiastical office.

² Eusebius describes them as coming from every part of Europe, Asia, and Africa: from Persia, Scythia, Spain. The Bishop of the Royal City, τῆς βασιλευούσης πόλεως, Silvester (Sozomen, L. 1. c. 17, by mistake mentions Julius, see c. 2), was absent from age, but was represented by his presbyters, Vito and Vincentius. By the Royal City we are to understand Rome, not Constantinople, as appears from Sozomen, L. 1. c. 16. Theodoret, L. 1. c. 7.

isters were distinguished for ¹ their wisdom; some for their gravity and enduring patience; some for their moderation; some were held in honour for their length of days; some were in the flower of their age, and in the full vigour of their intellect.

Socrates has particularly mentioned three bishops who were summoned by Constantine to Nicæa; whether he selected them for the purpose of proving the incorrectness of Sabinus' assertion, given below, he does not say. One was ² the Novatian Bishop of Con-

¹ De vitâ Constantini, L. 3. c. 9. Sozomen, L. 1. c. 17. Sabinus, however, who was attached to the party of Macedonius, and made by it Bishop of Heraclea, spoke of them in very different and very disparaging terms, calling them simple and uneducated men (*ἀφελεῖς καὶ ἰδιώταις*). Socrates replied, that even if the bishops were ignorant, yet as they were enlightened by the Holy Spirit, they could not miss the truth. L. 1. c. 8. Sabinus made a collection of the decrees of the different councils.

² L. 1. c. 10. Sozomen, L. 2. c. 32. Socrates says, that this story was told him by Auxano, a Novatian presbyter, who, when very young, accompanied Acesius to Nicæa, and lived till the reign of the younger Theodosius. C. 13. Valesius doubts its truth, on the ground that it is mentioned by no other author excepting Sozomen. L. 1. c. 2; that it is very improbable that Constantine should have summoned a Novatian bishop to the Council; and that Auxano must have been above a hundred years old, if he lived to the reign of the younger Theodosius. Socrates himself admits that no other author had mentioned the story; but says, that it is the practice of historians to pass over many facts in silence, either from personal feeling, or from a desire to gratify individuals. Mr. Newman casts no doubt upon it. It falls in with his theory respecting the motive by which Constantine was principally influenced in all his proceedings,—

stantinople, named Acesius, who expressed his assent to the Confession of Faith, and to the decree respecting Easter, which were finally propounded by the Council. The Emperor, therefore, asked him, why he was not in communion with the Church, as he agreed with it on the two points determined at the Council? His answer was, that he differed from it on the question, whether they who committed the sin described in Scripture as *unto death*, ought ever to be re-admitted to the communion of the Church? he holding that they ought not, but ought to be exhorted to repent, and to hope for the remission of their sins, not from the priests, but from God, who alone had power to remit and to pardon them. Constantine, thinking this a very insufficient ground of separation, said, "Take a ladder, Acesius, and climb up by yourself to heaven."

¹ Another bishop mentioned by Socrates is Paphnutius from the Upper Thebais: Socrates says that he wrought miracles; that he was deprived of an eye in the persecution, and was highly esteemed by Constantine, who frequently sent for him and kissed the socket out of which the eye had been cut.

the desire of preserving external peace. C. 13. sect. 1. p. 265. Socrates himself produces it as a proof of the Emperor's anxiety for peace. On the authority of the same Auxano, he tells a marvellous story about Eutychianus, a Novatian monk. L. 1. c. 13.

¹ L. 1. c. 11.

¹ When it was proposed in the Council that bishops, presbyters, and deacons should be forbidden to cohabit with the wives whom they had married while laymen, Paphnutius resisted the proposal, telling those who urged it, that they would injure the Church by imposing so heavy a yoke on the clergy: that cohabitation with a lawful wife is chastity; and that it was sufficient to adhere to the ancient tradition, which forbade the clergy to marry after they had taken orders. His advice prevailed.

² The third bishop mentioned by Socrates is Spyridion, Bishop of Trimethus in Cyprus, who was a shepherd, and according to Sozomen was married and had children. After his advancement to the bishoprick he continued to tend his sheep. Socrates tells two marvellous stories respecting him: one relating to the manner in which some thieves, who came to steal his sheep, were by an invisible Power bound to

¹ Sozomen, L. 1. c. 23. Valesius doubts the truth of this portion of the story, on the ground that it is not mentioned by Rufinus, from whom Socrates obtained the former part of the account of Paphnutius; and that no Ægyptian of the name of Paphnutius is mentioned among the bishops who attended the Council. We have seen that, according to Epiphanius, Paphnutius, whom he calls a distinguished person, accompanied the Meletian deputation, which was sent to Constantinople to complain of Alexander. Perhaps the opinion ascribed to Paphnutius respecting the celibacy of the clergy, may have disposed Valesius more readily to doubt the truth of the narrative. Theodoret says that he was at the Council. L. 1. c. 7.

² Socrates, L. 1. c. 12. Sozomen, L. 1. c. 11.

the sheep-pens; the other to the temporary resuscitation of his daughter from the dead, in consequence of his prayers, for the purpose of pointing out where she had deposited a costly ornament, which had been consigned to her care. Sozomen adds other stories respecting him.

Constantine repaired to Nicæa, after he had celebrated his ¹ last triumph over Licinius. Besides the bishops who were summoned, other persons appear to have been attracted thither for the purpose of showing their skill in dialectics, and to have passed the time previous to the meeting of the Council in discussions, calculated, ² according to Socrates, rather to amuse than to edify, until they were at last silenced by a layman, who had been a Confessor in the persecution, and who reminded them that Christ came not to teach dialectics, but to inculcate faith and good works. There has unhappily been scarcely any age of the Church in which its members have not required to be reminded of this truth.

³ On the day appointed for the meeting of the

¹ According to Valesius, the last battle with Licinius took place on the 15th of the calends of October, in the year 324. See his note *de vitâ Constantini*, L. 3. c. 15. According to Socrates, the Synod met on the 11th of the calends of June, in the year 325, in the consulate of Paulinus and Julianus, and the 636th year from the reign of Alexander the Great. L. 1. c. 13.

² L. 1. c. 8. Sozomen, L. 1. c. 18.

³ *De vitâ Constantini*, c. 10.

Council, the members having taken each his allotted seat, Constantine made his entry with great pomp : his body, according to the historian, arrayed in a purple robe sparkling with gold and precious stones, his soul clothed with piety and the fear of God. His deep humility was evinced by his downcast eyes, by the blush upon his cheek, by his walk and gait. At the signal of his approach, all arose ; and he, proceeding to the first row of seats, stood for a while in the midst ; nor did he seat himself in the low chair prepared for him, until the bishops had by a nod, signified that he was so to do : afterwards they also seated themselves. ¹ The bishop, then, who sat nearest to him on the right hand arose, and in a speech addressed to him, gave thanks to God on his account. All eyes were then directed to the Emperor, who rose, and in a short ² speech exhorted the assembled bishops not to allow *the enemy* to mar the happiness which they enjoyed, in consequence of the removal of their persecutors from the earth. The internal divisions of the Church were a source

¹ De vitâ Constantini, L. 3. c. 11. Sozomen says that this bishop was Eusebius himself. L. 1. c. 19. Theodoret, that the speech was made by Eustathius, Bishop of Antioch. L. 1. c. 7. Others, by Alexander of Alexandria. Valesius inclines to the opinion of Sozomen.

² Constantine delivered this speech in Latin, and used the aid of an interpreter to make it intelligible to the Council. Eusebius, however, adds, that he could express himself in Greek, ἐλληνίζων τε τῇ φωνῇ, ὅτι μηδὲ ταύτης ἀμαθῶς εἶχε. De vitâ Constantini, L. 3. c. 13. See Sozomen, L. 1. cc. 19, 20.

of greater trouble and grief to him than any foreign war. He exhorted them, therefore, as his friends, as ministers of God, as good servants of their common Master and Saviour, to lose no time in removing every cause of contention, and loosing every band of controversy, by obeying the laws of peace. So would they do that which was acceptable to God, the Lord of all, and confer an inestimable favour on himself, ¹ their fellow-servant. This exhortation to concord appears to have been far from unnecessary. ² The bishops at once broke out into mutual accusations, exhibited charges in writing against each other, and displayed so much bitterness of spirit, that the Emperor, though, according to ³ Sozomen, he professed his incompetency to decide disputes between ecclesiastics, was obliged not only to mediate between them, but even to address himself to them severally; till at length, by exhorting some, by persuading others, and by praising those who spoke well, he succeeded in bringing them to an agreement in opinion. He also directed the written accusations which they had preferred against each other to be burned; rightly judging that the preservation of such documents could not redound to

¹ συνθεράπων. Constantine frequently uses this expression. See cc. 17. 24. His letter to the Bishops assembled at Tyre, *Apologia contra Arianos*, c. 86. His letter to the Church of Alexandria. Socrates, L. 1. c. 9. p. 25 D.

² De vitâ Constantini, L. 3. c. 13. Socrates, L. 1. c. 8.

³ L. 1. c. 17. See also c. 20.

the credit and honour either of the individuals or of the Church.

¹ Gibbon observes very truly, that the transactions of the Council of Nicæa are related by the ancients, not only in a partial, but in a very imperfect manner; and we must join in his regret, that no such picture as Fra Paolo would have drawn can now be recovered. ² Sozomen tells us that, before the meeting of the Council, the bishops met among themselves, and sent for Arius and discussed the points in dispute; some, those especially who were simple in their life and conversation, and embraced the faith of Christ without entering into curious enquiries, contending, that no innovation ought to be made in the creed which had been handed down from the beginning: others, that the ancient opinions were not to be implicitly received without examination. He adds, that many of the bishops, and of the ecclesiastics who accompanied them, distinguished themselves by their skill in disputation, and attracted the notice of the Emperor and of the court; among them Athanasius, then the Deacon of Alexander. No specimens, known, of their controversial ability and eloquence have been preserved, excepting those contained in the works of Athanasius. We know only, that the ³ cause of Arius was chiefly

¹ C. 21, note 55.

² L. 1. c. 17.

³ Socrates, L. 1. c. 8. Theodoret, L. 1. c. 7, who mentions

maintained by Eusebius of Nicomedia, Theognius of Nicæa, and Maris of Chalcedon, in Bithynia; while the defence of the Catholic cause rested principally on ¹ Athanasius, who was supported by ² Marcellus of Ancyra and Asclepas of Gaza. According to Athanasius, the Catholics were so triumphant in the argument, that they reduced their opponents to ³ silence. This is certain, that the result of the contest was in their favour. The Council adopted a creed which was set forth by ⁴ Hosius, and pronounced the condemnation of Arius. The creed set forth by Hosius was as follows:—

“We believe in one God, Father Almighty, Maker of all things visible and invisible; and in one Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of God, only-begotten of the Father, that is of the essence of the Father, God of God, Light of Light, very God of very God, begotten, not made; of one essence with the Father; by whom all things were made, both in heaven and

also Menophantus of Ephesus, Patrophilus of Scythopolis, Narcissus of Neronias, in Cilicia, Theonas of Marmarica, and Secundus.

¹ The Benedictine editor supposes Athanasius to have been at this time about thirty years of age.

² This is stated by Pope Julius. *Apologia ad Arianos*, cc. 23. 32, and in the letter of the Synod of Sardica, c. 44, where Asclepas is also mentioned. See also *de Fugâ*, c. 3.

³ ἀχαρείς μὲν ἔμειον οὗτοι, καὶ διὰ τῆς σιωπῆς ὁμολόγουν τὴν ἐπὶ τῇ κακοδοσίᾳ αὐτῶν αἰσχύνην. *De Dec. Syn. Nic.* c. 3.

⁴ *Ad Monachos*, c. 42. According to Socrates, *L. 3. c. 7*, Hosius himself, in his anxiety to confute the heresy of Sabellius, gave occasion to the question respecting the words οὐσία and ὑπόστασις.

earth; who for us men and for our salvation came down, and was incarnate, and was made man, and suffered, and rose again on the third day, and ascended into heaven, and shall come again to judge the quick and the dead; and (we believe) in the Holy Ghost. But the Holy, Catholic, and Apostolic Church anathematizes those who say that there was a time when the Son of God was not; that He was not before He was begotten; that He was made from things which were not; that He is of another substance or essence; that He was created and is liable to change."

According to ¹ Socrates, all the bishops present subscribed this Confession of Faith, with the exception of five: according to ² Sozomen, seventeen at first hesitated, but the greater portion of them afterwards subscribed. The five mentioned by Socrates are ³ Eusebius of Nicomedia, Theognius, Maris, Theonas, and Secundus. They objected to the word *ὁμοούσιος*, co-essential or consubstantial, contending that whatever is co-essential with any thing comes from it either *κατὰ προβολήν*, by emission or being thrown out, as a branch from the root; or *κατὰ ῥεύσιν*, by efflux, as children from their father; or *κατὰ μερισμὸν*, by division, as bits of gold from a

¹ L. 1. c. 8.

² L. 1. c. 20.

³ In the five named by Sozomen, L. 1. c. 21, we find the name of Patrophilus of Scythopolis instead of that of Theonas.

mass; and that none of these modes of derivation could be predicated of the Son. They, together with Arius, were excommunicated by the synod; and Eusebius and Theognius were involved in the sentence of banishment pronounced by Constantine against Arius, and were deprived of their bishoprics. The Council also condemned a work of Arius, entitled ¹ *Thalia*, in which he set forth his opinions in verse, and from which Athanasius gives several extracts. Athanasius ² accuses him of imitating in the effeminate character of his metre the Ægyptian Sotades. The Oxford annotator on the works of Athanasius supposes him to have written in verse in order to ³ popularise his heresy; and compares his proceeding to that of some modern sectaries, who sing their hymns to popular airs. Eusebius of Cæsarea was one of those who hesitated to subscribe. In a ⁴ letter which he addressed to the members

¹ Socrates, L. 1. c. 9; Sozomen, L. 1. c. 21. He had not seen the work.

² ἔγραψε Θαλείαν ἐκτεθλυμένοις καὶ γελοίοις ἤθεσι, κατὰ τὸν Αἰγύπτιον Σωτάδην, De Sent. Dionysii, c. 6; De Dec. Syn. Nic. c. 16; Ad Ep. Ægypt. et Lib. cc. 7. 20; Oratio I. contra Arianos, cc. 2. 4, 5, 6. 8, 9, 10; Oratio II. c. 37; de Synodis, c. 15.

³ Philostorgius says that Arius wrote songs for the sea, the mill, and the road, after he seceded from the Church, L. 2. c. 2.

⁴ Socrates, L. 1. c. 8; Theodoret, L. 1. c. 12; De Dec. Syn. Nic. c. sub fin. In this letter, as given by Theodoret, and in the works of Athanasius, occur the following sentences, which are not found in the copy given by Socrates: ἔτι μὲν τὸ ἀναθεματίζεσθαι—τὸ πρὸ τοῦ γεννηθῆναι οὐκ ἦν—οὐκ ἄτοπον ἐνομήσθη,

of his own Church he states, that he himself proposed a Confession of Faith, which the Emperor approved and declared to be in accordance with his own opinions, and wished the other bishops to subscribe; with the insertion, however, of the word *ὁμοούσιος*, which was to be understood, not in the sense of any bodily affection, as implying subsistence by division or abscission from the Father, but in a divine and ineffable sense; since that which is immaterial and an object of the intellect and incorporeal cannot be subject to any bodily affection. The whole letter is of an apologetic character, and implies a consciousness on the part of the writer that his subscription to the Nicene Creed required explanation, as if there were expressions in it not in perfect agreement with his former teaching. He

τῷ παρὰ πᾶσι μὴν ὁμολογεῖσθαι εἶναι αὐτὸν υἱὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ πρὸ τῆς κατὰ σάρκα γεννήσεως. ἡδὲ δὲ ὁ θεοφιλέστατος ἡμῶν βασιλεὺς τῷ λόγῳ κατεσκευάζει καὶ κατὰ τὴν ἔνθεον αὐτοῦ γέννησιν τὴν πρὸ πάντων αἰώνων εἶναι αὐτόν. ἐπεὶ καὶ πρὶν ἐνεργείᾳ γεννηθῆναι, δυνάμει ἦν ἐν τῷ πατρὶ ἀγεννήτως, ὄντος τοῦ πατρὸς ἀεὶ πατρὸς, ὡς καὶ βασιλέως ἀεὶ, καὶ σωτῆρος ἀεὶ, δυνάμει πάντα ὄντος, ἀεὶ τε καὶ κατὰ τὰ αὐτὰ καὶ ὡσαύτως ἔχοντος. Bull considers these sentences to be an interpolation, partly from internal evidence, but chiefly on the ground that they are omitted by Socrates, De Filii, τῷ συναιδίῳ, III. 9. 3; but the Benedictine editor and the Oxford annotator suppose them to have been purposely omitted, on account of their heterodox aspect, by Socrates, who was a maintainer of the orthodoxy of Eusebius. Athanasius certainly refers to them, De Dec. Syn. Nic. c. 3; De Synodis, c. 13. In the former place Athanasius mentions his intention of subjoining the letter to the tract, in order to show that Eusebius had assented to the expression *ὁμοούσιος* and *ἐκ τῆς οὐσίας*.

states, therefore, that the different expressions were carefully weighed and canvassed; and gives his reasons for assenting to the word ¹ ὁμοούσιος, and to the expression “begotten, not made;” as well as for concurring in the anathema at the end. He had never, he says, himself used the expressions condemned; nor ² are they to be found in Scripture. I have noticed the very meagre account given by him of the proceedings of the synod. The preference shown to the Confession of Faith finally adopted over his own, and a consciousness that in subscribing he had in some measure compromised his own opinions, may have contributed to indispose him to dwell on the subject.

The part which Eusebius took in the Arian controversy has caused both his integrity and his orthodoxy to be called in question. I shall content myself with observing that he was evidently ³ regarded with suspicion and dislike by the Catholics, and that it is consequently necessary to receive their statements respecting him with some allowance.

¹ He says that some eminent bishops of former times had used the word in speaking of the relation of the Son to the Father.

² Does not this objection apply also to the word ὁμοούσιος? Athanasius seems to have felt this difficulty. His defence is, that the orthodox used such expressions in a pious, the Arians in an impious sense, *Oratio I. contra Arianos*, c. 30.

³ *Apologia contra Arianos*, c. 77, sub fin.

The ¹ Ægyptian bishops charged him in their Encyclical Letter with having offered sacrifice during the persecution; and ² Epiphanius tells us that this charge was openly brought against him at the Council of Tyre by Potamo, Bishop of Heraclea. Athanasius also accuses ³ him of having affirmed, in a letter to Euphratio, that Christ is not true God. Yet we have seen that he subscribed, though perhaps reluctantly, the declaration that the Son is *ὁμοούσιος* with the Father; a subscription which, if sincerely made, seems to imply a recognition of the ⁴ essential Divinity of the Son.

Perhaps the Creed which he proposed to the Council may give us some insight into the real nature of his opinions. It is as follows:

“We believe in one God, Father Almighty, Maker of all things, visible and invisible; and in one Lord Jesus Christ, the Word of God, God of God, Light of Light, Life of Life, the only-begotten Son, the first-begotten of every creature, begotten of the

¹ *Apologia contra Arianos*, c. 8.

² *Hæresis*, lxxviii. c. 7.

³ *De Synodis*, c. 17. Euphratio was Bishop of Balanea.

⁴ The word *essence* appears to me better to express the meaning of the word *οὐσία* than *substance*. By the *essence* of a thing I understand that by which it is what it is. Athanasius insisted upon the insertion of the word *ὁμοούσιος* in the Creed, because no other word could so fully express that the Son was very God.

Father before all ages, by whom all things were made; who for our salvation was incarnate, and lived among men; who suffered, and rose again the third day, and ascended to the Father, and shall come again in glory to judge both the quick and the dead. We believe also in one Holy Ghost. Each of them we believe to be and to subsist—the Father truly Father, the Son truly Son, the Holy Ghost truly Holy Ghost; as our Lord, when He sent forth his Apostles to preach, said, ‘Go, make disciples of all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.’”

Mr. Newman ¹says of this Creed, that, though the terms were orthodox, and would have satisfactorily answered the purposes of a test if the existing questions had never been agitated, and were consistent with certain produceable statements of the Ante-Nicene Fathers, they were irrelevant at a time when evasions had been found for them all and triumphantly proclaimed. He supposes it to have been drawn up for the purpose of avoiding a test which the Arians had committed themselves in condemning, inasmuch as ²Eusebius of Nicomedia had in the beginning of the controversy declared that the Son was not *ἐκ τῆς οὐσίας* of the Father. If this was

¹ History of the Arians, chap. iii. sect. i. p. 272.

² Theodoret, L. 1. c. 6.

the object of Eusebius, the Emperor completely frustrated it by insisting on the insertion of the word *ὁμοούσιος*.

In his Notes on the Letter, in the Oxford translation of Athanasius, Mr. Newman has carefully pointed out the artifices by which he supposes Eusebius to have evaded the full force of the words which he consented to use. Eusebius admitted that the Son was *ἐκ τῆς οὐσίας*, but not as a part; he seems to have added this qualification in order to guard against the notion that he supposed the Divine Essence to be divisible. Mr. Newman, however, doubts whether he admitted the *ἐκ τῆς οὐσίας* at all. In like manner, though he adopted the word *ὁμοούσιος*, yet Mr. Newman infers from the explanation which he gave of the sense in which he understood it, that he did believe, not in a oneness of substance, but in two substances. In his History of the Arians Mr. ¹Newman has said that there is, in the writings of Eusebius, little which fixes upon him any charge beyond that of an attachment to the Platonic phraseology; and that had he not connected himself with the Arian party, it would have been unjust to accuse him of heresy. In the ²interval between the publication of that work and of the Notes on Athanasius, his faculty of detecting heresy appears to have become more acute. The opinions of Eusebius may

¹ Chap. iii. sect. 2. p. 282.

² Between 1833 and 1842.

be collected from the second chapter of the first book of his Ecclesiastical History, in which he treats of the pre-existence and Divinity of Christ; and they appear to have been in accordance with those of the Ante-Nicene Fathers, who ¹held that the Word existed with the Father from eternity, being personally distinct, but that He was begotten in order to create the world; the generation of which they spake was a generation in time, not from eternity. The reluctance of Eusebius to subscribe to the word *ὁμοούσιος* may be partly ascribed to his belief that it savoured of Sabellianism; he knew that it had been rejected ²by the Council of Antioch, by which Paul of Samosata was condemned.

The Council, before it separated, addressed a ³letter to the Church of Alexandria, and to the brethren in Ægypt, Libya, and Pentapolis, to inform them of the questions which had been discussed, and of the manner in which they had been determined. The opinions of Arius had first been condemned and himself excommunicated, together with ⁴Theonas of Marmarica and Secundus of Ptolemais, whom he had infected with his errors.

¹ Select Treatises of Athanasius. Note on p. 214.

² Ibid. Note on p. 247.

³ Socrates, L. 1. c. 9. Theodoret, L. 1. c. 9.

⁴ Ad Ep. Ægypt. et Lib. c. 19. De Synodis, c. 12. Theodoret says that these two bishops alone refused to join in the condemnation of Arius, L. 1. c. 7. Sozomen tells us that Secundus expressed his approval of the Creed, L. 1. c. 21; but

The letter of the Council goes on to say, that the case of ¹ Meletius was next considered and determined; that he was allowed to retain the title of bishop, but was restrained from laying on hands in his own city, and from visiting any other place or city for the purpose. That they who had been ordained by him were to receive a ² more regular ordination, and to be admitted to communion on the condition that they should retain their honour and ministry, but be second in all things to those whom Alexander had ordained, and should not possess the power of doing any ecclesiastical act without the consent of the bishops subject to Alexander's jurisdiction. In the event, however, of the death of any of the Catholic ministers they might take the vacant

according to Philostorgius, Theonas and Secundus alone persisted in their refusal to subscribe the Creed; and Secundus charged Eusebius of Nicomedia with subscribing in order to escape banishment; which, however, he did not escape, as he was banished three months afterwards, L. 1. c. 8. Athanasius expressly states that Eusebius subscribed, De Dec. Syn. Nic. cc. 3. 18. And according to Philostorgius, they subscribed, at the suggestion of Constantina, the Emperor's sister, with a mental reservation, affixing to the word *ὁμοούσιος* the meaning of *ὁμοιούσιος*. Philostorgius appears himself to have been an Homeousian; and says that Eusebius of Nicomedia, Leontius of Antioch, and Anthony of Tarsus always adhered to that doctrine, but that Maris of Chalcedon abandoned it; that Theognius of Nicæa held that God was Father before He begat the Son, because He possessed the power of begetting; and that Asterius affirmed that the Son was the exact (*ἀπαράλλακτον*) image of the Father; all these, as we have seen, were disciples of Lucian.

¹ Compare Sozomen, L. 1. c. 24; Theodoret, L. 1. c. 9; Apologia contra Arianos, c. 59.

² *μυστικωτέρα χειροτονία βεβαιωθέντας.*

places, if they were deemed worthy and chosen by the laity with the approval of the Bishop of Alexandria. Meletius was also required to give in a ¹ list of those whom he had ordained. ² Athanasius appears to have been opposed to this arrangement, which could scarcely fail to lead to disputes. The Meletian presbyters would be desirous to resume their functions, and would not be content to wait until a vacancy occurred; and, on the other hand, when it did occur, the Catholics would resist the introduction of the Meletian claimant. There is no doubt that one of the objects of the Meletians, in uniting themselves to the Arians, was to re-establish themselves in the possession of their churches.

The letter next congratulates the bishops to whom it is addressed on the settlement of the ³ Paschal controversy. The decision of the Council was that Easter was to be celebrated, not according to the reckoning of the Jews, but according to that in general use throughout the Christian world. Constantine, who took an active part in the discussion, argued that Christians ought not in any thing to

¹ Athanasius gives this list, *Apologia contra Arianos*, c. 71.

² His words are: ὅτε Μελέτιος ὑπεδέχθη, ὡς μήπορ' ὄφελον. The enmity of the Meletians against Athanasius appears to have been occasioned by his resistance to their attempts to recover their churches.

³ *De vitâ Constantini*, L. 3. cc. 17—20. *Sozomen*, L. 1. c. 12. *Theodoret*, L. 1. c. 9.

follow the customs of the impious race which put Christ to death. It is worthy of observation that Eusebius, omitting all mention of the Decree upon the most important matter which occasioned the assembling of the Council—the controversy between Alexander and Arius—contents himself with inserting the letter in which Constantine announced to the bishops the decision upon the Paschal question. The omission can only be accounted for on the supposition that he was dissatisfied with the determination of the Council.

The letter concludes with an exhortation to the Alexandrians, to receive with due honour Alexander, who had undergone great labour for the peace of the Church ; and to join with them in praying that the decrees of the Council might remain unaltered.

¹ A record was made of all the points determined by the Council, and signed by all the bishops. The Emperor, before he dismissed them to their several sees, invited them to a splendid banquet, which, to borrow the language of ² his panegyrist, afforded a

¹ ἐκυροῦτο δὲ ἡδὴ καὶ ἐν γραφῇ δι' ὑποσημείωσης ἐκάστων τὰ κοινῇ δεδογμένα. De vitâ Constantini, L. 3. c. 14. Twenty canons of the Council are extant.

² De vitâ Constantini, L. 3. c. 15. Eusebius appears to have had in his mind Matt. xxvi. 29. Constantine at this time celebrated the Vicennalia, the twentieth anniversary of his reign. Sozomen, L. 1. c. 25.

lively representation of the Kingdom of Christ, and appeared rather a dream than a reality. He distributed among them presents according to their different ranks and merits; and addressed them in ¹a speech, in which he strongly inculcated the necessity of concord; warning them not to give way to envious feelings against those of their brethren who enjoyed a higher reputation for wisdom and eloquence than themselves; and at the same time cautioning all who possessed those endowments, not to treat their inferiors with contempt. He especially exhorted all to avoid contentions among themselves, lest they should render the Divine law a subject of ridicule to those who were inclined to blaspheme. He then proceeded to propound his views respecting the course to be taken in order to convert men to Christianity. ²Pains must be taken to convince them, that the worldly condition of a Christian is one to be desired. We must not trust to the force of reason alone, since few love truth for itself. As a physician varies his remedies according to each

¹ De vitâ Constantini, L. 3. c. 16--21. The necessity for these frequent exhortations to concord, does not convey a very favourable impression respecting the Christian temper of the assembled bishops.

² Constantine acted upon this principle, when he established the Christian worship at Heliopolis. He made ample provision for the relief of the poor, in order to win them to the Gospel; saying, in allusion to the words of St. Paul (Philip. i. 18), "Whether in pretence, or in truth, let Christ be preached." De vitâ Constantini, L. 3. c. 58.

particular case, so we must vary our modes of conversion according to the tempers of individuals. Some are won by the prospect of obtaining the means of subsistence; others of gaining influence with the great: some by courtesy of manners: some by presents. In conclusion, Constantine commended himself to the prayers of the bishops, and bade them farewell. I do not observe that Mr. Newman refers, as he well might, to this speech in proof of the political character of Constantine's Christianity. The advice here given, bespeaks an accurate acquaintance with human nature; but savours more of the politician than of the missionary. Men will naturally be disposed to embrace Christianity more readily, if they find that by embracing it, far from injuring, they are promoting their worldly interests; and the preacher of the Gospel may be justified in endeavouring to satisfy them that this will be the case; but to hold out temporal advantages as inducements to conversion, is to act in direct opposition to the spirit of the Gospel.

Constantine, after the termination of the Council, addressed ¹ letters to the Churches and bishops, in

¹ Socrates, L. 1. c. 9, gives his letter to the Church of Alexandria; that to the bishops and laity, in which he calls the Arians Porphyrians, see ad Monachos, c. 51; and that to the Churches, in which he gives an account of the decision on the paschal question. De vitâ Constantini, L. 3. c. 17, and Sozomen, L. 1. c. 21.

which he congratulated them on the establishment of the true faith and the restoration of peace; and ridiculed Arius and his followers, whom he called Porphyrians, because Arius, like Porphyry, had written against the Christian faith. He directed also, that the works of Arius should be burned; and that all who should be detected in concealing them, should be capitally punished. These angry invectives and denunciations, are little in accordance with the moderate and tolerant language which he employed in his letter to Alexander and Arius, written previously to the Council. But his object, as he himself states, was to bring all his subjects to an agreement respecting religion. As, therefore, the Council had decreed what the true faith was, and he had confirmed its decrees by his sanction, and had ¹ commanded them to be received as the dictates of the Holy Spirit, he appears to have regarded the few bishops who refused to subscribe them, not only as perverse and contumacious gainsayers of the truth, but as also conspiring to resist his sovereign authority, and consequently deserving condign punishment. ² Mr. Newman, however, who appears to condemn the repressive measures adopted by Con-

¹ πᾶν γὰρ ὅτι δ' ἐν τοῖς ἁγίοις τῶν ἐπισκόπων συνεδρίοις πράττεται, τοῦτο πρὸς τὴν θείαν βούλησιν ἔχει τὴν ἀναφοράν. De vitâ Constantini, L. 3. c. 17. Socrates, L. 1. c. 9. Sozomen, L. 1. c. 20.

² History of the Arians, c. 3. sect. 1. p. 264.

stantine against the Donatists, ¹ thinks that, in his proceedings after the Council of Nicæa, he acted a part altogether consistent with his own previous sentiments, and praiseworthy under the circumstances of his defective knowledge.

The history of the events which took place after the Council, is involved in great confusion. Alexander, Bishop of Alexandria, ² died about five months after it, and was succeeded by Athanasius, who, as we have seen, attended him as his deacon, at Nicæa, and, if we are to believe the Ecclesiastical historians, was marked out from the age of boyhood for the episcopal office. According to ³ Socrates, he and

¹ History of the Arians, c. 3. sect. 1. p. 273. See a curious statement respecting the early theory of persecution, in a note on the Epistle ad Monachos, in the Oxford translation, c. 67. The theory was that, when *a cause is good*, there is nothing wrong in using force in *due subordination* to argument. As the civil magistrate may hold out the secular blessings following on Christianity, as inducements to individuals who are incapable of higher motives, so he may with propriety employ force. Constantine was, therefore, consistent with himself; for we have seen that he held out temporal advantages as inducements to conversion. The annotator does not say whether he himself adopted the early theory; he was not then a member of an infallible Church: now his cause must necessarily be good, and he cannot hesitate to use force, but of course in due subordination to argument—when argument has failed to convince the stubborn gainsayer.

² Apologia contra Arianos, c. 59. Theodoret, L. 1. c. 26.

³ L. 1. c. 15. He tells the story on the authority of Rufinus. Sozomen tells it with some variation. L. 2. c. 17. Theodoret does not mention it; and the Benedictine editor disbelieves it. Sozomen says, on the authority of Apollinarius Syrus, that

some of his playfellows were amusing themselves on the anniversary of the martyrdom of Peter, a former bishop of Alexandria, with assigning to each other the titles of the different sacred orders: one was called a bishop, another a priest, another a deacon; and the title of bishop fell to Athanasius. Alexander, happening to pass by, called the boys to him, and asked each what title he had received; and thinking that there was something of a prophetic character in the transaction, ordered them all to be taken to the church and instructed; but particularly singled out Athanasius, whom he ordained as his deacon.

If Constantine entertained the hope that the decision of the Council would restore permanent peace to the Church, he was doomed to disappointment. The controversy, which appears never to have ceased entirely ¹in Ægypt, was renewed there with all its original bitterness; and the disputes among the bishops rose to such a height, that the Emperor found it necessary to interpose his authority, and to address a special letter to them. The triumph of the Catholics at the Council appeared

Athanasius at first declined the bishopric. See *Apologia contra Arianos*, c. 6. The Benedictine editor places the birth of Athanasius in 296; he was, therefore, thirty years of age at the time of his elevation to the episcopate. He says also, that after his appointment, he visited the Thebais, and there saw Pachomius, and Sarapion Bishop of Tentyra.

¹ *De vitâ Constantini*, L. 3. c. 23; L. 4. c. 41.

to be complete: Arius, Eusebius of Nicomedia, and Theognius were, as we have seen, banished, and the latter two deprived of their bishoprics; while the Emperor seemed well disposed to employ the whole force of civil power in crushing the Arian party. But suddenly the scene is changed, and the Eusebians are in their turn triumphant. ¹Eusebius and Theognius are recalled from banishment and reinstated in their sees, Arius ² having been previously allowed to return. ³The Eusebians contrive to expel several of the Catholic bishops, and to get possession of their bishoprics; and we find Constantine, who had so recently banished Arius, commanding Athanasius to receive him into communion, under pain of being himself deposed. If we may give credit to the account of Socrates, the change in the opinions of Constantine was effected through the instrumentality of an ⁴Arian presbyter, who

¹ Socrates, L. 1. c. 14. Sozomen, L. 2. c. 16. In the letter of retractation addressed by them to the bishops, they assert that they did not dissent from the confession of faith set forth by the Council, but objected to the excommunication of Arius. Compare Sozomen, L. 3. c. 19, where the Arian account is given.

² This appears from the letter of retractation just mentioned. Philostorgius says, that the recal of Eusebius and Theognius took place three years after the Council: but his statement is in many respects erroneous. L. 2. c. 7.

³ Athanasius says, that the Eusebians commenced their intrigues immediately after the Council. *De Synodis*, c. 21.

⁴ Socrates, L. 1. cc. 25, 26. Sozomen, L. 2. c. 27. Socrates says, that Constantine deposited his will in the hands of this presbyter, with injunctions to deliver it only to Constantius. L. 1. c. 39. Arius, ut orbem deciperet, sororem principis ante decepit. Jerome ad Ctesiphontem, Tom. 2. p. 171 C.

possessed great influence with Constantia, the sister of Constantine and widow of Licinius. In her last illness she commended this presbyter to her brother's favour, who admitted him to great intimacy. Of this intimacy he availed himself, to represent Arius as a much injured man, whose belief was not what his enemies affirmed it to be, but in agreement with the creed set forth by the Council. Constantine was in consequence induced to 'recall Arius, who went to Constantinople accompanied by Euzoius, who had been degraded from the diaconate by Alexander. The Emperor admitted them to his presence, and required them to bring him their profession of faith in writing. This they did, stating that they had derived it from the Holy Gospel, in which Christ commanded his disciples to go and make disciples of all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. They appealed to the judgment of God, both here and hereafter, in attestation of their acknowledgment of the three Persons of the Holy Trinity as the Catholic Church acknowledged them, and as the Scripture in

¹ Socrates gives the letter of recall; from which it appears, that Constantine had previously summoned Arius to his presence. Valesius thinks that the Arius, who, in company with Euzoius presented the profession of faith to Constantine, was not the hæresiarch, but another person of the same name. The letter, however, of Athanasius to Serapion seems to be decisive on this point. See the note of the Benedictine editor. *Apologia contra Arianos*, c. 84.

which they implicitly believed, taught. They, therefore, entreated the Emperor to unite them to their mother, the Church, removing out of the way all questions and superfluity of words, to the end that they and the Church might offer their united prayers for the Emperor's kingdom and for all his race.

The following was the ¹profession of faith presented by Arius and Euzoius:—

“We believe in one God, Father Almighty; and in the Lord Jesus Christ, his Son, begotten of Him before all ages, God the Word, by Whom all things were made, both in heaven and earth; who descended, and was incarnate, and suffered, and rose again, and ascended into heaven, and shall come again to Judge the quick and the dead. (We believe) in the Holy Ghost, in the resurrection of the flesh, in the life of the world to come, in the kingdom of heaven, and in one Catholic Church, extending from one end of the earth to the other.”

Such is the statement of Socrates, which he derived from Rufinus. Valesius doubts the truth of the story, and observes that Athanasius takes no notice of it. Yet it is not in itself improbable;

¹ The Oxford annotator on the works of Athanasius, supposes this creed to be referred to in the Synodal epistle of the Council of Jerusalem. *De Synodis*, c. 25.

and it accounts for that which requires to be accounted for—Constantine's change of opinion. The Benedictine editor adopts it.

Constantine had hoped, that the decree of the Council would effect the object which he had nearest his heart,—that of making all men of one mind in religion. He had, therefore, enforced by all the means in his power, subscription to the decree; and, as we have seen, had required Eusebius of Cæsarea to insert the word *ὁμοούσιος* in his creed. The result, however, had disappointed the Emperor's expectations; and the Eusebians, whose cause appears to have been espoused by many members of the ¹imperial family, succeeded in persuading him that, although they objected to the word, their sentiments were really orthodox, and that Athanasius, by pertinaciously insisting on the use of the word, was the chief obstacle to the restoration of peace. I have already explained the ²reason of the pertinacity of Athanasius; the expressions *ὁμοούσιος, ἐκ τῆς οὐσίας τοῦ Θεοῦ*, were the only expressions which the Arians could not evade. They were content to

¹ Athanasius says, that Eutropius was expelled from the see of Hadrianople through the influence of Basilina, the mother of Julian. *Ad Monachos*, c. 5.

² *De Dec. Syn. Nic.* cc. 19, 20. The Oxford annotator has however remarked, that in the three treatises against the Arians, the word *ὁμοούσιος* scarcely occurs. The history of the controversy will perhaps account for this remarkable fact. *De Synodis*, c. 54. p. 157, note i.

say that the Son was *of* God (ἐκ τοῦ Θεοῦ), because the expression is not inconsistent with the opinion that He is a creature (κτίσμα), all created things being *of* God: but the expression ἐκ τῆς οὐσίας τοῦ Θεοῦ, implies His essential divinity—that He is increate. It appears, ¹ however, that many considered the expressions to savour of Sabellianism, and to be destructive of the subsistence or personality (ὑπαρξιν) of the Son. This charge was brought by ² Eusebius of Cæsarea against Eustathius, Bishop of Antioch, who in turn charged Eusebius with corrupting the faith, and with introducing polytheism. The disputes rose to such a height, that a ³ Synod was assembled at Antioch in order to settle them. The party opposed to Eustathius prevailed, and he was deposed from his bishopric on the ground that he did not adhere to the Nicene doctrine, but taught Sabellianism. If, however, we may believe ⁴ Socrates,

¹ Sozomen, L. 3. c. 13.

² Socrates, L. 1. c. 13, observes upon this dispute that, while both parties recognized the proper personality and subsistence of the Son, they quarrelled because they did not understand each other; and like men fighting in the dark, brought mutual accusations of blasphemy. But Mr. Newman would say that Socrates, an uninstructed layman, was incompetent to pronounce upon the amount and importance of the difference between them. Sozomen, L. 2. c. 19.

³ The Benedictine editor places these events about the year 330.

⁴ δὲ ἄλλας οὐκ ἀγαθὰς αἰτίας, φανερώς γὰρ οὐκ εἰρήκασι. Socrates states, on the authority of George, Bishop of Laodicæa in Syria, an opponent of the Homoousian doctrine, who wrote a panegyric on Eusebius Emisenus, that Cyrus, Bishop of Berrhœa,

this was only a pretence; the real cause of his deposition being such as could not be avowed. This, the historian adds, was the universal practice: whenever an unfortunate bishop was deposed, the bishops who concurred in the sentence loaded him with all sorts of accusations, and charged him with impiety, though they never expressly stated wherein the impiety consisted. The deposition of Eustathius was the signal for a violent outbreak of party feeling at Antioch. When the time for the election of his successor arrived, one portion of the people wished to replace him in the see, another to elect Eusebius of Cæsarea; and so great was the tumult, that the city had nearly been destroyed. Not only the municipal authorities, but the military also took part in the contest; and the two parties would have proceeded to blows, if Constantine had not sent one of the counts of the empire with letters addressed to the lay-members of the Church; and Eusebius had

was the accuser of Eustathius; and adds, that he is unable to reconcile this account to a subsequent statement of the same George, that Cyrus himself was deposed for Sabellianism. L. 1. c. 24. See L. 2. c. 9. Sozomen, L. 2. c. 19. Athanasius mentions Cyrus among the bishops expelled by the Arians. *De Fugâ*, c. 3. *Ad Monachos*, c. 5. According to Theodoret, Eusebius of Nicomedia and his party concocted a charge of incontinence against Eustathius. L. 1. cc. 21, 22. Philostorgius, L. 2. c. 7. Athanasius mentions his banishment, as well as another charge which must have been still more injurious to him, that he had insulted the mother of Constantine. *De Fugâ*, c. 3. *Ad Monachos*, c. 4.

not, either spontaneously, or at the Emperor's suggestion, declined the bishopric. We have complained of the meagreness of the account given by Eusebius of the Nicene Council; the same complaint applies to his account of that of Antioch, though he took so prominent a part in the proceedings. ¹ He speaks of the serious disturbances in that city; but says nothing respecting the causes in which they originated, or of the grounds of the deposition of Eusebius; but contents himself with giving some ² letters of Constantine, one addressed to himself in commendation of his refusal to quit Cæsarea for Antioch; another addressed to the bishops assembled at Antioch, in which the Emperor states that Eusebius, in declining the bishopric of Antioch, had acted in strict conformity to ³ ecclesiastical rule; and ⁴ commends especially to their choice Euphronius,

¹ De vitâ Constantini, L. 3. cc. 59, 60, 61, 62. Socrates says that, in consequence of the slight notice taken by Eusebius of the causes of the disputes which led to the assembling of the Council of Antioch, he acquired the reputation of being *double-tongued*, and was suspected of insincerity in his assent to the Nicene faith. L. 1. c. 21.

² In the letter to Eusebius, Constantine says that he wrote at the divine suggestion, *προστροφῇ τοῦ Θεοῦ*. C. 61.

³ See the eleventh Apostolic Canon.

⁴ According to Socrates, L. 1. c. 24, the see of Antioch remained vacant eight years: Euphronius was then appointed to it through the influence of the Arians. Sozomen, L. 2. c. 19. Valesius contends that this statement is incorrect; that Paulinus, Bishop of Tyre, was translated to Antioch (see Eusebius contra Marcellum, L. 1. c. 4, sub in. Philostorgius, L. 3. c. 15), and

a presbyter of Casarea, in Cappadocia, and George of Arethusa, who had been ordained presbyter by Alexander at Alexandria. The former appears to have been appointed, though there is some doubt whether he was the immediate successor of Eustathius. Socrates says that he was an Arian; and the succession of Arian bishops at Antioch certainly continued for many years. But the Catholics also appointed a successor to Eustathius; so that the effect of his deposition was to create an open schism in the Church of Antioch, the two parties renouncing all communion with each other: till then there had been no open separation, but the two parties ¹ had joined in public worship.

The victory obtained by the Arians at Antioch encouraged them to proceed to further acts of aggression against their opponents, and to the deposition of ² other bishops. The influence of Eusebius

having held the bishopric only six months, was succeeded by Eulalius. According to Theodoret, Eulalius succeeded Eustathius, and held the bishopric a very short time. An attempt was then made to introduce Eusebius, but he declined the office; and Euphronius was elected, who lived little more than a year, and was succeeded by Placentius (Flaccillus). See, with respect to Paulinus, the note of Valesius on Eusebius Hist. Eccl. L. 10. c. 1.

¹ Sozomen, L. 2. c. 32. L. 3. c. 13.

² Athanasius mentions nine who were deprived of their bishoprics: among them Asclepas of Gaza, and Entropius of Hadrianople, ad Monachos, c. 5.

of Nicomedia and Theognius on the mind of the Emperor appears to have been gradually on the increase, and they at length determined to assail Athanasius himself. We have seen that Constantine had admitted Arius to his presence at Constantinople. He was now prevailed upon, not only to give Arius permission to ¹return to Alexandria, but to require Athanasius to receive him into communion. Athanasius, however, refused: and the Emperor, incensed at the refusal, wrote him a very angry letter, threatening him with deprivation of his bishopric, and expulsion from Alexandria. These threats not producing the desired effect, the Eusebians, in order to entirely destroy him in the opinion of the Emperor, brought various charges against him. ²They denied the validity of his consecration, asserting that, after the death of Alexander, fifty-five bishops (Catholic and Meletian) from Ægypt and the Thebais met together, and bound themselves by an oath to elect his successor by public suffrage; but that six or seven of the number held a clandestine meeting in violation of their oath, and consecrated Athanasius; who affirmed in refutation of this charge, and his statement is supported by the testimony of the

¹ Socrates says that Arius actually returned, L. 1. c. 27. Valesius doubts it. Athanasius does not mention it, *Apologia contra Arianos*, c. 59, where Constantine's letter is given.

² Sozomen, L. 2. cc. 17. 25. Compare *Apologia contra Arianos*, cc. 6. 28; Philostorgius, L. 2. c. 11. Socrates says that the Arians charged Athanasius with personal unworthiness.

bishops of Ægypt and Libya, that his consecration had taken place, not merely with the consent, but at the earnest demand of the people of Alexandria, and that a majority of the bishops assisted at the solemnity. The ¹ Eusebians then induced the Meletians, who for the reasons already stated had formed a ² coalition with them, to bring various accusations against Athanasius; many of them of a frivolous character. He was charged, for instance, with imposing upon the people of Ægypt a tax for providing linen vestments for the church at Alexandria. This charge was refuted by ³ Alypius and Macarius, two presbyters of Alexandria, who happened to be at Nicomedia. Constantine in consequence rebuked the accusers, and ordered Athanasius to repair to his court. Eusebius then concocted another charge, that Athanasius had ⁴ joined in a conspiracy against the Emperor, and had sent a purse of gold to one Philumenus for the use of those who were engaged

¹ Socrates mentions particularly Eusebius, Theognius, Maris, Ursacius, and Valens as the instigators of these proceedings, L. 1. c. 27. Compare Athanasius, *Apologia contra Arianos*, c. 59. Theodoret mentions also Theodorus of Heraclea, L. 1. c. 28.

² Sozomen says that the Arians were called Meletians in Ægypt, L. 2. cc. 21, 22. The names of the accusers were Ision, Endæmon, and Callinicus, see *Apologia*, c. 60.

³ Athanasius calls him Apis, c. 60.

⁴ *Contra Arianos*, c. 60. Theodoret, L. 1. c. 26. The Emperor heard this charge in person, in the suburb of Nicomedia called Psammathia.

in it; but Constantine, on investigation, found this charge also to be false, and sent back Athanasius with a ¹ letter to the members of the Church of Alexandria, in which he told them that their bishop had been calumniated. A third charge was afterwards brought forward, not against Athanasius directly, but against Macarius, the presbyter who had assisted in disproving the charge respecting the linen vestments, in the hope that his condemnation might indirectly contribute to that of his patron. The name of the accuser in this case was Ischyra, who, though never ordained, had ventured to exercise the functions of the priesthood in the ² Mareotic region; and, being detected, had ³ fled to Nicomedia, where Eusebius had not only allowed him to officiate as a priest, but had promised to raise him to the ⁴ episcopate if he would assist in procuring the condemna-

¹ Athanasius gives this letter, *contra Arianos*, c. 61. Theodoret, L. 1. c. 27.

² According to Socrates, this was a very populous region, abounding in villages and churches, and under the jurisdiction of the Bishop of Alexandria: *τάττονται δὲ αὐταὶ αἱ ἐκκλησίαι ὑπὸ τῷ τῆς Ἀλεξανδρείας ἐπισκόπῳ, καὶ εἰσὶν ὑπὸ τὴν αὐτοῦ πόλιν ὡς παροικίαι*. Athanasius says that there was neither episcopus nor chorepiscopus in the region; which, if the Benedictine editor rightly interprets the passage, contained ten or more villages, each having its presbyter, *Apologia contra Arianos*, c. 85.

³ The Benedictine editor doubts whether he fled to Nicomedia.

⁴ According to Athanasius this promise was fulfilled. At the request of Eusebius, the Emperor ordered a church to be built for him.

tion of Athanasius. He in consequence ¹accused Macarius of having rushed into his church, leaped upon the holy table, broken the mystic cup, and burned the sacred books.

According to ²Sozomen, many other charges were brought against Athanasius: he was accused of deposing Callinicus, Bishop of Pelusium, merely because that prelate would not adopt his opinions, and throwing him into prison; of committing the care of the church to one Mark, who had been degraded from the presbyterate; ³of causing other bishops to be scourged; and of ⁴violating a female. But a still more heinous crime was laid to his charge: his enemies produced a hand which they affirmed to be

¹ *Apologia contra Arianos*, cc. 11. 27. 37. 41. 46. 83. 85. In the decree of the Arian Synod of Philippopolis, Athanasius himself is charged with breaking the cup. *Hilarii ex opere historico* *Fragm.* iii. c. 6. See also Sozomen, L. 2. c. 25.

² L. 2. c. 25. *Philostorgius*, L. 2. c. 11. We have seen that among the accusers of Athanasius in the matter of the linen vestments was one named Callinicus. Sozomen calls Callinicus a bishop of the Catholic Church; but his name appears in the list of Meletian bishops submitted by Meletius to Alexander.

³ Gibbon observes that Athanasius takes no notice of this charge.

⁴ Sozomen says that this charge is not recorded in the Acts of the Synod of Tyre. The Benedictine editor assigns satisfactory reasons for disbelieving that it was ever made. It appears, however, that the Arian was not the only party which had recourse to this species of calumny; according to *Philostorgius*, L. 2. c. 11, a similar charge was brought against Eusebius of Nicomedia. See *Theodoret*, L. 1. c. 30.

that of ¹ Arsenius, the Meletian Bishop of Hypsala, and to be used by Athanasius for magical purposes.

On receiving these accusations Constantine directed his nephew, ² Dalmatius the censor, who resided at Antioch in Syria, to summon the accused parties, and to punish them if convicted. He sent also Eusebius and Theognius to Antioch, in order that they might be present at the investigation. Athanasius, on receiving the summons, ³ caused search to be made for Arsenius, but could not find him, as he was concealed by the opposite party, and directed continually to change his hiding-place. The investigation, however, was speedily closed by the Emperor, who directed the bishops whom he had summoned to the dedication of the Church of the Holy Sepulchre at Jerusalem, to stop at Tyre by the way, and inquire into the charges. He appears to have wavered much in his opinion; for Athanasius expressly says that he had satisfied himself by his own inquiries at ⁴ Nicomedia of the falsehood of the

¹ Sozomen, L. 2. c. 23. *Apologia contra Arianos*, cc. 8. 38. 42. See his own letter to Athanasius, *Apologia*, c. 69. Theodoret, L. 1. c. 30. His name does not appear in the list sent in by Meletius.

² Valesius observes that the Dalmatius here mentioned must have been the brother, not the nephew of Constantine.

³ *Apologia contra Arianos*, c. 65.

⁴ In the Psammathia, *Apologia contra Arianos*, c. 65. It should seem from the letter given by Athanasius, c. 68, that the Emperor had also been satisfied by the investigation before

charge against Macarius respecting the cup, and that Dalmatius was sent to inquire only into the charge respecting Arsenius. Both charges were, however, remitted to the bishops assembled at ¹ Tyre.

According to ² Sozomen a synod had thirty months before been summoned at Cæsarea, but Athanasius did not appear. He showed equal unwillingness to attend the synod at Tyre, not so much, Socrates says, from dread of the accusations, inasmuch as he was ignorant of their nature, as from fear lest some innovation should be attempted in the Creed settled at Nicæa. The Emperor, however, intimated to him that, if he did not come willingly, he would be brought by force; at last, therefore, he obeyed the summons.

Sixty bishops met at Tyre, and ³ Macarius was

Dalmatius of the innocence of Athanasius in the matter of Arsenius.

¹ Socrates, L. 1. c. 28. He says that it was held in the thirtieth year of the reign of Constantine; Valesius says in the twenty-eighth; Eusebius mentions, and only mentions it, *De vitâ Constantiniani*, L. 4. cc. 41, 42.

² L. 2. c. 25. Theodoret seems to say that the Emperor allowed the synod to be transferred from Cæsarea to Tyre, thinking that the known hostility of Eusebius to Athanasius would furnish the latter with a just plea for not appearing, L. 1. c. 28. Hilarii ex opere historico *Fragm.* iii. c. 7. The Benedictine editor places this Synod A.D. 333, and consequently, that of Tyre A.D. 335.

³ *Apologia contra Arianos*, c. 71.

carried thither in chains under a military guard. Athanasius contended that it ought in the first instance to be proved that Ischyrras, the accuser, had really been ordained priest, since he was so designated in the charge. ¹ His name does not appear in the list of Meletian clergy delivered by Meletius to Alexander; and Athanasius gives a letter addressed to the Synod of Tyre by the presbyters and deacons of the Mareotis, in which they deny that he had ever been ordained. He adds that the Meletians had never been able to introduce their schism into the region, nor to establish a church nor ministers in it. There was, therefore, neither cup to be broken nor table to be overturned. So long as Athanasius was present nothing was proved against Macarius; but it was finally determined to send a commission to the Mareotis to ascertain the state of facts upon the spot. Nothing, however, could be more unfair than the whole procedure; the ² com-

¹ *Apologia contra Arianos*, cc. 11, 12. 63. 71, 72. Hilary calls Ischyrras a deacon, *Ex op. hist. Fragm. ii. c. 16*. His own statement was that he was ordained by Colluthus, a presbyter of Alexandria, who assumed to himself episcopal functions, and whose ordinations were, as we have seen, annulled. The bishops who accompanied Athanasius to Tyre call his opponents Colluthians, as well as Meletians and Arians, *Apologia*, c. 77.

² They were Theognius, Maris, Theodorus, Macedonius, Ursacius, and Valens; Philagrius, the prefect, accompanied them to the Mareotis. Socrates, *L. 1. c. 31*. *Apologia contra Arianos*, cc. 13, 14. 28. 72. 74. According to the statement in c. 15, they committed many acts of violence upon the Catholics of Alexandria.

missioners were selected from the personal enemies of Athanasius; and while Macarius was detained in custody at Tyre, his accuser, Ischyra, was allowed to accompany them. Athanasius, therefore, finding that ¹ the Count Dionysius, whom Constantine had sent to preside over the synod, was hostile to him, and that, notwithstanding his urgent remonstrances, the commission was composed entirely of his enemies, secretly withdrew and went to the Emperor.

According to Athanasius, the result of the inquiry was wholly in favour of Macarius; ² and Ischyra confessed, in letters addressed to Alexander of Thessalonica and to Athanasius himself, that the whole story was a fabrication, and that force had been employed in order to induce him to tell it. The investigation into the case of ³ Arsenius resulted

¹ Athanasius gives a letter of Alexander, Bishop of Thessalonica, to Dionysius, in which he affirms that there was a conspiracy against Athanasius, and complains that none but his personal enemies had been sent, and that he himself had not been consulted, *Apologia contra Arianos*, cc. 27, 28. 80. See also the letters of the presbyters and deacons of Alexandria to the commissioners, c. 73 (the Synod of Alexandria complains of the irregular and violent proceedings of Dionysius, cc. 8, 9); and of the Ægyptian bishops to Dionysius, c. 79.

² *Apologia contra Arianos*, cc. 28. 64. It was proved also, by the evidence of a catechumen, that at the time when Macarius was said to have interrupted Ischyra in the performance of the divine offices, and to have broken the cup, Ischyra was lying ill in his cell.

³ Socrates says that the name of the accuser in the matter of Arsenius was Ahab or John (the same whom Meletius con-

also in the establishment of the innocence of Athanasius. We have seen that the Meletians had ¹ directed Arsenius to conceal himself; he was, however, ² discovered providentially in the following manner. He went privately to Tyre; and the servants of Archelaus, a man of consular rank, heard some men in a tavern say that Arsenius, who was reported to have been murdered, was in the house of a person whose name they mentioned. The servants, having taken such notice of the individuals who made the statement as to be able to recognize them, reported what they had heard to their master, who forthwith sought out and secured Arsenius, and

secreted, according to Epiphanius), and that he contrived to escape in the confusion which followed the detection of the falsehood, L. 1. c. 30. *Apologia contra Arianos*, c. 65, where he is called Arcaph.

¹ See the letter of the presbyter Pinnes, in which he gives an account of the manner in which he enabled Arsenius to avoid the pursuit of the deacon of Athanasius, *Apologia*, c. 67.

² Socrates, L. 1. c. 29. *Apologia contra Arianos*, c. 65. Athanasius gives a letter in which Alexander Bishop of Thessalonica congratulates him on the detection of the conspiracy in the case of Arsenius, c. 66; and one from Arsenius himself, in which Arsenius expresses his anxiety to be received into communion with the Catholic Church; but it contains no allusion either to the charge or to the detection of the fraud, c. 69. He gives also one from Constantine to John or Ahab, in proof that the latter had expressed his sorrow for having been a party to the accusation. The letter, however, only expresses the Emperor's satisfaction at the return of John to the communion of the Church, and his reconciliation to Athanasius, c. 70. Socrates states that Arsenius subscribed the sentence of deprivation against Athanasius, L. 1. c. 32. The Benedictine editor doubts this: nor is it probable.

sent word to Athanasius that he need be under no alarm, as Arsenius was alive. Arsenius, when seized, pretended to be another person; but Paul, Bishop of Tyre, who had known him long before, identified him. When, therefore, Athanasius was summoned before the synod and the hand was produced, he asked his accusers whether any of them knew Arsenius. Many affirming that they did, Arsenius was introduced, having his hands concealed beneath his garment. Athanasius then asked whether this was the man whose hand was cut off; and, gradually unfolding the garment, showed first one, then the other of his hands; and turning to those present, said: "Arsenius, as you see, has two hands; ¹ whence the third was obtained, let my enemies explain."

Notwithstanding, however, these proofs of the innocence of Athanasius, the synod, when the commissioners returned from the Mareotis, pronounced a sentence of deprivation against him. He must have been prepared for this result, since it was almost entirely composed of his ² enemies; and, if

¹ Socrates doubts, or affects to doubt, whether the accuser of Athanasius had cut the hand from a dead body, or had purposely murdered a man in order to obtain it, c. 27. Sozomen, L. 2. c. 25, gives the statement made by the Meletians of the grounds on which they were justified in believing that Arsenius was dead.

² Eusebius of Cæsarea and George of Laodicea, who had been degraded by Alexander, took an active part: *Apologia contra Arianos*, cc. 8. 77. Many, however, of those present did not concur in the sentence. Paphnutius, in particular, took Maximus,

we can place implicit reliance on the account given by him, they were themselves so ashamed of their proceedings, that ¹ they endeavoured to suppress the publication of the Acts of the Council. One copy, however, fell into the hands of Julius, Bishop of Rome, who communicated it to Athanasius. ² Four Alexandrian presbyters were also banished by the synod, though they had not appeared at Tyre. At the conclusion of their proceedings, ³ the bishops, in obedience to the Emperor's commands, proceeded to Jerusalem to celebrate the dedication of the Church of the Holy Sepulchre. On their arrival they received Arius and Euzoius⁴ into communion, in compliance, as they said, with the Emperor's injunction; and ⁵ in a synodical letter urged the Alexandrians to restore peace to the Church by receiving the Arians generally. The concourse of

Bishop of Jerusalem, by the hand, and led him out of the assembly, saying that they were confessors, and ought not to be associated with wicked men. Sozomen, L. 2. c. 21.

¹ *Apologia contra Arianos*, c. 83.

² *Apologia*, cc. 17. 40. Their names were Aphthonius, Athanasius the son of Capito, Paul, and Plutio.

³ Socrates, L. 1. c. 33. Sozomen, L. 2. c. 27.

⁴ They also received John, the accuser of Athanasius: Sozomen, L. 2. cc. 25. 31. *Ad Monachos*, c. 1. Sozomen says that Constantine afterwards banished John, as well as Athanasius.

⁵ *Apologia contra Arianos*, c. 84. *De Synodis*, cc. 21, 22. In this letter they say that Constantine was satisfied of the orthodoxy of Arius. Athanasius remarks upon their inconsistency in pretending that they were anxious to restore the peace of the Church, while they had banished him in order to restore Arius.

the bishops on the occasion was so great, that ¹ Eusebius compares the Synod of Jerusalem to that of Nicæa. After the completion of the ceremony, ² they gave an account of their proceedings to the Emperor; but in the mean time, as we have seen, Athanasius had gone to Constantinople. There he took an early opportunity of throwing himself in the Emperor's way, and having with difficulty obtained a hearing, succeeded in persuading Constantine that he had been unjustly condemned, and that his accusers ought to be summoned thither in order that he might have an opportunity of clearing himself in their presence of the charges brought against him. Constantine in consequence addressed a ³ letter to the bishops at Tyre, in which, after giving a graphic account of his meeting with Athanasius, he charged them with having conducted the proceedings at Tyre tumultuously, with a view rather to the

¹ De vitâ Constantini, cc. 43. 47. The Oxford annotator calls this comparison invidious: I know not why. De Synodis, c. 20.

² In their letter to the Emperor they stated that they had condemned Athanasius because he had obstinately refused to comply with the summons to attend at Cæsarea; because he had come to Tyre with a multitude in his train, had conducted himself with great intemperance and violence, and had at last avoided the judgment of the synod by flight; and because they were satisfied by the report of the commissioners of the truth of the charges respecting Macarius and the broken cup. Sozomen, L. 2. c. 25.

³ Socrates, L. 1. c. 34. Sozomen, L. 2. c. 28. Apologia contra Arianos, c. 86.

gratification of their animosity than to the establishment of the truth, and summoned them to his presence.

Most of the bishops had already returned to their dioceses. ¹ But Eusebius of Nicomedia, Theognius, Patrophilus, Ursacius, and Valens went to Constantinople; and instead of attempting to substantiate the charges already brought forward, preferred ² a new one—that Athanasius had threatened to prevent the exportation from Alexandria of the corn usually sent to Constantinople. This charge, though highly improbable in itself, Constantine either believed or affected to believe; he was naturally weary of these never-ending disputes, and Socrates insinuates that, regarding Athanasius as the only or principal obstacle to the re-establishment of unity in the Church, the Emperor was glad of a pretence for removing him out of the way and banishing him to Treves. Athanasius himself ³ ascribed his banishment to the wish of the Emperor to place him out of the reach

¹ Socrates, L. 1. c. 35. Theodoret, L. 1. c. 31. Sozomen, L. 2. c. 28, names Theodorus of Heraclea in the place of Patrophilus. *Apologia contra Arianos*, c. 87, where a second Eusebius is mentioned.

² *Apologia contra Arianos*, c. 9.

³ Or rather the synod of Ægyptian bishops, *Apologia contra Arianos*, c. 9. They insinuate that the Eusebians hoped by the last charge to induce Constantine to punish Athanasius capitally, *Ad Monachos*, c. 50. The Benedictine editor places the banishment of Athanasius A.D. 336.

of his enemies; and in the ¹ letter which the younger Constantine addressed to the people of Alexandria when he sent back Athanasius from Gaul, he intimates this, and adds that his father fully intended to revoke the sentence of banishment. It is difficult otherwise to account for Constantine's conduct. According to the ² representation of Athanasius, when he was summoned to Nicomedia and charged with having been engaged in a conspiracy, Constantine was satisfied of his innocence. The result of the inquiry carried on at ³ Nicomedia into the charge respecting Macarius and the broken cup, as well as of that instituted before Dalmatius the censor, at Antioch, respecting the mutilation of Arsenius, was equally favourable to Athanasius; the ⁴ Emperor expressed himself satisfied of his innocence, though he remitted both the charges to the bishops assembled at Tyre. It was not till the charge of threatening to stop the supply of corn from Alexandria was brought that Constantine yielded to the solicitations of his accusers. The threat was one calculated greatly to incense Constantine, inasmuch as it directly affected his authority; but it was, as

¹ *Apologia contra Arianos*, c. 87. Theodoret says that Constantine, before his death, directed Athanasius to return, in spite of the remonstrances of Eusebius, *L. 1. c. 32*; *L. 2. c. 2*.

² *Apologia*, c. 60.

³ *Apologia*, c. 65.

⁴ See the letter of Constantine to Athanasius, *Apologia*, c. 68.

¹the Ægyptian bishops represent, in the highest degree improbable that it was ever uttered; and the precipitancy with which his banishment was pronounced, lends countenance to the account given by Socrates of the motives by which Constantine was influenced. Wearied, as I have already said, by the never-ending disputes, and assailed by the incessant representations of the members of his family and his court, who were for the most part attached to the Eusebian party, he persuaded himself that he was consulting the peace of the empire and of the Church, as well as his own, by banishing Athanasius.

²It is to be observed, that the charges against Athanasius turned entirely upon acts committed by him in the administration of his diocese;—upon his tyrannical exercise of power, either over his own clergy or over the Meletians. No charge of heretical teaching was brought against him. Notwithstanding the inconsistency of Constantine's conduct towards him personally, the Emperor appears steadily to have maintained the decree of the Nicene Council.

³The friends of Arius were obliged to profess that

¹ They ask how a private, and not rich, individual could stop the supply of corn. The Eusebians, however, appear to have represented Athanasius as rich and powerful: *Apologia contra Arianos*, c. 9.

² Compare the decree of the Arian Synod of Philippopolis. *Hilarii ex historico opere Fragm.* iii. cc. 6, 7.

³ Socrates, L. 1. c. 25: *φάσκων μὴ ἄλλως φρονεῖν ἄρειον ἢ ὁ τῇ συνόδῳ ἔοκεῖ*. See also Sozomen, L. 3. c. 19, and the

his doctrine had always been in accordance with that of the Council, before they could procure permission for him to return from banishment; nor was it till after the death of Constantine that any attempt was made to substitute another creed in the place of the Nicene.

After the banishment of Athanasius, ¹ Arius returned to Alexandria, and again created confusion by openly preaching his doctrine. Constantine, in consequence, summoned him to Constantinople. Alexander then occupied that see, having succeeded Metrophanes. Regarding himself as the guardian of the Nicene faith, but alarmed at the threats of Eusebius that he should be deprived unless he admitted Arius to communion, he was in a great strait. In his distress he fled to God; and after frequent fastings and supplications, shut himself up in the church called Irene, and there, prostrate beneath the holy table, ² prayed for several successive days and nights

note of the Benedictine editor on Hilary contra Constantium, c. 27.

¹ Socrates, L. 1. cc. 37, 38. Sozomen, L. 2. c. 29, who says that Arius went to Constantinople, because the Church of Alexandria refused to communicate with him. Athanasius, Ep. ad Serapionem, c. 2, says, that the Eusebians prevailed upon the Emperor to send for him.

² Athanasius gives a somewhat different and certainly more unobjectionable version of the prayer. According to him, Alexander prayed that God would either have mercy on the Church and remove Arius from the world; or would remove him (Alexander), that he might not witness the reception of Arius. Ep.

with many tears, that if the doctrine of Arius were true, he might not live until the day appointed for the discussion, which was to take place in the presence of Constantine; but that if his own doctrine were true, Arius might receive the punishment of his impiety. ¹Constantine required Arius to declare on oath that he adhered to the Nicene faith; and believing him, commanded him to be received into communion by Alexander. This took place on Saturday; and Arius, who was to be received into communion on the following day, after he had quitted the Emperor's presence, went as it were in triumph through the streets of the city, surrounded by his partizans. When he came to the ²forum of Constantine, his conscience smiting him on account of his perjury, he was seized with a looseness, and went aside to ³a place behind the forum, where he died, having voided the smaller intestines, the spleen and the liver. Such was the

ad Serapionem, c. 3. In this letter Alexander is called ὁ μακαρίτης. See ad Ep. Ægypt. et Lib. c. 21.

¹ Athanasius states the conversation which passed between Constantine and Arius, and says that the latter used the words of Scripture, secretly applying to them his own interpretation. Ad Ep. Ægypt. et Lib. c. 18. Socrates tells, from hearsay, a strange story respecting an equivocation practised by Arius: he wrote out his own confession of faith, and having concealed it under his arm, swore, when he subscribed the Nicene confession, that he believed as he had written.

² εἶθα ὁ πορφυροῦς ἵδρυνται κίων.

³ Socrates says that the place continued to be pointed out in his day.

death of Arius, which the Emperor regarded as a testimony borne by God to the truth of the Nicene doctrine; and respecting which Gibbon says, that we must make our choice between a miracle and poison. I must confess myself unable to see the necessity. ¹ There is nothing in the circumstance which, if we make due allowance for exaggeration, may not be accounted for by natural causes. It was not a miraculous or preternatural interposition; but a most striking and awful event, occurring in the ordinary course of God's providential government.

The death of Arius was followed quickly by that of the ² Emperor himself.

We have seen that the Eusebians availed themselves of the ascendancy which they obtained at the Synod of Antioch, in order to oppress and persecute

¹ Sozomen says that Arius was found dead on the seat, and that various opinions were entertained respecting the cause of his death: some thought that it was occasioned by a sudden affection of the heart or of the bowels, produced by the excitement arising from joy at his success; others, that it was inflicted in punishment of his impiety; others ascribed it to magical arts. L. 2. c. 29. Athanasius speaks of it as a manifest judgment of God; but the description which he gives of it is that of a natural, though awfully sudden death. He was not himself at Constantinople when the event occurred, but received the account from the presbyter Macarius. Ep. ad Serapionem, c. 3. Ad Ep. Ægypt. et Lib. c. 18. Ad Monachos, c. 51.

² Socrates, L. 1. c. 19. Sozomen, L. 2. c. 34. Theodoret, L. 1. c. 32. In the year 337, according to the Benedictine editor.

their opponents. The result of the Synod of Tyre gave them still greater confidence; and when they met at Constantinople, they deposed ¹Marcellus, Bishop of Ancyra, whom we have mentioned as joining Athanasius at Nicæa in the defence of the Homœousian doctrine. He appears, however, in defending that doctrine against Asterius, an Arian of whom Athanasius makes frequent mention, to have been betrayed into the use of language, in which his adversaries discovered the ²heresy of Paul of Samosata,—that of denying the pre-existence of Christ. The real cause of his deposition was, according to Sozomen, that he had refused to join in the proceedings of the Eusebians in the Synods of Tyre and Jerusalem, and had absented himself from the dedication of the church of the Holy Sepulchre, because he was unwilling to hold communion with them. ³His own account of the expressions to which objection had been taken was, that he had used them, not to convey his own deliberate opinions, but merely in order to provoke inquiry. He appears,

¹ Socrates, L. 1. c. 36. Sozomen, L. 2. c. 33. De Fugâ, c. 3. Ad Monachos, c. 6. Basil was sent to Ancyra in his place. Theodoret, L. 2. cc. 25. 27. This happened in the year 336.

² See the account of his opinions, given in the decree of the Synod of Philippopolis. Hilarii ex historico opere Fragm. iii. c. 2. In the Macrostic confession of faith, he is coupled with Photinus. De Synodis, c. 26.

³ Apologia contra Arianos, c. 47.

however, to have leaned to ¹ Sabellianism, although ² Pope Julius, in his letter to the Oriental bishops, maintains his orthodoxy. Athanasius himself did not venture absolutely to affirm it; but his evident disinclination to condemn Marcellus gave the Arians a handle against him ³. He was restored to the communion of the Church at the Council of Sardica.

Another case in which Athanasius charged the Eusebians with acting with great injustice and cruelty, was that of Paul, ⁴ who succeeded Alexander in the bishopric of Constantinople. Valesius has written a particular dissertation on the dates connected with the events of his episcopacy. ⁵ In the decree of the Arian Synod of Philippopolis it is stated, that he subscribed the deposition of Athanasius at Tyre; a statement not easily reconciled to the language in which Athanasius speaks of him, nor to the fact that he was himself, in the ⁶ following year, ejected from his bishopric; to which, however,

¹ Eusebius of Cæsarea wrote two separate works against him, which are still extant.

² *Apologia contra Arianos*, c. 32. See the reply of Athanasius to the question put by Epiphanius respecting him, to which Gibbon has referred. *Hæres.* lxxii.

³ See Basil, *Ep.* 69 or 52.

⁴ According to Sozomen, Alexander named both Paul and Macedonius as qualified to succeed him, but gave the preference to Paul. *L.* 3. c. 3. Socrates, *L.* 2. c. 6.

⁵ *Hilarii ex historico opere Fragm.* iii. c. 13.

⁶ It was alleged that he had been consecrated irregularly, and that he led a dissolute life. Sozomen, *L.* 3. c. 3.

he was restored at the death of Constantine, when the other ejected bishops returned to their sees. ¹ He was again ejected by the artifices of Eusebius of Nicomedia, who took possession of the bishopric. ² At the death of Eusebius, he returned to Constantinople at the invitation of the Catholics, the Arians at the same time inviting Macedonius. Violent tumults in consequence arose: the populace took part with Paul, and Hermogenes, who was sent by Constantius to quell the disturbances, was murdered. The Emperor, in consequence, went in person to Constantinople, and directed Paul to be carried in chains to ³ Sangaris in Mesopotamia, thence to Emesa, and lastly to Cucusus in Cappadocia, where he was strangled by the order of Philip the Prefect, who had first tried to kill him by starvation. We may observe that Athanasius is scarcely justified in casting the odium of the death of Paul upon the Eusebians: it appears rather to have been the act of Constantius himself, who might consider Paul as

¹ Socrates, L. 2. c. 7. Sozomen, L. 3. c. 4. He was then banished to Pontus. *Ad Monachos*, c. 8. The Benedictine editor refers this banishment to Pontus to his first ejection from the see.

² Socrates, L. 2. c. 12. Sozomen, L. 3. c. 7.

³ *Ad Monachos*, c. 8; *De Fugâ*, c. 3; Theodoret, L. 2. c. 5. Socrates, L. 2. c. 15, and Sozomen, L. 3. c. 8, both say that Paul, after his expulsion on account of the death of Hermogenes, went to Rome, and procured letters from Julius directing that he should be restored to his see. Valesius deems this statement incorrect, and quotes the authority of Theodoret against it.

the instigator of the tumult in which Hermogenes lost his life, and deal with him in consequence as an offender against his authority.

One of the first objects which occupied the attention of the three sons of Constantine, among whom the empire was divided at his death, was the restoration of peace to the Church. ¹ They met in Pannonia, and agreed that the exiled bishops should be allowed to return to their sees. Athanasius, therefore, after a ²sojourn of two years and four months at Treves, returned to Alexandria, bearing a letter from the younger Constantine to the lay members of the Church, in which he told them, that in sending back Athanasius he was only fulfilling his father's intention. Both the clergy and laity received their bishop with ³every demonstration of joy; but he was not allowed a long respite from the attacks of his enemies.

The ⁴Eusebians appear to have been able to make no impression on Constantine and Constans by their

¹ *Ad Monachos*, c. 8; *Apologia contra Arianos*, c. 87; *Socrates*, L. 2. c. 3; *Sozomen*, L. 3. c. 2.

² This is the statement of *Theodoret*, L. 2. c. 1. The Benedictine editor places the return of Athanasius in 338. See *Philostorgius*, L. 2. c. 18.

³ Such is the statement of the Alexandrian Synod. *Apologia contra Arianos*, c. 7. The Arians appear to have given a very different representation of his reception.

⁴ *Ad Monachos*, c. 9.

representations; but the case was different with Constantius. ¹ Socrates gives a lively description of the manner in which the presbyter, through whose influence Constantine was induced to recal Arius from banishment, and ² in whose hands he placed his will, with directions to deliver it only to Constantius, gained over first the eunuchs, and afterwards the wife of Constantius, to the Arian party. Confident, therefore, that they should find the Emperor disposed readily to receive any accusations which they might bring against Athanasius, ³ the Eusebians charged him with having acted with great violence on his return to Alexandria. They represented him also as guilty of ⁴ great contumacy

¹ L. 2. c. 2. Sozomen, L. 3. c. 18. Theodoret, L. 2. c. 3. Socrates represents the rage for theological disputation as pervading not only the palace, but all private houses throughout the East. According to Sozomen, Constantius embraced the Homœousian doctrine under the impression that the word homoousius implied something corporal.

² See the improbable account given by Philostorgius, L. 2. c. 16.

³ *Apologia contra Arianos*, c. 5. The Ægyptian bishops retort the charge, and accuse the Arians of being guilty of great outrages, when the commissioners, sent by the Synod of Tyre to inquire into the affair of Macarius, went to Alexandria, accompanied by Philagrius and Ischyra. C. 15. The probability is, that there was truth in the statements of both parties. The people of Alexandria were always noted for their turbulence; and in the exasperated frame of mind in which both parties were, it was not to be expected that either, when it got the upper hand, would use its power with moderation.

⁴ Socrates, L. 2. c. 8.

in returning before the sentence pronounced against him by the Synod of Tyre had been reversed by the decision of another synod; they renewed the old charges respecting the broken cup and the mutilation of Arsenius; and further ¹ accused him of diverting to his own use the corn intended for the support of the widows of Alexandria.

Both parties were naturally ² desirous to secure the support of the bishop of Rome. The Eusebians sent the presbyter Macarius and the deacons Martyrius and Hesychius on an embassy to Julius, in order to persuade him that the charges preferred against Athanasius at the Synod of Tyre were well founded. They appear, however, to have been completely ³ confuted by the presbyters whom Athanasius had sent from Alexandria to defend his cause. Macarius in consequence quitted Rome secretly, leaving his two companions there, who called upon Julius to summon a synod for the settlement of all the points in dispute. They made this demand, according to Athanasius, in the expectation that he would not appear at Rome.

In the mean time he, in order to add strength to

¹ *Apologia contra Arianos*, c. 18. The Ægyptian bishops say, that the Arians wished to transfer it to their own use.

² Ammianus Marcellinus mentions the anxiety shown by Constantius to gain over Liberius to the Arian cause.

³ *Apologia contra Arianos*, cc. 22. 24.

his cause, had assembled a ¹synod at Alexandria, to whose letter, which is inserted in his apology against the Arians, reference has already been made; and with a similar view the Eusebians assembled at ²Antioch, in the presence of Constantius, the synod which was called the Synod of the Dedication, because the alleged plea for convening it was the dedication of a church which had been left unfinished by Constantine. Socrates, however, says that the real object was to set aside the confession of faith agreed upon at Nicæa. This, as we have seen, the Eusebians despaired of effecting so long as ³Constantine lived: but as they had persuaded

¹ In the year 340. Eusebius of Cæsarea died in the preceding year, and was succeeded by Acacius. Socrates, L. 2. c. 4. Sozomen, L. 3. c. 2, who places the death of the younger Constantine shortly after.

² In the year 341. Socrates, L. 2. c. 8. Sozomen, L. 3. c. 5. It was held in the fifth year after the death of Constantine, Flacillus, who succeeded Euphronius, being bishop of Antioch. Ninety bishops (Sozomen says ninety-seven) attended; but neither Maximus of Jerusalem nor Julius of Rome, either in person or by deputy; although, Socrates adds, it was contrary to ecclesiastical rule to promulge canons without the sanction of the Bishop of Rome.

³ Sozomen, L. 3. c. 1; L. 3. c. 18. In c. 13, Sozomen gives an account of the state of theological opinion in the Eastern Churches. He says that the Western adhered, almost without exception, to the Nicene Creed. He thought also, that the great majority of the Eastern concurred in believing that the Son is of the essence of the Father, ἐκ τῆς τοῦ πατρὸς οὐσίας, but that many having at first objected to the word ὁμοούσιος, were prevented by false shame from afterwards adopting it.

Constantius that the word *ὁμοούσιος* necessarily implied something corporeal, they felt assured that they should now be able to expunge it from the creed.

¹ Four creeds were set forth at this Council. In the first, as if conscious that they laboured under the suspicion of Arianism, the framers began with saying that they were not followers of Arius, for how could bishops follow a presbyter? but that they had received Arius into communion, finding, on examination, that his faith was correct. They then put forth a profession of faith, in which, as Sozomen justly observes, they appeared designedly to omit every expression which could be objected to by either party, and did not even state whether the Son is co-eternal and co-essential with the Father, or not.

Of the second creed Sozomen says, that it appeared to him to agree in all points with the Nicene faith, excepting that it omitted the word *ὁμοούσιος*. This creed they professed ² to possess in the handwriting of Lucian, who suffered martyrdom at Nico-

¹ De Synodis, c. 22. Socrates, L. 2. c. 10. Sozomen, L. 3. c. 5. He remarks that they did not object to any thing in the Nicene creed.

² Sozomen appears to doubt the truth of this statement. For the different opinions of learned men on the point, see the note of the Oxford annotator De Synodis, c. 23.

media, and was, as we have seen, the master of Eusebius, Arius, and others of that party. The Oxford annotator calls it semi-Arian; ¹ Hilary pronounces it orthodox.

The ² third creed was put forth by Theophronius, Bishop of Tyana; and the ³ fourth was the creed with which ⁴ Narcissus, ⁵ Maris, ⁶ Theodorus, and

¹ De Synodis, c. 28. Hilary speaks favourably of the council.

² De Synodis, c. 24. Nothing is known of Theophronius. The Benedictine editor says that there is nothing censurable in the creed excepting the omission of the word *ὑποούσιος*. He says the same of the fourth creed.

³ De Synodis, c. 25. Socrates, L. 2. c. 18. Sozomen, L. 3. c. 10.

⁴ Narcissus was Bishop of Neronias, in Cilicia, and was one of the early supporters of Arius. De Synodis, c. 17. He appears to have been personally hostile to Athanasius, and to have joined in the calumnies thrown out against him in consequence of his flight. De Fugâ, c. 1. He was deposed at the Council of Sardica. *Apologia contra Arianos*, cc. 36. 48, 49. *Ad Ep. Ægypt. et Lib.* c. 7, where Athanasius speaks of him as one *πρὸς πᾶσαν ἀσέβειαν τολμηρότατος*. See also De Fugâ, c. 26, where he is said to have been deposed in three different Synods. Hilary ad Const. L. 1. c. 5. *Ad Monachos*, c. 17.

⁵ Maris was Bishop of Chalcedon. We have seen that he took an active part in support of Arius at the Nicene Council, and refused to subscribe the confession of faith; but that, according to Philostorgius, he afterwards abandoned the Homœousian doctrine. He was one of the commissioners sent into the Mareotis to inquire into the case of Macarius. He was present at the Council of Constantinople, at which the third Sirmian confession was altered by the Acacian party. Socrates, L. 2. c. 41. Socrates records a conversation between him and Julian, in which he boldly upbraided Julian with his apostacy, L. 3. c. 12.

⁶ We have seen that Theodorus was one of the commissioners sent into the Mareotis. Athanasius says that the Arians made

¹ Mark were ² sent to Constans, in Gaul, in the hope of attaching him to the Eusebian party. Neither of these creeds contains the word *ὁμοούσιος*. We have seen that when, at the command of Constantine, Eusebius of Cæsarea inserted the word in the creed which he drew up at Nicæa, he added an explanation of the sense in which it was to be understood: it was to be understood, not in the sense of any bodily affection, as implying subsistence by division or abscission from the Father, but in a divine and ineffable sense; since that which is immaterial and the object of the intellect and incorporeal, cannot be subject to any bodily affection. By adding this explanation, he meant to anticipate the objection which the Eusebians made to the word. They objected to it on the ground that it is applicable only to things corporeal, to men, and animals, and trees, and plants, which are generated

him Bishop of Heraclea. *Ad Ep. Ægypt. et Lib.* c. 7. He was deposed at the Council of Sardica. *Apologia contra Arianos*, cc. 36. 49. *Ad Monachos*, cc. 17. 28. He was an Homœousian. *Philostorgius*, L. 8. c. 17. He died before the banishment of Liberius. *Theodoret*, L. 2. c. 16. *Hilary ad Const.* L. 1. c. 5.

¹ Mark was Bishop of Arethusa in Syria. *Socrates*, L. 2. c. 18. He composed one of the professions of faith set forth at Sirmium, L. 2. c. 30, and having destroyed a heathen temple at Arethusa, in the reign of Julian, was commanded by the Emperor either to rebuild, or to defray the cost of rebuilding it. As he could do neither, the heathen population of the place murdered him, after they had compelled him to undergo the most excruciating torments. *Sozomen*, L. 5. c. 10. The Oxford annotator calls him a semi-Arian. *De Synodis*, note on c. 25.

² According to the Benedictine editor this mission took place A.D. 341.

from that which is like to them, and participate of it; and they contended that the word *ὁμοιούσιος* is the proper word to be used with reference to incorporeal beings, as God and angels, of each of whom we form a notion separately, according to his proper essence. By these subtleties they induced Constantius to adopt the Homœousian doctrine, or perhaps we should rather say, language; for Sozomen states, that Constantius really agreed in opinion with his father and his brother Constans; but was ¹ afraid to use the term *ὁμοούσιος*, lest he should confound things corporeal and incorporeal—a vain fear, Sozomen very justly adds; since when we speak of the objects of the intellect, we must borrow our language from the objects of sense; and so long as the meaning which we attach to them is correct, the words are of little consequence. This statement of Sozomen accounts for the determination of the Eusebians to exclude the word *ὁμοούσιος* from the creeds which they put forth: I have already explained why Athanasius insisted so pertinaciously on its insertion.

To return to the proceedings of the synod of Antioch, it confirmed ² the sentence of deposition pronounced against Athanasius at Tyre, and sent Gregory of Cappadocia to take possession of the see of

¹ See the explanation of the bishops assembled at Antioch in the reign of Jovian. Socrates, L. 3. c. 25.

² Sozomen, L. 3. c. 5. Theodoret, L. 2. c. 4.

Alexandria. Although Athanasius had been banished to Treves, yet as he had not been convicted, nor even accused of holding heretical doctrine, ¹ Constantine does not appear to have sent any one to occupy his place.

After the death of Constantine ² the Eusebians endeavoured to prevail upon Julius, while Athanasius was still at Alexandria, to recognize as bishop Pistus, who had been expelled by Alexander for Arianism, and had been consecrated by Secundus. They failed in their attempt: and the Synod of Antioch then offered the bishopric to ³ Eusebius Emisenus, who declined it, knowing the attachment of the Alexandrians to Athanasius, and fearing their turbulent temper. Gregory, therefore, was sent; and his arrival was the signal for the ⁴ commencement of a series of violent proceedings against the Catholics who manifested their dislike of his intrusion. Virgins were insulted and scourged; monks were trodden under foot; the holy temple was profaned; the sacred books thrown into the flames; a church and baptistery were burned. Sarapammon, who had been a confessor, was banished; and Potamo, whose re-

¹ *Apologia contra Arianos*, c. 29. See the remarks of the Benedictine editor.

² *Apologia contra Arianos*, c. 24. See also the Encyclical Letter, c. 6.

³ *Socrates*, L. 2. c. 9. *Sozomen*, L. 3. c. 6.

⁴ See the Encyclical Letter, cc. 3. 5. *Apologia contra Arianos*, c. 30. *Ad Monachos*, cc. 10. 12.

buke of Eusebius of Cæsarea at the Synod of Tyre has been already noticed, was so severely beaten that he died in consequence of the injuries which he received. These outrages were committed by Philagrius, the prefect, and the military, at the instigation of Gregory. They went at last in search of Athanasius to the church at which he chiefly resided, with the intent to put him to death; but he secretly withdrew, and escaped their fury. He ¹appears about this time to have received from Julius a summons to attend the synod which was to meet at Rome, and in consequence to have repaired thither; having first addressed a ²letter to Constans, in which he defended himself against the charges of the Eusebians. He sent with it the volumes of the Scriptures which Constans had ordered him to prepare.

Although the Eusebians had urged Julius to summon a synod, yet when he informed them, through the presbyters Elpidius and Philoxenus, that he was ready to hold it, and that ³Athanasius had been

¹ *Apologia contra Arianos*, c. 29. His language, *Ad Monachos*, c. 11, seems to imply that he left Alexandria before the violent proceedings of Philagrius took place. The Benedictine editor endeavours to reconcile the apparent contradiction by supposing that he fled on receiving the report of the outrages committed at the church of Cyrinus, and remained for some days concealed in the neighbourhood of Alexandria, and wrote the Encyclical Letter. Compare Sozomen, L. 3. c. 6. Theodoret, L. 2. c. 4.

² *Ad Constantium*, c. 4.

³ *Apologia contra Arianos*, c. 29.

residing eighteen months at Rome, instead of attending to his summons, ¹ they detained his messengers and made various excuses for not repairing thither. They complained of the shortness of the notice, and of the impediments thrown in the way of travelling by the Persian war. ² A synod, however, was held, and attended by fifty bishops, who received Athanasius and ³ Marcellus into communion. At their request Julius addressed a ⁴ letter to the heads of the Eusebian party, who were present at the Synod of the Dedication, in which he complained that, having urged him to summon a synod, Eusebius had, when invited, refused in uncivil terms to attend it. Nothing, he goes on to say, had been proved against Athanasius at Tyre; nor was Athanasius present in the Mareotis when the investigation of the charges against him took place. Julius mentions, as we have already seen, the attempt made by the messengers of Eusebius to induce him to recognize Pistus, and a similar attempt made

¹ *Apologia contra Arianos*, c. 25. *Ad Monachos*, c. 11. See an account of their letter to Julius. *Socrates*, L. 2. c. 15. *Sozomen*, L. 3. c. 8.

² In the year 342. *Apologia contra Arianos*, cc. 20. 27. *Ad Monachos*, c. 15.

³ According to *Sozomen*, Asclepas of Gaza accompanied them to Rome, L. 3. c. 8.

⁴ *Apologia contra Arianos*, c. 21. It is addressed to Danius (query Diognius or Theognius), Flacillus, Narcissus, Eusebius, Maris, Macedonius, Theodorus, and their colleagues, who wrote to him from Antioch.

through the mission of ¹ Carponas to induce him to recognize Gregory. He states his refusal to accede to their requests; and adds that more credit was to be given to the ² Ægyptian bishops who were on the spot than to those assembled at Antioch, who were at a distance when the transactions in the Mareotis occurred. Gregory, moreover, had taken possession of the see by violence, through the intervention of an armed force, had committed various enormities, and persecuted all who opposed the Arians. He alleges the long interval during which the see of Alexandria had remained vacant as a proof that Athanasius had not been convicted of any offence at Tyre; and concludes his letter with ³ complaining that the bishops at Antioch had proceeded to pronounce sentence without previous communication with the Church of Rome, and with exhorting them to follow his example and to receive Athanasius and Marcellus into communion. All the bishops of Italy appear to have concurred in the sentiments expressed in this letter.

¹ Carponas has been mentioned as one of the early supporters of Arius.

² In their Synodical Letter. *Apologia contra Arianos*, c. 3.

³ εἰ μὲν οὖν τι τοιοῦτον ἦν ὑποπευθὲν εἰς τὸν ἐπίσκοπον τὸν ἐκεῖ. ἔδει πρὸς τὴν ἐνταῦθα ἐκκλησίαν γραφῆναι. *Apologia contra Arianos*, c. 35. Compare Sozomen, L. 3. c. 8. He represents the Oriental bishops as confessing the greatness and orthodoxy of the Church of Rome, but denying to it any pre-eminence over their own Churches.

Matters were in this state when Constans, who was then at Milan, ¹at the request of some of the bishops who had met at Rome, suggested to Constantius that, in order to put an end to the disputes which troubled and disgraced the Church, a general council should be summoned to Sardica. But before it met, the Eusebians called a synod at Antioch, in which they agreed upon the ²confession of faith known by the name of the Macrostich, on account of its length, and sent it into Italy by the hands of ³Eudoxius, Martyrius, and

¹ Ad Monachos, cc. 15, 16, 17. Apologia contra Arianos, cc. 36, 37. Ad Constantium, c. 4.

² A.D. 344. De Synodis, c. 26. The Oxford annotator calls it semi-Arian, but of the higher kind. The framers object to the use of the terms ἐνδιάθετος and προφορικὸς λόγος as applied to Christ; and interpret Proverbs viii. 22, not of the incarnation, with Athanasius, but of the generation of the Son from the Father.

³ Socrates, L. 2. c. 19. Sozomen, L. 3. c. 11. Eudoxius was Bishop of Germanicia, in Syria. De Synodis, c. 1. Socrates, L. 2. c. 19. Sozomen, L. 3. c. 5. Eustathius, Bishop of Antioch, refused to ordain him on account of his heretical opinions, but the Arians advanced him to the episcopate. Ad Monachos, c. 4. Ad Ep. Ægypt. et Lib. c. 7. Socrates, L. 2. c. 40. He was deposed at the Synod of Selencia, De Synodis, c. 12, or of Ariminum. Ad Afros, c. 3. Theodoret, L. ii. c. 23. He afterwards became Bishop of Antioch, De Synodis, c. 12. Socrates, L. 2. c. 37. Theodoret, L. 2. c. 25. Sozomen, L. 4. c. 12, and of Constantinople on the expulsion of Macedonius: Socrates, L. 2. c. 43; L. 4. c. 1. Philostorgius, L. 4. c. 4, where it is said that he baptized the Emperor Valens. Theodoret, L. 2. c. 27. Philostorgius, L. 5. c. 1. Socrates mentions his death, L. 4. c. 14. He seems to have indulged in profane jests. Socrates tells us that, immediately after his advancement to the see of Constantinople, he publicly said that the Father was ἀσεβής, because He worshipped no one; and the Son was εὐσεβής, be-

¹ Macedonius, by whom it ² was presented to Constans and to the bishops whom he had assembled at Milan, and who refused to receive it on the ground that they were satisfied with the Nicene faith ³. The Eusebians also drew up ⁴ a letter in reply to that which Julius had addressed to them. They denied that they were bound to refer the case of Athanasius to Rome, and contended that Julius had been guilty of a breach of ecclesiastical rule in annulling their sentence and restoring him to communion. They said that the Eastern Churches had not interfered when Novatian was ejected by the Church of Rome; and that they would maintain peace and communion with Julius, if he would concur in the deposition of the bishops whom they had expelled, and in the appointment of those who had been substituted in their place.

⁵ About one hundred and seventy Eastern and cause He worshipped the Father, L. 2. c. 43. See Theodoret, L. 2. c. 29. Hilary, *De Synodis*, c. 13.

¹ Macedonius was Bishop of Mopsuestia, in Cilicia. Socrates, L. 2. c. 19. He was one of the commissioners sent into the Mareotis. *Apologia contra Arianos*, cc. 13. 72. Hilary mentions also Demophilus; and says that when they were asked to condemn the doctrine of Arius, they quitted the synod in anger. Athanasius was present at it. P. 1331.

² A.D. 345.

³ Socrates, L. 2. c. 20. Sozomen, L. 3. c. 11. *Ad Constantium*, c. 4. Hilary, *Frag.* V. c. 4.

⁴ Socrates, L. 2. c. 15. Sozomen, L. 3. c. 8. A.D. 347.

⁵ *Ad Monachos*, cc. 15, 16, 17. In the beginning of the Apology against the Arians Athanasius says that more than 300 bishops subscribed; and there are 281 signatures to the En-

Western bishops met at Sardica: the Western having Hosius at their head; the Eastern being accompanied by the Count Musonianus and an officer of the palace named Hesychius. The Eusebians, however, finding that some of the ¹ bishops who had accompanied them to Sardica had seceded from them, and that they could not carry matters with the same high hand as at Tyre and Antioch, quitted Rome under the pretence that they had ² received letters from the Emperor in which he announced his victory over the Persians. Hosius, having in vain summoned them to return, proceeded with the other bishops to receive Athanasius, Marcellus, and Asclepas into communion, and sent letters into Ægypt and Libya declaring them free from all blame. The bishops at the same time deposed ³ Stephanus,

cyclical Letter of the Synod, c. 50. Socrates, L. 2. c. 20. Theodoret says that 250 bishops met at Sardica, L. 2. c. 7; and Athanasius, *Ad Monachos*, c. 28, that more than 400 had declared that he was in communion with them. 170 might be the number of those who actually met, and others might afterwards subscribe the decree. Socrates quotes Sabinus as saying that only seventy-six of the Eastern bishops were present, and among them Ischyrras, as Bishop of the Mareotis, L. 2. c. 20. The synod was held in the year 347.

¹ Asterius and Arius (in the Synodal Letter of the Council he is called Macarius, *Apologia contra Arianos*, c. 48) are named; the latter is supposed to be the Arius mentioned among the early supporters of the heretic. Asterius signs himself Bishop of Petra, *Tom. ad Antioch.* c. 10.

² This seems to imply that Constantius recalled them to celebrate the *ἐπιτίκια*.

³ Stephanus was Bishop of Antioch, *Ad Monachos*, c. 17;

Menophantus, Acacius, George of Laodicea, Ursacius, Valens, Theodorus, and Narcissus. With respect to Gregory, who had been sent to Alexandria, they pronounced that he had never been consecrated. They addressed also a ¹letter to Julius, in which they gave a brief account of what had been done in the Council, and requested him to make it known to the brethren in Sicily, Sardinia, and Italy.

The Eusebians, after they quitted Sardica, held a Council at Philippopolis, and put forth a ²decree, which has been preserved by Hilary, and which they insidiously represented as the decree of the Council of Sardica. From it we learn the reasons which they assigned in justification of their refusal to act with the bishops of the Western Church. It is one of the few documents put forth by the Eusebians in their defence which has reached our time, and may be considered as their manifesto against Athanasius and his party.

They begin with assailing Marcellus, whom they

Menophantus of Ephesus. Acacius succeeded Eusebius at Cæsarea. Ursacius was Bishop of Singidunum; Valens of Myrsa in Pannonia. *Apologia contra Arianos*, c. 36. Theodoret, L. 2. c. 8. Hilary, *Fragm.* ii. In the *Epistle ad Ep. Ægypt. et Lib.* c. 7, are mentioned also Patrophilus, Eustathius, afterwards Bishop of Sebaste, Demophilus, Germinius, Eudoxius, Basil.

¹ Hilary, *Fragm.* ii. c. 9.

² *Ex opere historico* *Fragm.* iii.

accuse of mixing together the errors of Sabellius, Paul of Samosata, and Montanus. A Council was held at Constantinople by order of Constantine to inquire into his tenets, which were condemned; and a record of the condemnation was deposited in the archives of the Church. Notwithstanding this condemnation, he had been received into communion at Sardica, with the consent of Protogenes, the bishop of that see, who had been a party to the sentence pronounced against him at Constantinople.

They then proceed to repeat the old charges against Athanasius of breaking the mystic cup, of overturning the altar and the priests' throne, of destroying the church, and committing the presbyter, whom they call Narchus, to military custody. They accuse him of various acts of oppression and cruelty, of scourging and even killing bishops. The accusations are, indeed, the counterpart of those which Athanasius brought against Gregory and the præfect Philagrius, when the former took possession of the see of Alexandria. They ascribe similar acts of violence to Paul, Marcellus, ¹ Asclepas, and Lucius of Adrianople, when they were restored to their respective sees after the death of Constantine.

¹ They say, c. 13, that Athanasius had himself condemned Asclepas; but this is very improbable, since Asclepas is mentioned by Athanasius as one of those who supported him at Nicæa.

They state that a Council was first summoned to Cæsarea to investigate these charges, but that Athanasius did not appear; that another Council was summoned in the following year to Tyre, and that certain Bishops were sent to the Mareotis to inquire into the truth of the accusations on the spot, who on their return reported that the charges were well founded; that Athanasius, being ¹ present, was condemned, and in consequence repaired to the Emperor at Constantinople; that the inquiry was then reopened, and that he was again condemned and banished by Constantine.

They go on to state that, when he returned from Gaul after the death of Constantine, in his way to Alexandria, he interfered irregularly with the Churches in the places through which he passed, restoring bishops who had been condemned by Councils, and ejecting those actually in possession; that on his arrival at Alexandria he acted in the most arbitrary and tyrannical manner; that being convicted of all these charges he was deposed by the Synod of Antioch, and Gregory, a holy and blameless man, sent to fill his place; and that, having in vain endeavoured to induce the Eastern bishops to espouse his cause, he at last came to Julius at Rome, in the hope that he

¹ They should rather have said that he quitted Tyre before the sentence was pronounced, because he foresaw that it would be unfavourable to him. See Theodoret, L. 2. c. 16. p. 93 B.

might easily impose on those who, on account of their distance from Alexandria, could not be cognizant of the real state of facts.

They further state, that on their arrival at Sardica, in compliance with the summons of Julius, they found that he and Maximin of Treves, and Hosius, had received Athanasius and Marcellus into communion, and had allowed them to take their seats at the Council ; that they to the number of eighty remonstrated and insisted on their expulsion, on the ground that they had been condemned by a Council, but that no attention was paid to the remonstrance ; that five of the bishops who had been employed on the mission to the Mareotis then proposed that other bishops should be united with them, and another investigation take place ; but that Protogenes and Hosius would not entertain the proposition. They add, that a number of men of the most profligate and desperate character had flocked from Alexandria and Constantinople to Sardica, and committed many acts of violence against the Eastern bishops, who, in consequence, determined to retire from the place, having first drawn up this synodical letter.

They conclude with exhorting their brethren not to communicate with ¹ Hosius, Protogenes, Athanasius,

¹ They charge Hosius with having persecuted Mark of Arethusa, and having patronized men of infamous lives. C. 27.

Marcellus, Asclepas, Paulus, and Julius ¹; with complaining that aged and infirm bishops were dragged from their churches and their homes on account of some few worthless persons who were disturbing the peace of the Church; with affirming that it was contrary to ² all ecclesiastical rule, and reason, and justice, that the Western Churches should take upon them to undo what the Eastern Churches had done; and with alleging, in proof of the statement, that the decree pronounced against Novatus at Rome had been confirmed by the Eastern Church, and that against Paul of Samosata at Antioch by the Western. It appears that the Eastern Churches were already beginning to be jealous of the superiority assumed over them by the Church of Rome.

The bishops who met at Philippopolis are said by ³ Socrates to have anathematized the word *ὁμοούσιος*, and to have asserted the Anomœan doctrine; but as Valesius observes, this charge is not borne out by the profession of faith annexed to the decree, which

¹ They afterwards add Gaudentius of Ariminum and Maximin of Treves; the latter because he refused to receive the Arian bishops who were sent to Treves after the Council of Antioch.

² To the statement that Julius was not competent to reopen a question decided by the Council of Antioch, he replies by denying the competency of that Council to open the question decided at Nicæa. *Apologia contra Arianos*, cc. 22. 24.

³ L. 2. c. 20.

¹ Hilary pronounces orthodox. ² It appears to have been brought forward at the Council of Sardica, and to have been rejected on the ground that the Nicene profession was sufficient, and that no other ought to be allowed.

According to ³ Athanasius, the seceding bishops acted with great violence after they quitted Sardica. They caused, through the agency of the Count Philagrius, ten laymen who refused to communicate with them to be put to death at Adrianople; two presbyters and three deacons to be banished into Armenia; and Arius and Asterius, who had quitted their party at Sardica, to be banished into Libya. They procured also an order from Constantius, authorizing the magistrates to put Athanasius and certain of his followers to death, if they should attempt to enter Alexandria. In some cases they endeavoured to accomplish their purposes by less open means. ⁴ The bishops assembled at Sardica sent Vincentius of Capua and Euphratas of

¹ De Synodis, cc. 34, 35, 36, 37.

² Tom. ad Antiochanos, c. 5.

³ Ad Monachos, cc. 18, 19. They caused Lucius also, Bishop of Adrianople, to be bound in chains, and in that state to be carried into exile, in which he died. They also caused a bishop named Diodorus, and Olympius, Bishop of Œni, and Theodulus of Trajanopolis in Thrace, to be banished.

⁴ Ad Monachos, c. 20. Athanasius calls Capua the metropolis of Campania, and Agrippina of Upper Gaul. Theodoret, L. 2. c. 9.

Agrippina to Constantius, to obtain his sanction to their decision, and to prevail upon him to restore the exiled bishops to their churches. When the two bishops arrived at Antioch, the bishop ¹Stephanus laid a plot to involve Euphratas in a charge of incontinence: the plot, however, was detected, Stephanus deposed, and Leontius substituted in his place.

It is probable that the solicitations of the Council would have made little impression on Constantius, if ²Constans had not written to the same effect. He now permitted the bishops to return; and on the death of ³Gregory, which happened shortly after, he invited Athanasius to Alexandria, at the same time telling Constans that he had been expecting the bishop for a year, and had kept the see open for him. Not content with writing ⁴three letters to Athanasius, he wrote also to the bishops and clergy of Alexandria, commending Athanasius to them. ⁵He commanded also that all the documents in-

¹ Stephanus, as we have seen, was deposed by the Council: he had been appointed to Antioch by the Arians. *Ad Monachos*, c. 4. *Ad Ep. Ægypt. et Lib.* c. 7.

² *Ad Monachos*, c. 20. Socrates, L. 2. c. 22.

³ εἶτα μετὰ μὴνός που δέκα τελευτήσαντος Γρηγορίου, μεταπέμπεται καὶ Ἀθανάσιον. *Ad Monachos*, c. 21.

⁴ *Apologia contra Arianos*, cc. 51. 55. *Ad Monachos*, c. 23. Socrates, L. 2. c. 23. Sozomen, L. 3. cc. 20, 21. Theodoret, L. 2. cc. 10, 11, 12.

⁵ *Apologia contra Arianos*, c. 56.

jurious to the character of Athanasius should be destroyed. ¹ Having remained at Rome three years, Athanasius had gone to Milan at the command of Constans, and was present among the bishops to whom the Macrostic profession of faith was presented by the delegates from the Council of Antioch. From Milan, at the summons of Constans, he went with Hosius into Gaul, and they travelled together to Sardica. After the Council at Sardica he went to Naissus, where he again received letters from Constans, and thence to Aquileia, where he received the ² letters from Constantius. He then went to Constans in Gaul, and afterwards met Constantius at Antioch. Leaving Antioch, he passed through Syria, and was congratulated by the bishops of Palestine, assembled in council at Jerusalem, on his restoration to his see. ³ They addressed also a congratulatory epistle to the Church of Alexandria,

¹ Ad Constantium, c. 4. According to Sozomen, L. 3. c. 20, Constantius wished Athanasius to allow one church at Alexandria to be assigned to the Arians, and Athanasius consented, on the understanding that one should be given to the Catholics at Antioch. The Emperor considered this fair; but the Arians thought that the arrangement would not be for their advantage. Theodoret gives the same account, L. 2. c. 12.

² In further proof of the friendly feeling of Constantius towards him at this time, Athanasius produces the letter addressed to him by the Emperor, on the occasion of the death of Constans. Ad Monachos, c. 24. Ad Constantium, c. 23.

³ Apologia contra Arianos, c. 57. Ad Monachos, c. 25. Socrates, L. 2. c. 24. Sozomen, L. 3. c. 22. Compare Philostorgius, L. 3. c. 12.

which received him with every demonstration of joy and affection. About this time also, ¹ Ursacius and Valens, who were deposed by the Council of Sardica, wrote letters to Julius and Athanasius; in that to the former they acknowledged the charges brought against Athanasius to be false, and condemned Arius and his heresy: the letter to Athanasius contains

¹ *Apologia contra Arianos*, c. 58. *Ad Monachos*, c. 26. *Ad Constantium*, c. 1. Hilary, ex historico opere *Fragm.* ii. c. 20. Sozomen, L. 3. c. 23. There is a difference of opinion respecting the date of their letters; they say themselves that they made the profession of their penitence at Milan:—some think in 347, at the Council assembled to condemn the errors of Photinus; others refer the event to 349. The Benedictine editor adopts the later date on the authority of Hilary, *Fragmentum* ii. c. 19, who says that Ursacius and Valens applied to Julius to be received into communion, two years after the condemnation of Photinus at Milan; and of Socrates, L. 2. c. 24, who says that they were induced to take this step when they learned that the Council at Jerusalem had addressed letters to the Church of Alexandria in favour of Athanasius. The statement of Athanasius himself, *contra Arianos*, c. 58, is in favour of the later date. See the note of the Benedictine editor of Hilary. Gibbon, from the different tone of the two letters, questions the genuineness of that to Julius. Athanasius says that the letter to himself was written without any previous communication on his part, was in Latin, and sent to him by Paulinus, Bishop of Tibur. See the note of the Benedictine editor, *ad Constantium*, c. 9. Athanasius says of Ursacius and Valens, that they were instructed (κατηχήθησαν) in the Christian faith by Arius, were degraded from the presbyterate, and nevertheless advanced to the episcopate by the Arians. *Ad Ep. Ægypt. et Lib.* c. 7. He speaks of them also as νεώτεροι. *Apologia contra Arianos*, c. 13. *Imperitis atque improbis duobus adolescentibus*. Hilary *ad Const.* L. 1. c. 5. The Benedictine editor places the return of Athanasius A.D. 349.

only the expression of their good wishes, and of their desire to be in communion with him.

¹ Eusebius of Nicomedia died soon after the Council of Rome. And about this time, by the death of Constans, Athanasius was deprived of his most stedfast and powerful friend. ² Leontius, Bishop of Antioch, appears then to have become the head

¹ *Apologia contra Arianos*, c. 36. *Socrates*, L. 2. c. 12. After he quitted the see of Nicomedia, Constantius appears to have translated Cecropius to it from Laodicea. *Ad Monachos*, c. 74. He is mentioned, *Ep. ad Ep. Ægypt. et Lib.* c. 7. The Benedictine editor places the death of Eusebius A.D. 342.

² Leontius, as we have seen, succeeded Stephanus in the bishopric of Antioch. Athanasius generally calls him *ὁ ἀπόκοπος*, because he mutilated himself in order that he might live with a female named Eustolium. Though he had been degraded from the presbyterate he was made a bishop by Constantius. *De Fugâ*, c. 26. *Socrates*, L. 2. c. 26. *Ad Monachos*, cc. 4. 28. Theodoret says that he was of a crafty, dissembling character, and compares him to a rock concealed under the water, L. 2. c. 10, adducing in proof of the charge the artifice which he used in reciting the Doxology. Though the churches at Antioch were in the hands of the Arians, the congregations did not agree in their manner of repeating the Doxology, some saying, "Glory be to the Father, and to the Son, and to the Holy Ghost," others, "to the Father, through the Son in the Holy Ghost." But Leontius pronounced the words in so low a tone as to be inaudible, and thus concealed his mode of repeating it. Sozomen, however, ascribes to him a better motive, that of preventing the peace of the Church from being disturbed; and says that, placing his hand upon his head, which was white from age, he said, "When this snow shall be dissolved, there will be much mud:" thereby intimating that there would be great confusion after his death, if his successors should refuse to tolerate the Athanasian mode of repeating the Doxology, L. 3. c. 20. Theodoret says also that Leontius, being himself an Anomœan, was fearful of

of the Arian party, and to have associated to himself ¹ George of Laodicea, ² Acacius, Theodorus, and Narcissus.

provoking the anger of Constantius, who was an Homœousian, and strongly opposed to the Anomœans. He adds that Leontius admitted Aetius, the master of Eunomius, to the diaconate; but being alarmed by the threats of Flavianus and Diodorus, two ascetics, that they would go to the Western Churches and expose his proceedings, he forbade Aetius to exercise the ministerial functions. Compare *de Synodis*, c. 38. Aetius is there called the master of Eudoxius, and it is doubtful whether Athanasius meant to say that Leontius ordained Aetius or Eudoxius deacon.

¹ George of Laodicea had been a presbyter of Alexandria, and before the Nicene Council had written a letter to Alexander from Antioch in defence of the Arian tenet—that there was a time when the Son was not. He seems to have suggested to the Arians that they should not quarrel with Alexander for saying that the Son is from the Father, inasmuch as all things are from the Father. He was degraded by Alexander, but afterwards made Bishop of Laodicea by the Arians. *De Synodis*, c. 17. *Apologia contra Arianos*, c. 8. *Ad Ep. Ægypt. et Lib.* c. 7. He was degraded from the bishopric at the Council of Sardica, at which, however, he did not venture to appear. *Apologia contra Arianos*, cc. 36. 49. *Ad Monachos*, c. 17. He appears to have been a man of an intemperate and sensual life. *De Fugâ*, c. 26. Philostorgius says that he had originally studied philosophy, and was an Homœousian, *L. 8. c. 17*. Sozomen says that he was present at the Council of Antioch, *L. 2. c. 5*. Socrates, *L. 3. c. 9*; and wrote a letter condemning Eudoxius for favouring Aetius, *L. 4. c. 13*. He wrote also a panegyric on Eusebius Emisenus. Socrates, *L. 1. c. 24*; *L. 2. c. 9*.

² Acacius was a disciple of Eusebius of Cæsarea, and succeeded him in that see. Socrates, *L. 2. c. 4*. Athanasius, therefore, charges him with inconsistency and dissimulation, inasmuch as he rejected the Nicene Faith, although he knew that his master Eusebius had subscribed it. *De Dec. Syn. Nic.* c. 3. *De Synodis*, cc. 12, 13. He was guilty also of the inconsistency of objecting to the Nicene Creed on the ground that it contained expressions

Athanasius, therefore, was not allowed to remain long in quiet at Alexandria. Ursacius and Valens were ¹persuaded to retract their confession, and to say that it was made under fear of the displeasure of Constans; and ²the Emperor was at last prevailed upon, notwithstanding the promise which he had made to Athanasius never again to listen to the accusations of the Eusebians, to commence a persecution of the Catholic bishops. He was then on his march against Magnentius; and he afterwards, both from Arles and

not found in Scripture, though he himself used similar expressions. De Synodis, cc. 36, 37. He was deposed at Sardica, *Apologia contra Arianos*, c. 49; and again at Seleucia, De Synodis, c. 12. He was one of those who joined in inducing Constantius to call the Council of Rimini. De Synodis, c. 1. In the fourth Epistle to Serapion, c. 7, he is charged with using profane language respecting the Holy Spirit. Athanasius speaks of him as *πρὸς πᾶσαν ἀσέβειαν τολμηρότατος*. Ad Ep. Ægypt. et Lib. c. 7. It appears from Socrates, L. 2. c. 40, that Acacius produced a confession of faith in which neither the words *ὁμοούσιος* nor *ὁμοιούσιος* appeared. He said, however, that the Son is like to the Father, and condemned the Anomœans, L. 4. cc. 40, 41. Compare Sozomen, L. 4. cc. 22, 23. In the latter passage the historian speaks highly of his talents. Philostorgius confirms this character of him, and says that at the Council of Seleucia he joined the Anomœan party in order to vex Basil of Ancyra, who had supported Cyril of Jerusalem after he had been deposed by Acacius, L. 4. c. 12. He lost the favour of Constantius by bringing a charge against Eunomius which he was unable to substantiate, L. 6. c. 4.

¹ Ad Monachos, c. 29. Socrates says that they always sided with the stronger party, L. 1. c. 37. p. 109 D. See the account given by Sulpicius Severus, L. 2. p. 400, of the intrigues of the Arian party, and of the manner in which Valens obtained unlimited influence over the mind of Constantius by pretending to predict the result of the battle of Myrsa.

² Ad Monachos, cc. 30, 31, 32.

Milan, issued decrees favourable to the Arians. The portion of corn hitherto given to Athanasius was transferred to the Arians; and commissioners were sent in different directions to compel both the magistrates and the bishops to renounce communion with him. The bishops were threatened with deprivation; some, however, refused to obey the Emperor's commands, and even remonstrated with him on the iniquity of his proceedings. ¹They were in conse-

¹ Athanasius mentions Paulinus of Treves, the Metropolitan of Gaul; Lucifer of Cagliari, the Metropolitan of Sardinia; Eusebius of Vercelli; Dionysius of Milan, the Metropolitan of Italy. *Ad Monachos*, c. 33. *De Fugâ*, c. 4. They refused to subscribe to the condemnation of Athanasius, and to give credit to the testimony of Ursacius and Valens; Constantius then declared himself the accuser of Athanasius; but they still refused to subscribe, and were in consequence banished. *Ad Monachos*, c. 76. This, according to Socrates, took place at the synod assembled by Constantius at Milan, *L. 2. cc. 34. 36.* Sozomen, *L. 4. c. 9.* Sulpicius Severus mentions a synod held at Arles after the defeat of Magnentius. The Catholic bishops who met there were required by an edict of the Emperor to subscribe the condemnation of Athanasius; but they refused, on the ground that the question of doctrine should be settled before they proceeded to decide upon the cases of individuals. Paulinus was in consequence banished. A council was then called at Milan, at which Constantius was present; the same demand was made by him, and Lucifer of Cagliari and Eusebius of Vercelli were, upon their refusal to comply, banished. Dionysius of Milan appears to have said that he would subscribe the condemnation of Athanasius, provided that the question of doctrine was discussed. The Council then put forth a letter in the name of the Emperor full of heretical pravity, which Dionysius refused to subscribe, and was in consequence banished. Such is the statement of Sulpicius, who places the banishment of Liberius and Hilary at this time. *L. 2. p. 400.* The account of Hilary himself is somewhat different. According to him a synod had been summoned

quence banished; but, according to ¹ Athanasius, this severity operated to the disadvantage of the Arian cause; for the exiles, in their way to their several places of banishment, took every opportunity of preaching the true doctrine and exposing the injustice and cruelty of their opponents. He hence takes occasion to observe that attempts to suppress truth by violence always contribute to its wider diffusion. In the mean time Julius, Bishop of Rome, ² died, and Constantius lost no time in endeavouring

to meet at Aquileia. Liberius, therefore, did not go to Arles, but sent Vincentius of Capua and Marcellus a bishop of Campania in his place. Vincentius took with him letters from the Eastern bishops and from eighty Ægyptian bishops in favour of Athanasius; he also required that the question of doctrine should in the first instance be considered; but terrified at length by the threats of Constantius, subscribed the condemnation. Liberius himself says, that Vincentius offered to subscribe the condemnation if the Arians were also condemned; a strange sort of compromise. Hilary, *Fragm.* p. 1332. According to Hilary, 300 of the Western bishops met at Milan. Eusebius of Vercelli and Lucifer of Cagliari were the defenders of the Nicene faith; and in consequence of their refusal to subscribe the condemnation of Athanasius were banished. Hilary appears to have been previously deposed at Arles by Saturninus, the bishop, whom Sulpicius calls *homo impotens et factiosus*. Athanasius seems to have been but imperfectly acquainted with what passed at Arles and Milan. The Benedictine editor assigns 354 as the date of the former, 355 of the latter synod.

¹ Ad Monachos, c. 34.

² Socrates, L. 2. c. 34. Sozomen, L. 4. c. 8. Theodoret, L. 2. c. 15. Athanasius calls Rome the metropolis of Romania. Ad Monachos, c. 38. By Romania the Benedictine editor understands the whole Roman Empire. Epiphanius uses the word in this sense. Hær. lxvi. c. 1; lxix. c. 2.

to gain over Liberius, who succeeded him, to the Arian cause. ¹The eunuch Eusebius was sent to him with large presents, and Athanasius gives a lively account of the conversation which passed between them. It ended in the refusal of Liberius to receive the presents and to condemn Athanasius. Eusebius then offered the presents at the shrine erected in memory of the martyrdom of St. Peter; but Liberius indignantly ordered them to be removed. Constantius was greatly incensed at the failure of the mission of Eusebius, and commenced a ²persecution of the Catholics, which Athanasius describes as more cruel even than that of Maximian, since he separated those whom he banished; whereas Maximian allowed them the consolation of each other's society in their exile. The Emperor ordered ³Liberius to be brought by force from Rome. His

¹ Ad Monachos, cc. 35, 36, 37. We have seen that the Eusebians had gained over the eunuchs, who possessed great influence at the court of Constantius. Ammianus Marcellinus mentions the eunuch Eusebius: L. 14. c. 11. 1441 D; L. 15. c. 3. He was put to death by Julian: L. 22. c. 4. Hilary gives some letters of Liberius: one to Constantius, calling upon him to convene a synod, Fragment. v.; one to Lucifer and Eusebius of Vercelli; and one respecting the fall of Vincentius, Fragm. vi., written before his banishment.

² Ad Monachos, c. 40. Constantius ordered Eutropius a presbyter and Hilary a deacon, who were the bearers of a letter to him from Liberius, the former to be banished, the latter scourged: c. 41.

³ Compare Ammianus Marcellinus, L. 15. 1450 C. He represents Athanasius as interfering in matters beyond his province,

severity, however, was unavailing; the bishop still refused to join the Arian party, and even ¹ rebuked him sharply for his persecution of the Catholics. The result was the banishment of Liberius, ² whose firmness gave way after he had remained in exile two years, and had been threatened with death. He subscribed the Creed put forth by the Council of Sirmium, which condemned Photinus, and was restored to his bishopric.

Nearly a similar course was pursued with the

and as foretelling future events by the casting of lots and the flight of birds. He mentions also the anxiety of Constantius to obtain the sanction of Liberius to his proceedings against Athanasius; and the strong attachment of the people to their bishop, whom the Emperor did not dare to remove from Rome in the face of day.

¹ Theodoret gives a graphic account of what passed at the interview between the Emperor and Liberius; and says that Liberius was banished to Berœa, in Thrace, and Felix substituted in his place: L. 2. cc. 16, 17. De Fugâ, c. 4. Socrates, L. 2. c. 37. p. 116 A. Sozomen, L. 4. c. 11. Ad Monachos, c. 75.

² Ad Monachos, c. 41. Socrates, L. 2. c. 37. p. 116. Sozomen, L. 4. c. 15, says that Felix died shortly after the return of Liberius. Sozomen says, also, that Liberius produced a creed at Sirmium, in which all were condemned who said that the Son is not in substance and in all respects like the Father. I incline, therefore, to the opinion of the Benedictine editor of Hilary, Ex opere historico Fragm. vi. c. 6, that the confession which Liberius subscribed was the first Sirmian; though I feel the difficulty of reconciling Hilary's approval of this Creed, De Synodis, c. 38, with the harsh terms in which he speaks of Liberius in the Fragment. The letter of Liberius to Ursacius and Valens does him little credit.

aged ¹ Hosius. Constantius urgently solicited him to condemn Athanasius. He not only refused, but wrote a letter to the Emperor, in which he contrasted the conduct of Athanasius at the Council of Sardica with that of the Arian bishops; and, referring to the confession of Ursacius and Valens, reminded the Emperor of the account which he must one day render, and warned him against lending his countenance to men who, having once confessed the innocence of Athanasius, afterwards retracted their confession. With such men no communion ought to be held. Hosius, however, after he had been detained a whole year at Sirmium, and treated ² with great severity, being broken down with ³ age and suffering, consented to communicate with Ursacius and Valens, but still refused to subscribe the condemnation of Athanasius.

As Constantius had himself invited Athanasius to return to Alexandria, it was necessary for him, before he again took hostile measures against the bishop, to assign some reason for his change of conduct; and we find that he charged Athanasius with having

¹ Ad Monachos, c. 42—46. De Fugâ, c. 5.

² Socrates says that he was actually tortured, and that in consequence he signed the second Sirmian Confession, A.D. 357: L. 2. c. 31. Sozomen, L. 4. c. 6. Hilary speaks of Hosius in very bitter terms. De Synodis, cc. 11. 63. He calls the Confession *blasphemia*. See Athanasius, de Synodis, c. 28.

³ He was then 100 years old.

¹ endeavoured to alienate his brother Constans from him, and with having favoured the cause of Magnentius. In his reply to the former of these accusations, Athanasius affirms that he had never conversed with Constans, excepting in the presence of other bishops, who might, if there had been any truth in the charge, have been produced as witnesses against him; and that he had never written to Constans, excepting in his own defence, or on the affairs of the Church. He refers particularly to one occasion, on which he had spoken in praise of the piety of Constantius to Constans in the presence of ²Thalassius, who, at the suggestion of Constantius, had written to encourage him to return to Alexandria.

Athanasius ³ treats the second charge as too monstrous to deserve a serious answer. Was it probable that he should assist or hold intercourse with one who had murdered his benefactor? He had, on the contrary, directed prayers to be offered up in the churches of Alexandria for the success of the arms of Constantius. His enemies appear to have asserted that they had in their possession letters in his handwriting addressed to Magnentius. He answered

¹ This charge appeared to receive some countenance from the fact hinted at by Theodoret, that Constans had threatened to commence hostilities against Constantius if he did not restore Athanasius: L. 2. cc. 4. 13.

² Ad Constantium, cc. 2, 3. Compare Ad Monachos, c. 22.

³ Ad Constantium, c. 6—14.

that if any such letters existed they were forgeries; and asked whether the ambassadors who came from Magnentius to Constantius brought any letters addressed to him.

Two other charges were brought against him: ¹ one that he had performed service in the Great Church before it was completed. He admits the fact, and defends it on the ground of necessity; none of the churches in Alexandria being of sufficient magnitude to receive the crowds who assembled to celebrate the festival of Easter. He appeals also to the example of his predecessor Alexander, who had used the church called Theonas before it was finished; and of the Bishops of Treves and Aquileia, who had followed the same course; the latter when Constans himself was present.

The other charge was, ² that Athanasius had disregarded the command of Constantius to leave Alexandria and repair to the court. To this charge he replied, that Montanus, ³ the Palatine, brought

¹ Ad Constantium, c. 14. The church was in the Cæsareum, the royal quarter of Alexandria: Ad Monachos, cc. 56. 74; Epiphanius, Hæresis, lxi. c. 2; and was built at the expense of Constantius. Ad Constantium, c. 17. Athanasius appears to have been charged with consecrating the church; this he denies, admitting that it would have been unlawful to consecrate it without previously obtaining the Emperor's consent: c. 14.

² Ad Constantium, c. 19. Sozomen, L. 4. c. 9. A. D. 353.

³ See Suicer in γ. Παλατῖνος.

him a letter from Constantius, purporting to be an answer to one in which he had asked permission to go to Italy in order to obtain a supply of what was wanting to the churches of Alexandria. Knowing that he had written no such letter, he concluded that it had been forged by his enemies, like those which they had accused him of writing to Magnentius. As, therefore, the Emperor's letter had been obtained by misrepresentation, he acted as if he had received no such summons. He would, moreover, have been guilty of a breach of duty in quitting his churches; especially as the Emperor had always been ready to supply any wants, which he made known by letter. ¹Twenty-six months afterwards, Diogenes and Hilary the notary came, but brought no letter from the Emperor. When, therefore, Syrianus gave out that the churches, ²in violation of the promise made by Constantius to Athanasius, were to be placed at the disposal of the Arians, Athanasius demanded a sight of his instructions. He admitted the justice of the demand, and promised to put an end to the disturbances created by the Arians. Instead, however, of keeping his promise, he himself broke into the Great Church while the people were assembled, and committed many outrages.

¹ Ad Constantium, c. 22. Ad Monachos, cc. 50. 52.

² Athanasius refers to the letters written to him by Constantius after the death of Constans. C. 23.

Such were the charges by which the enemies of Athanasius succeeded in exasperating Constantius against him, and by which the Emperor justified his own departure from the promise contained in his letter written after the death of Constans. ¹ He professed also, that nothing but respect for his brother's memory had induced him to allow Athanasius to remain so long at Alexandria. Finding, at length, that the peace of the Church could not be restored by any other means, he had determined, ² in imitation of his father's example, not only to banish Athanasius, but also to deprive him of his bishopric. With this view, George of Cappadocia was sent to Alexandria; and, as the people showed a disposition to support their bishop, he was accompanied by an armed force under the orders of the Count Heraclius. Athanasius gives an account of the ³ violence used by Heraclius in taking possession of the churches in order to transfer them to the Arians: and says that the persecution of the Catholics by the Arians was worse than that of the Christians by the Heathens.

¹ *Ad Monachos*, c. 50. Athanasius refers to the letters of Constantius in proof of the falsehood of this statement, cc. 51, 52.

² Athanasius observes that, although Constantine banished him, no person was sent to take possession of his bishopric. *C.* 50.

³ *Ad Monachos*, c. 65. *De Fugâ*, cc. 6, 7. Athanasius alleges the cruelties of the Arians as proofs of the badness of their cause; and says, that to employ force in the propagation of religion, is contrary to the spirit of the Gospel, c. 67; see note 1. p. 52. Compare Hilary *contra Constantium*, c. 8—12.

It extended throughout Ægypt, under the directions of Secundus of Pentapolis, one of the original supporters of Arius, and Stephanus, who had been ejected from Antioch. The orthodox bishops were expelled and banished, and Arians ¹ substituted in their place, many of whom are represented by Athanasius to have been men of bad morals.

² Athanasius himself with difficulty escaped, when, at the instigation of Heraclius, the rabble broke into the Great Church, where the people were holding a vigil, and committed every species of enormity, taking out the seats, the holy table, the curtains, the throne, and burning them in the streets; treating the women with every kind of insult, tearing the veils from the heads of the virgins, assailing their ears with the most obscene expressions, and even

¹ Athanasius mentions by name Secundus, Euzoius, Julius; Ammon, Marcus, Irenæus, Zosimus, Serapion called Pelycon, Sisinnius. C. 71. Germinius was transferred from Cyzicus to Sirmium; Cecropius from Laodicea to Nicomedia; Auxentius from Cappadocia to Milan, whence Dionysius had been expelled. Cc. 74, 75.

² At the end of the *Tract ad Monachos*, is given the protest of the Alexandrians, in which they describe these outrages: they say that Athanasius fainted away, and that they knew not how he had escaped with his life. See also *de Fugâ*, c. 24, where Athanasius represents himself as having refused to leave the church, and having been dragged away by the monks and clergy. He ascribes his escape to divine interposition. See Sozomen, L. 4. c. 10, who says that Athanasius frequently received warning from heaven of the dangers which awaited him.

stoning some to death. After his escape from the church, ¹ Athanasius remained in concealment in the desert, and prepared his Apology to Constantius, with the intention of presenting it in person. Receiving, however, intelligence of the banishment of Liberius, Hosius, Paulinus, Dionysius, Eusebius of Vercelli, Lucifer, and many other bishops, priests, and deacons, and of the persecution to which Vincentius of Capua, Fortunatianus of Aquileia, Heremius of Thessalonica, as well as other Western bishops, and nearly ninety bishops of Ægypt and Libya, had been subjected: hearing also that Constantius had ² sent orders to seize Frumentius, Bishop of Axume, and to make strict search for himself, he returned to the desert. ³ His enemies, as was to be expected, made his flight a ground of accusation against him, imputing it to the fear of death. He, in consequence, wrote the apology for his flight, in which he ⁴ justified himself by appealing to the examples of Jacob, Moses, David, and Elias under the Old Testament, and to the precepts and example of our Blessed Lord, and to the conduct of St. Paul and the other apostles. He fled, not because he feared death, but ⁵ in obedience to Christ's injunc-

¹ Ad Constantium, cc. 25, 26, 27.

² Ad Constantium, cc. 29, 30, 31, 32.

³ Athanasius names Leontius, Narcissus, and George of Laodicea. De Fugâ, c. 1.

⁴ De Fugâ, cc. 10, 11, 12.

⁵ De Fugâ, c. 22. Ad Constantium, c. 32. Athanasius urges

tions, that men should know their appointed time, and not rashly tempt the Lord : he was at all times ready to encounter death, rather than renounce the orthodox faith.

In the mean time, the Arian bishops had suggested to Constantius, that a council should be held at Nicæa, for the final settlement of the disputes which agitated Christendom ; their real object being, ¹ according to Athanasius, to supersede the decrees of the Nicene Council in the minds of men. ² Basil, however, of Ancyra, objected to Nicæa as the place of meeting, on the ground that any decrees which might be made there, would be confounded with those of the former Council ; and Nicomedia was then named. The intention of meeting there was frustrated by the occurrence of a severe ³ earthquake ; and Nicæa was again named, at

as another reason for flight in persecution, that you thereby save the persecutors from the guilt of committing murder. The Oxford annotator, in the short preface to the translation of the *Apology de Fugâ*, says that the real reason why Athanasius fled, was, that if he had been cut off, there was no one to take his place. If Athanasius himself assigns this reason, the passage has escaped my notice.

¹ De Synodis, cc. 1. 7. He mentions Ursacius, Valens, Germinius, Acacius, Eudoxius, and Patrophilus, as the prime movers in the business. Germinius had been made Bishop of Sirmium after the removal of Photinus, A.D. 351, having been translated from Cyzicus. Ad Monachos, c. 74.

² Sozomen, L. 4. c. 16.

³ In this earthquake, the bishop Cccropius lost his life. So-

the suggestion of ¹Basil. Ultimately it was determined that the Western bishops should meet at Rimini, the Eastern at Seleucia.

zomen, ubi supra: he gives a particular account of the damage done by it. Theodoret, L. 2. c. 26. Philostorgius says that fifteen bishops were killed, L. 4. c. 10.

¹ Sozomen says that, as the bishops could not be brought to any agreement respecting the place of meeting, Basil went to the Emperor at Sirmium, where Mark of Arethusa, George of Cappadocia, and Valens still were; and that Valens proposed the drawing up of a confession of faith for the signature of the bishops present, from which the word essence was carefully excluded. Selencia was then fixed as the place for the meeting of the Council; but Eudoxius, Acacius, Ursacius, and Valens, knowing that of the bishops, some adhered to the Nicene confession, others preferred that of the Council of the Dedication at Antioch, in both which the word essence occurred, and the Son is declared to be in all respects like to the Father; and fearing that Aetius, whose opinions they favoured, would be condemned, proposed the division of the council, in the hope that one at least of the two would decide in their favour. Constantius, in consequence, ordered one to meet at Rimini, the other at Seleucia. The Arians, according to Sozomen, affirmed that Constantine having learned from Eusebius and Theognius the grounds on which they objected to the word ὁμοούσιος, had determined to call another general council; but being attacked, before he could fulfil his resolution, by the disease which terminated his life, he enjoined Constantius to carry it into execution, telling him, that the empire would profit him nothing unless all his subjects agreed in their worship of the Deity. Constantius, in obedience to this injunction, called the Council of Rimini. Sozomen exposes the falsehood of the latter part of this story, and says that the controversy about the opinions of Aetius was the real occasion of the summoning of the council. L. 3. c. 19. Compare de Synodis, c. 8. Socrates, L. 2. c. 37. Hilary, de Synodis, c. 8, also mentions a synod held at Ancyra for the purpose of counteracting the effect of the proceedings at Sirmium. See cc. 3. 12. 27. 90. Sozomen, L. 4. c. 13.

¹ Four hundred bishops met at Rimini. A profession of faith drawn up at Sirmium was presented, and the Council was pressed to adopt it, on the ground that, if the word *οὐσία*, which is no where applied in Scripture to the Father, and gave offence to many, were omitted, peace would be restored to the Church. This profession represented the Son as like in all respects, ² *κατὰ πάντα ὅμοιον*, to the Father.

¹ A.D. 359. De Synodis, cc. 8, 9. This appears to have been the third Sirmian confession given by Athanasius. De Synodis, cc. 8. See also c. 29. It is given also by Socrates, L. 2. c. 37, who expressly calls it the third, though in c. 30 his remarks respecting the wish on the part of the framers to keep it secret, appear to apply to the second. Sozomen, L. 4. c. 17. Theodoret, L. 2. c. 18. Jerome adv. Luciferianos, p. 98 C. From the letter of Germinius to Rufinianus, it appears to have been drawn up by Mark of Arethusa. Hilary, ex opere historico Fragment. xv. c. 3. Epiphanius, Hær. lxxiii. c. 22. This creed Jerome calls "infidelitas." Adv. Lucif. p. 98 C.

² This, according to Epiphanius, Hæresis, lxxiii. cc. 22, 23, was the language of the semi-Arians, who understood the expression *κατὰ πάντα ὅμοιον* to include similarity in essence. Valens, in subscribing, wished to omit the words *κατὰ πάντα*, but was compelled by Constantius to add them. Epiphanius says that the Arians were divided into three parties: that of the semi-Arians, whose leaders were Basil of Ancyra and George of Laodicea; that of the Anomœans, of whose number were Valens, Eudoxius, George of Cappadocia; and that of Acacius, who seems to have held an intermediate opinion, but attached himself to the Anomœan party through dislike of Cyril of Jerusalem, who, though placed, according to Socrates, L. 2. c. 38, in the see of Jerusalem by Acacius himself and Patrophilus of Scythopolis, afterwards quarrelled with Acacius respecting the metropolitan rights of the see of Cæsarea. Cyril calls Christ *κατὰ πάντα ὅμοιον* to the Father, but appears to have avoided the use of the word *ὁμοούσιος*. Catechesis, iv. 5.

The orthodox bishops objected to its reception, on the ground that the Nicene Confession was sufficient. ¹ They suspected also, that some fraud was intended, and that the creed, though apparently orthodox in terms, might admit an Arian construction: in consequence, they required the ² bishops who presented it, to subscribe the condemnation of the Arian tenets in the terms prescribed at the end of the Nicene Creed. On their refusal to subscribe they were deposed. The Council then addressed a ³ letter to Constantius, in which it expressed its determination to adhere to the Nicene Creed, which had been settled after due deliberation in the presence of his father Constantine. This, it proceeded to say, was the true mode of preserving the peace of the Church; which must, on the contrary, be disturbed, if attention were paid to the representations of Ursacius and Valens, who had been suspended from communion on account of their leaning to Arianism; and though they had been restored at Milan on their

¹ See Jerome's lively account of the conduct of Valens at the Council. *Adv. Luciferianos*, p. 98 E. The orthodox bishops are stated in the *Epistle ad Afros*, c. 3, to have been about two hundred.

² Germinius, Valens, Ursacius, Demophilus, Gaius, Auxentius. See *ad Afros*, cc. 3. 10. Hilary *contra Auxentium*, c. 8. *Ad Ep. Ægypt. et Lib.* c. 7. *Ad Monachos*, c. 75.

³ *De Synodis*, c. 10. Socrates, L. 2. c. 37. Sozomen, L. 4. c. 18. Theodoret, L. 2. cc. 19, 20. Hilary, *ex opere historico* *Fragm.* vii. 4; viii. The Benedictine editor, instead of translating the Greek as it is given by Athanasius, inserts the Latin from Hilary.

retractation of their errors, were yet continually putting forth new formulas of faith. The Council concluded with urging the Emperor to allow the bishops detained at Rimini, many of whom were broken with age and poverty, to return home, lest the spiritual interests of their Churches should suffer. The Council also sent its decree to the Emperor, in which it states that Ursacius, Valens, Germinius, and Gaius had been ¹ condemned.

² The letters and the decree were sent to the Emperor by ten bishops, in obedience to his original direction. Valens, however, anticipated them: he repaired to the court, where he succeeded so completely in gaining over the Emperor to his views, that the delegates of the Council could not obtain admission to the royal presence. At last, ³ Constantius wrote to the Council, alleging in excuse of his refusal to receive their delegates, that he was wholly occupied with the Persian war, and stating

¹ Hilary says, on the motion of Grecianus, *Episcopus a Celle*. Socrates adds the names of Auxentius and Demophilus. L. 2. c. 37. Germinius appears afterwards to have seceded from the *Homœousian* party, and to have adopted or returned to the *Homœousian* expression, *ὁμοιον κατὰ πάντα*. Hilary, *Fragm.* xiii.

² Socrates, L. 2. c. 37. Sozomen, L. 4. c. 19; see also c. 16. p. 456 D. Theodoret, L. 2. c. 19. Hilary, *ex opere historico* *Fragm.* viii. He gives the letters of Constantius, *Fragm.* vii. c. 1.

³ De Synodis, c. 55. Socrates, L. 2. c. 37. Sozomen, L. 4. c. 19.

that he had ordered them to meet him at Hadrianople on his return from the campaign. In answer to this letter, the Council expressed its determination to adhere to its decree, and again entreated Constantius to allow the bishops to return to their dioceses before the setting-in of winter. It is certain, however; that a creed of a character similar to that which had been rejected, was at last put forth as the profession of faith agreed upon at Rimini; and we learn from ¹Sozomen, that two different accounts were given of the mode in which this was effected. One was, that the bishops at Rimini, having waited some time for an answer to their last letter to the Emperor and received none, broke up the Council and returned to their dioceses; that Constantius resented their departure without his previous permission as a contempt of his authority, and gave Valens full power to arrange the affairs of the Western Church according to his discretion; to promulgate the profession of faith which he had caused to be read at Rimini; to expel from their bishoprics all who refused to subscribe, and to substitute others in their places; that Valens, acting upon the authority thus given him, expelled several ²bishops, and having constrained the Western Churches to adopt the creed, proceeded to the East.

¹ L. 4. c. 19.

² Sozomen mentions Liberius; but this could not be, as Liberius had already subscribed the Sirmian creed, and been restored to his bishopric.

Passing through Thrace, he caused a synod to be called at ¹ Nice, at which he published the creed, having first translated it into Greek, and, availing himself of the similarity of names, pretended that it was the creed set forth at Nicæa in Bithynia. The other account is, that the delegates from Rimini were detained at Nice, under the pretence that the season of the year rendered travelling almost impracticable; that Valens and his associates took the opportunity of ² representing to them, that the peace of the Church ought not to be disturbed on account of a single word; that the Eastern bishops would never ³ consent to the introduction of the word *οὐσία*, but that they would adopt the creed set forth by Valens; and that the delegates ought consequently, for the sake of peace, to subscribe it.

In the mean time, the ⁴ Eastern bishops had met

¹ Compare Socrates, L. 2. c. 37, sub fine. Theodoret, L. 2. c. 21, where the creed is given. Hilary, Fragment. viii. c. 5, from which it appears that Restitutus, Bishop of Carthage, presided, and that all the proceedings at Rimini were pronounced null. Ad Afros, cc. 3, 4. Theodoret, L. 2. c. 26.

² According to Sulpicius, the delegates sent by the Council were young, unlearned, incautious men; while Valens and his associates were crafty, able, and unscrupulous. L. 2. p. 422. Hilary, Fragment. viii. c. 4, note h.

³ Sozomen denies the truth of this statement, and says that the Oriental bishops, with few exceptions, contended that the Son is like *κατ' οὐσίαν* to the Father, though some preferred the use of the word *ὁμοιούσιος* to that of *ὁμοούσιος*. L. 4. c. 37, sub fine.

⁴ A.D. 359. De Synodis, c. 12. Socrates, L. 2. c. 39. He

at Seleucia to the number of about one hundred and sixty. According to Athanasius, Acacius, with his friends, in order to ward off the condemnation which they apprehended, having associated to themselves certain Arian bishops who had been consecrated by Secundus, the same who was deposed at the Nicene Council,—Stephanus, Seras, and Pollux, bishops of Libya, Pancratius and a Meletian bishop named Ptolemy,—openly rejected the Nicene creed. A great majority, however, confirmed it, with the exception of the word *ὁμοούσιος*, which they omitted on account of its ambiguity. After much angry discussion, Acacius, Patrophilus, Uranius of Tyre, George of Cappadocia, Leontius, Theodotus, Evagrius, and Theodulus, were deposed; Asterius, Eusebius, Abgarus, Basilicus, Phœbus, Fidelius, Eutychiis, Eustathius, and Magnus, were excommunicated, because they had not appeared when called upon to answer the accusations against them.

refers his readers to the collection of Sabinus. The number of those who attached themselves to Acacius was thirty-two. George of Laodicea, Sophronius of Pompeiopolis, and Eleusius of Cyzicus, were the leaders of the majority. Sozomen, L. 4. c. 22. The Oxford annotator de Synodis, c. 12, note o, says that Basil of Ancyra was not present; but Socrates says that on the third day, both he and Macedonius of Constantinople were present, c. 40. Sozomen says the same. Hilary was present: and it has been inferred from the manner in which Athanasius expresses himself, that he was also present; but the Benedictine editor shows this to be highly improbable. De Synod. sub in.

Having communicated the decree to their several dioceses, the bishops returned home, with the exception of those who were deputed to render Constantius an account of their proceedings.

According to ¹ Socrates and ² Sozomen, the question was first debated among the bishops, whether they should, before they entered into the discussion of points of doctrine, enquire into certain charges affecting the moral character of some of their number. It was determined, however, to proceed to the points of doctrine. ³ The majority were in favour of the Creed of the Dedication; the others of the creed set forth by Mark of Arethusa at Sirmium. Acacius joined the latter party, though he had not long before written a letter to Macedonius, in which he professed to believe that the Son is in all respects like the Father, and of the same substance. Leonas, an officer of the palace, who had been sent by Constantius to be present at the discussions, took part with Acacius, and caused the profession of faith which he had drawn up to be read to the Synod. He and his party were, nevertheless, as we have seen, condemned. After the Synod was dissolved,

¹ L. 2. c. 40.

² L. 4. c. 19.

³ Hilary, *contra Constantium*, c. 12, says that one hundred and five maintained the Homœousian doctrine, nineteen the Anomœan. The minority, in their letter to Constantius, represent themselves as having subscribed the true doctrine, omitting the word *ὁὐσία*. Hilary, *Fragm.* ix. c. 2.

the ¹ Acacians proceeded to the Emperor at Constantinople, where they met the delegates both from Rimini and Seleucia; and Constantius directed the united body, in conjunction with other bishops who happened to be in the place, to examine into the tenets of ² Aetius, which were condemned. He then

¹ Hilary, *contra Constantium*, c. 15, *Fragm.* x.

² See the lively account given by Theodoret of what passed at Constantinople, *L.* 2. c. 27. Aetius was the leader of the Anomœan party. He was ordained by Leontius, was the friend of Acacius, and indoctrinated Eudoxius in Arianism. *De Synodis*, c. 38. Socrates, *L.* 3. c. 10. Sozomen, *L.* 3. c. 15, says that he practised medicine at Antioch (Philostorgius also states this), and devoted himself to the study of the Scriptures and to philosophy. He, in consequence, became intimate with the Cæsar, Gallus: an intimacy which, according to Philostorgius, *L.* 4. c. 8, through the malicious representations of Basil of Ancyra to Constantius, occasioned his banishment. Basil had previously tried to injure him in the estimation of Gallus. Philostorgius says that he was born in Cœle-Syria, that his father's property was confiscated, and that in order to support his mother, he took up the trade of a goldsmith; that after her death he applied himself to the study of logic, and became a hearer of Paulinus, Bishop of Antioch; that Enlalius, the successor of Paulinus, drove him away from Antioch; that he then went to Anazarbus, where he was patronized by Athanasius, who had been a disciple of Lucian; that he afterwards went to Tarsus, whence he returned to Antioch, and was there ordained by Leontius; that he excited the implacable hatred of Basil of Ancyra and Eustathius of Sebastia by defeating them in a disputation respecting the Homœousian doctrine; that he went to Alexandria for the purpose of counteracting the effect of the teaching of Athanasius; that when Secundus and Seras wished to consecrate him bishop, he refused on account of their connexion with the Homœousians (he appears afterwards to have consented, *L.* 7. c. 6); and that Eunomius became his disciple. *L.* 3. cc. 15, 16, 17. 19, 20. At c. 27,

commanded the delegates from Selencia to subscribe the profession of faith which Valens had succeeded in persuading the delegates from Rimini to sign. Such was the result of the Synods of Rimini and Selencia. Constantius, who professed, according to Sozomen's statement, to believe that the Son is *in all respects*, κατ' οὐσίαν, like the Father, employed his imperial power in forcing upon the Christian world a creed in which the Son is said *generally* to be like the Father, and the word ¹ οὐσία is purposely omitted. It is to the publication of this creed that the me-

Philostorgius says that Gallus, when Julian first showed a disposition to renounce Christianity, sent Aetius to him in the hope of preventing his apostasy. Athanasius, de Synodis, c. 6, says that he was called ἄθεος ὁ θρυλλούμενος Ἀέτιος, ὁ ἐπικληθεὶς ἄθεος. Socrates says of him, that he was better acquainted with the logic of Aristotle than with the Scriptures; and that Eunomius was his amanuensis. L. 2. c. 35; L. 4. c. 7. Compare Sozomen, L. 4. c. 12. Eunomius appears to have attached himself inseparably to Aetius. Philostorgius, L. 6. c. 3; L. 7. cc. 5, 6; L. 8. c. 2; L. 9. cc. 4, 6, where he is said to have closed the eyes of his dying master, and to have done honour by a splendid funeral to his remains.

¹ In the third Sirmian Creed, which was first produced at Rimini, the word οὐσία is omitted, but the Son is said to be like the Father, κατὰ πάντα. De Synodis, c. 8. In the creed produced at Selencia, the terms ὁμοούσιος and ὁμοιούσιος are rejected as unscriptural, the Anomœans are condemned, and the likeness of the Son to the Father is recognized. De Synodis, c. 29. Hilary, contra Constantium, c. 14. In the confession agreed to at Nice and confirmed at Constantinople, the word οὐσία is omitted, and the Son is said to be like to the Father: this likeness the Arians would interpret according to their own views. C. 30. This is the creed given by Theodoret, L. 2. c. 21, and Socrates, L. 2. c. 41. See Hilary, Fragm. xiii.

morable remark of ¹Jerome applies: “Ingemuit totus orbis et se Arianum esse miratus est.” Athanasius ²had applauded the Synod at Rimini for their firmness in rejecting the creed proposed by Valens; ³great, therefore, was his surprise and grief, when he learned that they had been induced by the threats of Constantius to subscribe the creed put forth by Valens at Nice. He states further, that the Arian bishops met together afterwards at Antioch, and there put forth a purely Anomœan creed, in which the Son was said to be in no manner like the Father, reverting, as he says, to the original principles of Arius, the founder of their sect.

Having completed his narrative of what passed at Constantinople, and made his way, to use his own expression, through the labyrinth of confessions of faith, ⁴Socrates says that he will pause to enumerate them.

He first mentions the Nicene, of which the distinguishing feature was the word *ὁμοούσιος*, insisted upon by Athanasius as that which best expressed the essential divinity of the Son, ⁵the oneness of His

¹ Adv. Luciferianos, p. 98.

² De Synodis, c. 13.

³ De Synodis, cc. 30, 31. Theodoret, L. 2. c. 31.

⁴ L. 2. c. 41.

⁵ *ὁμοιούσιος* or *ὅμοιος κατ' οὐσίαν* implies rather a separation of *οὐσίαι*. Likeness implies two distinct things or beings. The

essence with the Father's, and admitted of no evasion.

He next mentions ¹two creeds set forth at Antioch, of which the former does not bear on the points in dispute, but is another version of the Apostles' creed: the latter is known by the name of the Formulary of the Dedication, and ²was attributed to Lucian by the Eusebians, who said that they had found a copy in his own handwriting. It does not contain the word *ὁμοούσιος*, but it calls the Son *τῆς θεότητος οὐσίας τε τοῦ πατρὸς ἀπαράλλακτος εἰκὼν*.
³Hilary deemed it orthodox.

Socrates next mentions the ⁴confession which was generation of the Son's essence from the Father's establishes the distinction between the Generans and the Genitum, while it maintains the co-essentiality. According to the decree of the fourth Lateran Council, "*Essentia divina nec est generans, nec genita, nec procedens*;" on which Bingham remarks, that it cometh nearest to Tritheism. Sermon on the Divinity of Christ. Cudworth had before observed, after stating that the Trinity of Gregory of Nyssa and Cyril of Alexandria came to be deemed Tritheistic, that in the room thereof started there up that other Trinity of persons numerically the same, as having all one and the same singular existent essence;—a doctrine which seemeth not to have been owned by any public authority in the Christian Church, save that of the Lateran Council only. Intellectual System, fol. ed. p. 604.

¹ De Synodis, cc. 22, 23.

² Sozomen, L. 3. c. 5.

³ De Synodis, cc. 28. 33. He says that it was put forth, not against those who held that the Father and the Son were of dissimilar essence, but against those who held a nominal Trinity. Compare ad Constantium, c. 23.

⁴ De Synodis, c. 25.

delivered by Narcissus and his associates to Constans, in Gaul; and omits the word *οὐσία*.

The ¹ next is the confession known by the name of the *Macrostic*; in it the Son is said to be in every respect like to the Father, *ὅμοιον κατὰ πάντα*; an expression which admitted of evasion, since it might or might not be construed to include likeness in *essence*.

Socrates then mentions the three confessions drawn up at Sirmium; the ² first, that of the synod summoned for the condemnation of Photinus, which Hilary deemed orthodox; the ³ second, from which the words *οὐσία*, *ὁμοούσιος*, *ὁμοιούσιος* are excluded, and to which Hilary gives the title of “blasphemia;” the ⁴ third, which has prefixed to it the consulate in which it was published, and was composed by Mark of Arethusa. It was, with some alteration, proposed to the Synod of Rimini, but rejected.

¹ De Synodis, c. 26.

² A.D. 351. De Synodis, c. 27. Hilary, de Synodis, c. 38. In his book against Constantius, he says that the Arians wished to alter the first anathema of this creed, c. 23. p. 1255 A. According to the Benedictine editor, Photinus was four times condemned: at Milan, in 347; again in 349; at Sirmium in 354. Fragm. ii. cc. 21. 24. 29.

³ A.D. 357. De Synodis, c. 28. Hilary, de Synodis, cc. 2. 10, 11. According to Hilary, this was the creed subscribed by Hosius, c. 63. Hilary, Fragm. ii. c. 21.

⁴ De Synodis, cc. 8. 29. Hilary, ex opere historico Fragm. xv. c. 3. A.D. 359.

The eighth, the creed produced at Seleucia by the Arians; the ninth, that which Constantius forced upon the synods of Rimini and Seleucia. Socrates adds that Ulphilas, the Bishop of the Goths, then joined the Arian party. This long list of confessions is not complete, for Athanasius ¹ says that ten or more were put forth; among them ² one, as we have seen, by the bishops who seceded from Sardica to Philippopolis.

To return to Athanasius, who, as has been stated, took refuge from the violence of his enemies in the desert. ³ George of Cappadocia then took possession of the see of Alexandria, and held it about six years. According to Athanasius, he was a man of bad character and not really a Christian; and according

¹ Ad Afros, c. 3.

² Hilary, Fragm. iii. c. 29.

³ The Benedictine editor places this event A. D. 356. De Synodis, c. 37. Socrates, L. 2. c. 45. Sozomen, L. 4. c. 30. Athanasius calls him τὸν ἀπὸ ὑποδέκτων, De Synodis, c. 12, and ὑποδέκτην ἐν Κωνσταντινουπόλει τῶν ταρμακῶν; and adds that, having been guilty of peculation, he was obliged to fly. Ad Monachos, c. 74. Athanasius calls him also τὸν ταρμειοφάγον: c. 51. See also ad Ep. Ægypt. et Lib. c. 7. Snicer interprets ὑποδέκτης a receiver of taxes. Gregory of Nazianzen says that he supplied the army with pork. Oratio xxi. c. 16. In his letter to the Alexandrians Constantius calls him ὁ σεμνότατος. Ad Constantium, c. 30. Athanasius speaks of him as ignorant; but, as Gibbon observes, he collected a valuable library, which Julian ordered to be preserved for his own use: c. 23. Gibbon considers it to be extremely probable that George of Cappadocia is no other than St. George, the patron saint of England.

to ¹ Epiphanius, he resorted to the most disgraceful as well as violent proceedings in order to gratify his avarice. He deprived many of the inheritance left them by their parents; he monopolized the nitre of Ægypt, the beds of papyrus, and the salt lakes, farming them for his own profit; he caused a number of biers to be made, and would allow no others to be used for carrying out the bodies of the dead, thus making a profit even out of funerals. We might feel some distrust of the accounts given of his avarice and cruelty by the supporters of Athanasius, if they were not confirmed by the testimony of ² Ammianus Marcellinus, who speaks of his appointment to the bishopric of Alexandria as a public calamity, and says that he tried to persuade Constantius that the soil on which Alexandria stood belonged to him, as the successor of the founder of the city, and consequently all the houses built upon it. The people had long regarded him with bitter hatred; but the immediate cause of his death appears to have been ³ a casual exclamation which he uttered as he passed the Temple of Genius, a temple remarkable for its beauty. "How long," he said,

¹ Hæresis, lxxvi. c. 1.

² L. 22. p. 1626 C. Ammianus says that he was born at Epiphania in Cilicia.

³ Socrates, L. 3. c. 2, and Sozomen, L. 5. c. 7, agree in stating that the tumult arose from an attempt to purify a spot of ground on which the heathen had been accustomed to celebrate the mysteries of Mithras, and which Constantius had granted for the site of a church.

“shall this sepulchre stand?” The people inferring that he intended to destroy the temple, broke out into insurrection, tore him, together with Dracontius, the master of the mint, and the Count Diodorus, to pieces, and treated their dead bodies with every species of indignity. This event took place shortly after the death of ¹Constantius; his successor Julian, on hearing it, was at first disposed to inflict very severe punishment on the offenders, but, in the end, contented himself with threatening any one who should in future disturb the public tranquillity. ²The friends of Athanasius were naturally charged by his enemies with instigating the tumult, but the letter of Julian gives no countenance to the charge. Julian, on his accession to the empire, permitted all the bishops who had been banished by Constantius to ³return home; among them Eusebius of Vercelli and Lucifer of Cagliari, who had been banished to the Thebais. Athanasius in consequence returned to Alexandria; and

¹ A.D. 362. Constantius was baptized shortly before his death by Euzoius. De Synodis, c. 31. Socrates, L. 2. c. 47. Sozomen, L. 5. c. 1. Philostorgius, L. 6. c. 5. Gibbon says that Athanasius spoke of Constantius in opposite terms *at the same time*; the Oxford annotator calls this statement unfair, De Synodis, c. 12; it must, however, be admitted that the transition from the language of praise to that of vituperation was rapid. Compare ad Ep. Ægypt. et Lib. c. 23. Ad Constantium, c. 27, with De Fugâ, c. 26. Ad Monachos, c. 69.

² Socrates, L. 3. c. 3. Sozomen, L. 5. c. 7. Philostorgius, L. 7. c. 2.

³ Hilary, ad Const. L. 1. c. 8. Socrates, L. 3. cc. 4, 5. Sozomen, L. 5. c. 12. Philostorgius, L. 6. c. 7. Theodoret, L. 3. c. 4. Jerome adv. Luciferianos, p. 99 A.

as the death of George had removed all obstacle to his ¹ resumption of the see, he resumed it amidst the joy and acclamations of the people.

In recording the events which occurred after the reinstatement of Athanasius in his see, we derive little assistance from his own works. We learn from ² Socrates that, shortly after his return, he and Eusebius of Vercelli determined to hold a synod at Alexandria, at which Lucifer was not present, though he sent ³ his deacon and promised to abide by all which the synod might decree. ⁴ The immediate object of the synod appears to have been to reunite the orthodox who had been scattered during the episcopate of George, and to settle the terms of union. These were, that all should condemn the

¹ The Arians appointed Lucius in the place of George. Socrates, L. 4. c. 1. Sozomen, L. 6. c. 19.

² L. 3. cc. 6, 7. 9. Socrates appears to have fallen into an error respecting the decision of the synod upon the use of the words *οὐσία* and *ὑπόστασις*, which he states to have been that they were not to be used with reference to the Deity, but only in opposition to the error of Sabellius. Athanasius, in his letter to the Church at Antioch, makes no mention of any such decision. Sozomen, however, agrees with Socrates, L. 5. c. 12. The remarks of Socrates on the word *ὑπόστασις* deserve attention; Athanasius understood by the word an individual subsistence. See Introduction to Bingham's Sermons, vol. viii.

³ It appears from the *Tomus ad Antiochenos* that he sent two deacons, Herennius and Agapetus: c. 9.

⁴ *Tomus ad Antiochenos*, c. 3. It seems that some who professed the Nicene faith denied the Divinity of the Holy Spirit. See the letter of Basil of Cæsarea, 204 or 75.

heresy of Arius and accept the Nicene confession; that they should condemn, also, those who said that the Holy Spirit was a creature, and distinct from the essence of Christ; and ¹ that they should hold the perfect humanity of Christ—that He had a human soul as well as body. It appears that there were ² some who spoke of three ὑποστάσεις in the Deity, and some only of one ὑπόστασις, the former using the word in the sense of person, in opposition to the notion of a nominal Trinity; the other as synonymous with οὐσία, in opposition to Arianism: both parties were pronounced orthodox. The proceedings of the synod were conducted with so much wisdom and in so conciliatory a spirit as to command the approval of ³ Gibbon.

After the synod ⁴ Eusebius was sent to Antioch, where he found the Church in a state of great confusion, occasioned principally by the precipitancy of Lucifer. When ⁵ Eustathius was deposed, though the

¹ c. 7.

² cc. 5, 6.

³ c. 23. He refers to the Epistle to Rufinianus, from which it appears that the course pursued at Alexandria had been followed by other Churches. See the letter of Liberius. Hilary, *Fragm.* xii.

⁴ Socrates, *L.* 3. c. 9. Sozomen, *L.* 5. c. 13. Asterius, who quitted the Arians at Sardica, accompanied him. Tomus, cc. 1, 2.

⁵ Socrates, *L.* 2. c. 44. Sozomen, *L.* 5. c. 13. According to the lively description of Theodoret, the Emperor, being at Antioch when Meletius was elected bishop, ordered him and

Arians became the prevailing party at Antioch, the orthodox continued to hold their assemblies. On the translation of Eudoxius to Constantinople, the Arians appointed Meletius to succeed him. Meletius had been Bishop of Sebastia, whence he was translated to Berœa, and, as Bishop of Berœa, attended the Council of Seleucia, where he subscribed the creed set forth by Acacius. The Arians, therefore, conceiving him to hold their tenets, appointed

others to expound Proverbs viii. 22. George of Laodicea first poured forth his heretical version; then Acacius of Cæsarea took a middle course, avoiding the blasphemy of George, but not setting forth the pure apostolical doctrine; lastly, Meletius declared the true faith, amidst the applause of the people, who besought him to set it before them in a compendious form; upon which he first held up three fingers, and then closing two of them, held up one; saying at the same time, there are three objects of the understanding, *τρεῖς μέρη*, but we address them as one. L. 2. c. 31. We find his name subscribed to the decree of the Synod of Antioch held in the reign of Jovian, which declared its adhesion to the Nicene faith. Socrates, L. 3. c. 25. See Philostorgius, L. 5. c. 1. Basil speaks of him in terms of high eulogium, as pure in faith and life; and strongly expresses his wish that the orthodox congregations at Antioch may be united under his episcopacy. Ep. 67 or 50. It appears that when Athanasius went to Antioch, Meletius declined to hold communion with him, influenced by the suggestions of some ill-disposed advisers. Athanasius, therefore, on his return to Alexandria, wrote to Paulinus, whose supporters took advantage of the circumstance in order to create the impression that Athanasius regarded him, not Meletius, as the orthodox bishop of Antioch. Basil professed his determination to adhere to Meletius, who seems afterwards to have wished to be received into communion by Athanasius; Basil tells him that, after what had passed, Athanasius could not make the first overture. Ep. 89 or 273, 214 or 349, 258 or 325.

him to Antioch: at first he treated only of questions of morals, avoiding all doctrinal points; but by degrees he began to teach the Nicene doctrine, and was in consequence removed by Constantius, who appointed Euzoius in his place. Many, however, of his hearers still followed him; but the members of the congregation who had adhered originally to Eustathius regarded him with suspicion, because he had been appointed by the Arians and his followers had received Arian baptism; they refused, therefore, to hold communion with him: thus, as Socrates observes, the Church was divided into two parties, agreeing with each other in point of doctrine. One object of the mission of Eusebius and Asterius was to heal this division; ¹but on their arrival they found that Lucifer had already consecrated Paulinus bishop of the church which derived its succession from Eustathius. All the efforts of Eusebius to form a junction of the two parties were unavailing; Paulinus performed divine service in a small church which Euzoius from feelings of personal respect allowed him to retain; Eustathius held his meetings without the walls of the city. The precipitancy and obstinacy of Lucifer multiplied the causes of dissension. Finding that Eusebius refused to recognize Paulinus, he treated the refusal as an insult to himself, broke off communion with Eusebius, and, in his

¹ Socrates, L. 3. c. 9; L. 4. c. 1. Sozomen, L. 5. c. 13. Theodoret, L. 3. c. 5. Philostorgius, L. 3. c. 18.

anger, ¹ began to object to the easy terms on which the clergy, who had joined the Arians during their ascendancy under Constantius, had been restored by the synod at Alexandria to their position in the Church. Thus he formed a sect, which bore his name, and continued to exist in the time of Socrates; he himself returned to Sardinia.

If Athanasius had been allowed to remain in peace at Alexandria, he might have effected much towards the restoration of harmony, not only in that city, but throughout the Christian world. As, however, he had been driven from his bishopric by one Emperor on account of his uncompromising defence of the Catholic faith, ² he was now again to be driven from it by that Emperor's successor on account of his active zeal in the maintenance of Christianity itself. Julian, having himself renounced it, was determined, by appealing to the fears or the interests of his subjects, to induce them to join him in his apostacy. Having learned, therefore, from the prefect of Ægypt that all the attempts to re-establish

¹ He had, as we have seen, promised to abide by the decision of the synod. That decision was, that those of the clergy who had taken an active and prominent part on the Arian side should not be allowed to resume their ministerial functions; but that indulgence should be extended to those who had temporized through fear, and acted *οἰκονομῶς*. Epistle to Rufinianus. Lucifer appears to have received those who had been baptized among the Arians. Jerome adv. Luciferianos, p. 99 F.

² Socrates, L. 3. cc. 13, 14. Sozomen, L. 5. c. 15.

the Gentile worship at Alexandria were frustrated by the preaching of Athanasius, and that converts were even made from heathenism to Christianity, he ¹ordered the bishop to quit the city, threatening him with the severest punishment if he hesitated to obey the order. Athanasius resolved to obey; and said to his friends, who were weeping around him, "Be of good courage; this is a little cloud, which will soon pass away:" he then went on board a vessel in the Nile, with the view of escaping into Upper Ægypt. ² A story in connexion with his flight has been preserved, which the person who records it states himself to have heard from his mouth. He was advised to take refuge with Theodorus, the head of the monastery at Tabenne. In company with him in the vessel were Theodorus and the Abbot Pammo, and the wind proving contrary, in the disquietude of his heart he had recourse to prayer. The abbot began to console him, but he replied: "Believe me, I never feel the same confidence in time of peace which I feel in time of persecution.

¹ He pretended that, although he had on his accession given the bishops permission to return from banishment, he had not given them permission to resume their bishoprics.

² *Narratio ad Ammonium*, tom. ii. p. 868. Socrates appears not to have heard this story; but he gives an account of a clever artifice by which Athanasius escaped the pursuit of his enemies. It is also recounted by Theodoret, L. 3. c. 9. Sozomen says that the revelation of the death of Julian was made to Didymus, a Christian philosopher of Alexandria, who communicated the event to Athanasius: L. 6. c. 2.

For I take courage from the assurance that suffering for Christ and being strengthened by his mercy, I shall, even if I am slain, find still greater mercy from Him." While he was yet uttering these words, Theodorus, fixing his eyes on the abbot, smiled, and the abbot nearly laughed. Athanasius then inquired why they smiled, and whether they suspected him of cowardice. Theodorus answered: "At this very moment Julian is slain in Persia; and will be succeeded by an Emperor illustrious, indeed, but short-lived. Instead, therefore, of pursuing your route to the Thebais, go secretly to the court; you will meet him by the way, and will be well received by him; but he will quickly be removed from the world."

Athanasius would not be unwilling to give credence to the intelligence of the death of Julian, from whatsoever source derived; but he does not appear to have adopted the advice of Theodorus: he did not repair to the court, but ¹ went to Alexandria immediately after Julian's death. One of Jovian's earliest acts, however, appears to have been to address a ² letter to Athanasius, inviting him to return to Alexandria. He afterwards wrote another letter, in which he requested the opinion of the bishop

¹ Socrates, L. 3. c. 24. Sozomen, L. 6. c. 5. Theodoret, L. 4. c. 2. Philostorgius, L. 8. c. 5.

² See the letter, tom. ii. p. 779. Epiphanius refers to it, Hæres. lxxviii. c. 11.

upon the points of doctrine on which the Church was divided. Athanasius thought it advisable, before he answered the letter, to ¹assemble some of the more eminent bishops, and by obtaining their concurrence to give greater authority to his reply. It contains, however, little more than a statement that the Catholic Church agreed in holding the Nicene faith.

In the mean time, ²the Arians were not idle. They went to the Emperor, who was then at Antioch, and petitioned him to give them a bishop, but not Athanasius, in the hope perhaps, that he would confirm the appointment of Lucius, whom they had chosen after the death of George of Cappadocia.

¹ Theodoret, L. 4. cc. 2, 3. Athanasii Opera, tom. ii. p. 780. It appears that the character of the controversy had undergone a change: Athanasius now speaks of those who, while they adopted the word *ὁμοούσιος*, attached to it an heretical meaning, and said the Holy Spirit is a creature. Ep. 1. ad Serapionem, c. 1. The Emperor's letter was occasioned by the attempts made at his accession by the leaders of the different parties, to gain him over to their side. Basil of Ancyra and his party, whom Socrates calls Macedonians, petitioned Jovian to expel the Anomœans. He answered, that he hated contention, and was anxious to promote concord. Seeing, therefore, that Meletius was much esteemed by him, the Acacians, from whom Meletius had seceded, joined in a confession, in which they declared their adhesion to the Nicene Faith, with an explanation of the word *ὁμοούσιος*, which they interpreted to mean that the Son was of the essence of the Father, and like Him in essence. Socrates, L. 3. c. 25. Sozomen, L. 6. c. 4.

² Athanasii Opera, tom. ii. p. 782. Compare Sozomen, L. 6. c. 5. See also Philostorgius, L. 8. c. 6.

They alleged against Athanasius, that he had been banished both by Constantine and Constantius, that he had been guilty of various acts of oppression, and would not allow them to hold their religious assemblies. Athanasius appears to have been then at Antioch, either in consequence of a summons from Jovian, or having thought it advisable to go thither in order to answer in person the charges of his enemies. The result was altogether in his favour. The Emperor repelled the Arian delegates with strong expressions of anger and dislike, and uttered a somewhat uncharitable imprecation against Lucius.

¹ The premature death of Jovian gave occasion to the renewal of the dissensions of the Church, and of the troubles of Athanasius. He was succeeded by Valentinian, who, immediately after his accession, associated his brother Valens to himself in the empire: ² both were sincere in the profession of Christianity; both had run the risk of incurring the displeasure of Julian by refusing to take part in the heathen rites; but ³ Valentinian upheld the Homo-

¹ A. D. 364.

² Socrates, L. 4. c. 1. He says that the Catholics were so few in number at Constantinople, that a very small building was sufficient to hold them.

³ Theodoret gives the letter of a synod held in Illyricum by the command of Valentinian, in which the Homooousian doctrine is expressly set forth; as well as the Emperor's letter in explanation of it. L. 4. cc. 7, 8.

ousian creed, while Valens, who had been baptized by Eudoxius, was an Arian, and not content with favouring his own party, persecuted those whose belief differed from his own. ¹ Sozomen says that he gave orders for the expulsion from their bishoprics of all the bishops who, having been deposed by Constantius, had returned at the accession of Julian; but that when the Præfect of Ægypt proceeded to carry this order into effect at Alexandria, the people showed so strong a determination to prevent the expulsion of Athanasius, that he thought it better to desist. Athanasius, however, left the city secretly, and so effectually ² concealed himself, as to baffle the pursuit of the Præfect; and Valens, after a short interval, allowed him to return and to resume his bishopric.

³ Valens, shortly after his accession to the empire, had been urged by the Macedonians ⁴ to call a synod, and supposing them to agree in opinion with Acacius

¹ L. 6. c. 12. Socrates, L. 4. c. 13.

² Sozomen says that he lay hid in his father's monument.

³ Socrates, L. 4. cc. 2. 4. Sozomen, L. 6. c. 7, says that the request for a synod was made also to Valentinian.

⁴ We have seen that Paul succeeded Alexander in the bishopric of Constantinople; that he was ejected by Eusebius of Nicomedia, but replaced in the bishopric on the death of that prelate. The Eusebians, however, appointed Macedonius, who, as well as Paul, had been named by Alexander as well qualified to succeed him; and who, after the final expulsion of Paul, remained in the sole, though not quiet, possession of the see. He joined Basil

and Eudoxius, had consented. It met at Lampsacus, and having confirmed the profession of the Council of Antioch which they had subscribed at Seleucia, condemned that of ¹ Rimini. Valens was extremely incensed at the proceedings of the synod, and on his return after the defeat of Procopius, assembled ² a council of Arian bishops, who deposed Eleusius, the head of the Macedonian party, and substituted Eunomius in his place. ³ The Macedonians determined to send delegates to Valentinian, and to Liberius, Bishop of Rome. The former was then occupied with the Sarmatian war, and could not, therefore, receive them; and Liberius at first hesi-

of Ancyra at the Council of Seleucia, and acquired such influence among the semi-Arians that, as we have seen, Socrates calls them Macedonians. His opposition to the Arian or Anomœan party was so deeply resented by them, that they succeeded at the Synod of Constantinople (A.D. 360) in depriving him of his bishopric. Philostorgius, L. 4. c. 9. He appears to have been of the number of those whom Athanasius describes, in his Epistles to Serapion on the Holy Spirit, as having renounced the Arian doctrine as far as it related to the Second, but having retained it as far as it related to the Third, Person of the Holy Trinity; denying His Personality, and considering Him as a Divine Energy. The publication of his opinions occasioned the calling of the Council of Constantinople, A.D. 381, by which they were condemned.

¹ The creed forced upon the bishops by Valens. Socrates, L. 4. c. 12. p. 181 B.

² Socrates, L. 4. c. 6. Sozomen, L. 6. c. 8. Eleusius was offered the alternative of subscribing the profession put forth by the Council or of being banished; he at first subscribed, but afterwards repented of his subscription, and was deprived.

³ Socrates, L. 4. c. 12. Sozomen, L. 6. cc. 10, 11, 12.

tated, saying that they belonged to the Arian party. Being afterwards satisfied that they had abjured their error, and having obtained from them a subscription to an Homousian creed, he addressed a letter to them, in which he bore testimony to their orthodoxy. This letter they caused to be circulated among all who held the Homousian doctrine; and an attempt was made to convene a synod at Tarsus for its confirmation, but frustrated by the influence of Eudoxius with Valens.

Damasus had ¹now succeeded Liberius in the bishopric of Rome; and ²Theodoret has preserved a letter, addressed by him and ninety bishops from Italy and Gaul, assembled at Rome, to the bishops of Illyricum, in which the proceedings of Valens at Nice are condemned, and the ³subscriptions of the bishops are said to have been obtained by fraud.

The last public act of Athanasius appears to have been the calling together of a ⁴synod at Alexandria, by which a letter was addressed to the bishops of Africa for the purpose of exhorting them to adhere to the Nicene Confession, and not to be shaken in their minds by that which the Arians put forth as the confession of Rimini, but which was really that

¹ A. D. 366.

² L. 2. c. 22. Compare ad Afros, cc. 1. 20.

³ Hilary, Fragm. xii. c. 3.

⁴ Ad Afros.

imposed upon the bishops at Nice. In this letter, reference is made to the council held by ¹ Damasus at Rome. But though no public act of Athanasius is recorded during the remaining years of his life, he still continued to watch over the purity of Christian doctrine; and finding that the errors of Apollinarius were widely circulated, he wrote in confutation of them the ² two tracts which purport to be expressly directed against that heretic, and the Epistle to Epictetus.

The Benedictine editor places his death, A.D. 373. His character has been drawn with a masterly hand by Gibbon, who was fully competent to appreciate his intellectual and moral qualities:—his quickness and clearness of perception; his patience of labour; his unflinching, yet well-regulated, courage; his stedfastness of purpose; his knowledge of human nature; and that which is the surest mark of a great mind, his power of swaying the wills and the affections of all who came within the sphere of his

¹ The Benedictine editor supposes two councils to have been held by Damasus; the former, A.D. 368. Athanasius, on receiving from him an account of what had passed in it, assembled the synod at Alexandria A.D. 369, which addressed a letter to Damasus, calling upon him to condemn Auxentius, who had obtained possession of the see of Milan. See p. 119. note 1. Damasus held a second council for the purpose, A.D. 370, and then wrote the letter preserved by Theodoret.

² The Benedictine editor thinks that the title to the tracts was added by a transcriber.

influence. But Gibbon, himself an unbeliever, and regarding the questions on which the life of Athanasius was employed as scarcely worthy to occupy the thoughts and talents of a rational being, could not appreciate, for he could not understand, the feeling which was the main-spring of the whole conduct of Athanasius, which prompted his exertions and supported him amidst all the vicissitudes of his chequered career, amidst the persecutions, the privations, the dangers to which he was subjected—the intensity of his zeal for the preservation of the integrity and purity of the Christian faith. That zeal in the eye of the sceptical historian assumed the character of fanaticism. In order, therefore, to fill up what is defective in the portrait which he has drawn, I will add the estimate formed by a Christian philosopher of the services which Athanasius was appointed to render to the cause of Christianity.

¹ “Of whom (Athanasius) we can think no otherwise than as a person highly instrumental and serviceable to Divine Providence for the preserving of the Christian Church from lapsing, by Arianism, into a kind of Paganick and idolatrous Christianity, in religiously worshipping of those whom themselves concluded to be creatures; and by means of whom especially the doctrine of the Trinity, which before fluctuated in some loose uncertainty, came to be more punctually stated and settled.”

¹ Cudworth, *Intellectual System*, p. 620. ed. fol.

SOME ACCOUNT
OF THE
FOUR ORATIONS OF ATHANASIUS
AGAINST
THE ARIANS.

My design in the following chapter is to place before the reader on the one hand the objections urged by the Arians against the Homousian doctrine, and, on the other, the reasonings by which Athanasius, its great defender, replied to them; and thus to give him a just notion of the character of the Arian controversy. I must, however, exhort those of my readers who are conversant with the Greek language to read the treatises in the original. The style of Athanasius is both perspicuous and forcible: and in consequence of the flexibility and copiousness of the language in which he writes, he is enabled to render the nice and subtle questions on which he treats clearer and more intelligible than they can be rendered by an English translation; our language, to use the words of Gibbon, frequently not supplying just equivalents to the Greek terms.

¹ We have seen that the anathema attached to the profession of faith put forth by the Nicene Council, was directed against those who said that there was a time when the Word did not exist; that He did not exist before He was begotten; that He was made of things which were not; that the Son of God was of another essence or substance, as liable to change or variation.

That the opinions here condemned were those really held by Arius and his followers, is evident from ² a profession of faith which they addressed to Alexander. In it they state that God begat His only-begotten Son before eternal times, and by Him made the ages and the universe; that God begat Him, ³ not in appearance, but in truth; unchangeable and unalterable, ⁴ because He so willed (i. e. not by nature, but by the exercise of His free-will); perfect creature of God, but ⁵ not as one of the creatures; offspring of God, but not as one of

¹ Compare de Dec. Syn. Nic. c. 6. Ad Ep. Ægypt. et Lib. c. 12. De Synodis, c. 15. Ad Jovianum, p. 780.

² De Synodis, c. 16. This profession of faith has been already given in p. 14, but I think that I consult the reader's convenience in repeating it here.

³ οὐ δοκῇσει.

⁴ ἰδίῳ θελήματι. τῷ ἰδίῳ ἀντεξουσίῳ. Ad Ep. Ægypt. et Lib. c. 12. ἀντεξουσιότητι κακίας καὶ ἀρετῆς δεκτικὸν τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ. See the Synodical Epistle. Socrates, L. 1. c. 9. Sozomen, L. 1. c. 15.

⁵ οὐχ ὡς ἐν τῷ κτισμάτῳ. Oratio contra Arianos, ii. c. 19.

things generated. They then reject the notions of Valentinus, Manichæus, Sabellius, and Hieracas; and ¹a notion, which they state to have been condemned publicly by Alexander himself:—that the Son, having previously existed, was generated or newly created into a Son. They proceed to state their own belief to be, that the Son was created by the will of God, before times and ages; that He received life and being from the Father, the Father substantially communicating to Him His own glory; not that the Father, in giving Him the inheritance of all things, deprived Himself of that which He has ²without generation or uningenerately in Himself, inasmuch as He is the fountain of all things. There are, therefore, three ³Subsistences:—God the cause of all things, alone unoriginate; the Son, begotten, ⁴not in time, by the Father, but created and founded before the ages, was not before He was begotten; but begotten, not in time, before all things, alone ⁵subsisted by the Father; for He is neither eternal, nor co-eternal, nor ⁶co-ingenerate with the Father; nor has He existence together with the Father, according to the language of some

¹ This seems to refer to the opinion certainly expressed by some of the ante-Nicene Fathers, that the Word, existing from eternity in intimate union with God, was generated to create the universe, and then was called the Son; the distinction between the λόγος ἐνδιάθετος and προφορικός.

² ἀγεννήτως.

³ ὑποστάσεις.

⁴ ἀχρόνως.

⁵ ὑπὸ τοῦ πατρὸς ὑπέστη.

⁶ συναγέννητος.

who, in speaking of their relation to each other, introduce two ingenerate principles; but as God is *the One* and ¹ the origin of all things, He is before all things, and therefore before the Son. As then the Son has being from the Father, and glory, and life, and all things are delivered to Him, God is His origin, and being His God and before Him, has dominion over Him. Those who interpret the expressions *from Him*, and *from the* ² *womb*, and *I came forth from the Father*, and *I am come*, as implying a part of the same substance or an emission (προβολή), make the Father compounded, divisible, liable to alteration, corporeal; and, as far as in them lies, subject the incorporeal God to the accidents of the body.

³ Athanasius, in his confutation of the Arians, begins with the two propositions which are first anathematized: ⁴ *that there was a time when the Son*

¹ They appeal, in support of this statement, to the teaching of Alexander himself. The persons here condemned, perhaps, like Cyril of Alexandria and Gregory of Nyssa, spoke of the essence of the Godhead as a numerical, not as a generical essence. See Cudworth, *Intellectual System*, p. 602.

² We have seen that in the letter addressed by Alexander to his namesake the Bishop of Constantinople, he alleges Psalm cx. 3, ἐκ γαστρὸς πρὸ ἑωσφόρου ἐγέννησά σε, to prove that Christ is by nature, not by growth in holiness, the Son of God; or as he expresses himself, τῆς πατρικῆς μαριεύσεως φυσικὴν ἐνδείκνυσται υἱότητα, οὐ τρόπων ἐπιμελεία καὶ προκοπῆς ὑσκήσει, ἀλλὰ φύσεως ἰδιώματι ταύτην λαχόντος. Theodoret, *L. 1. c. 4.* p. 14 D.

³ Oratio i. contra Arianos, c. 11.

⁴ ὅτι ἦν ποτε, ὅτε οὐκ ἦν ὁ υἱός.

was not; and that ¹ *the Son was not before He was begotten*. The Arians argued that the relation between God and the Word is represented in Scripture as that of Father and Son; that this relation implies a priority of existence in the Father, and, consequently, a time when the Son was not. They ² contended also, that this relation is irreconcilable to the notion that the Son existed co-eternally with the Father. If they were co-eternal, the relation between them would be that of brothers, not of Father and Son. The Arians appear also to have endeavoured to cast ridicule upon the doctrine of the eternal generation of the Son, by illustrations drawn from the generation of human beings. They asked a woman for instance: ³ “Had you a son, before you bore him? you had not: in like manner the Son of God was not, before He was begotten.”

Athanasius answers ⁴ generally, that the error of the Arians lay in reasoning from created things to that which is increate, and supposing that expressions applicable to the case of human, were applicable to that of Divine generation. He ⁵ challenges them also to produce any passages from Scripture which countenance the statement, that there was a

¹ οὐκ ἦν ὁ υἱὸς πρὶν γεννηθῆναι.

² Oratio i. c. 14.

³ εἰ εἶχες υἱόν, πρὶν τέκεσθαι; ὥσπερ δὲ οὐκ εἶχες, οὕτω καὶ ὁ τοῦ Θεοῦ υἱὸς οὐκ ἦν, πρὶν γεννηθῆναι. Oratio i. c. 22.

⁴ See c. 29.

⁵ cc. 11, 12.

time when the Son was not. Scripture, on the contrary, speaks of the Son as always existing together with the Father; for instance, John i. 1. Apocalypse i. 4. Rom. ix. 5; ¹ i. 20. Isaiah xl. 28. ² Hebrews i. 3. Psalm xc. 17; xxxv. 9; cxlv. 13. Athanasius draws the same conclusion from the passages in which Christ, speaking of Himself, uses the expression *I am*, not *I was made*, the Truth, the Light, the Lord, the Shepherd, a mode of speaking which implies eternal existence. John xiv. 6; viii. 12; xiii. 13; x. 14. ³ On the other hand, it is with reference to created things that Scripture speaks of a time prior

¹ τὰ γὰρ ἀόρατα αὐτοῦ ἀπὸ κτίσεως κόσμου τοῖς ποιήμασι νοούμενα καθορᾶται, ἥ τε αἰδῶς αὐτοῦ δύναμις καὶ θεότης. That the Apostle meant in this verse to say, that man may discern in the contemplation of the visible works of creation, the power and Godhead of their invisible Creator, and that he used the word Godhead absolutely, without any reference to a distinction of persons, seems scarcely to admit of a question; and so Asterius the Arian appears to have interpreted the text. Oratio ii. c. 37. But Athanasius argues, that the Father is known, not through the works of creation, but through the Son (Matt. xi. 27), by whom all things were created; and that consequently, ἡ αἰδῶς δύναμις καὶ θεότης must be understood of the Son. Christ is called in 1 Cor. i. 24, the power of God, and the wisdom of God. The Oxford annotator does not express a direct approval of this interpretation, but indirectly sanctions it, by speaking of it as a received interpretation, or as one adduced at Nicæa. See also Oratio ii. cc. 78. 81.

² Athanasius lays particular stress on this text, ὅς ὢν ἀπαύγασμα τῆς δόξης καὶ χαρακτὴρ τῆς ὑποστάσεως αὐτοῦ. The brightness or radiance, ἀπαύγασμα, is inseparable from the light; so the Son from the Father.

³ c. 13.

to their existence, of a time when they were not : thus, in Genesis ii. 5. Deuteron. xxxii. 8. Proverbs viii. 23. John viii. 58. Jeremiah i. 5. Psalm xc. 1, the different language in which Scripture speaks of the Son and of created things, shows that He is not of the number of created things, but existed from eternity. ¹ How can there ever have been a time when He who made the ages, τοὺς αἰῶνας, did not exist ?

To the argument, that the co-eternity of the Word is irreconcilable to the relation of Father and Son, Athanasius ² answers, that both these truths are clearly recorded in Scripture. Christ is represented as the Son of God, and as co-eternal with the Father. They are not represented as begotten from some pre-existent principle, ἀρχή, but the Father is represented as the principle, and begetter of the Son. The Son must, consequently, be the eternal offspring of the Father : the essence of the Father would be imperfect, if that which is proper to it, ἵδιον αὐτῆς, were added as an accident, ³ ἐπισυμβαίνῃ, to it. The error arises from reasoning from human generation to divine. Man begets in time, on account of the imperfection of his nature ;

¹ Athanasius points out the inconsistency and disingenuousness of the Arians, who said that the Son existed before time, πρὸ χρόνων, and yet that there was a time when He did not exist. c. 14.

² c. 14.

³ See c. 20.

the son is posterior to his father. But the offspring of God, being the proper Son of the eternal God, His word, His wisdom, His radiance, exists eternally; if He did not, there would be a time when God was without ¹ His word and wisdom, the Light without splendour, the Fountain dry, and sending forth no stream. The Arians rejoined that, according to this representation, the ² Son being the proper offspring of the essence of the Father, the Divine essence is divisible into parts. This, as we have seen, was the ³ principal objection taken by them to the word *ὁμοούσιος*, and that which, in the opinion of Eusebius of Cæsarea, rendered it necessary for him, when, at the command of Constantine, he subscribed the Nicene Decree, to explain the sense in which he understood it. But here

¹ Hence the Arians were sometimes called Alogians. See cc. 19, 20, 24; Oratio ii. c. 32.

² c. 15. *τῆς οὐσίας τοῦ πατρὸς ἴδιον γέννημα*. This objection is further considered in Oratio ii. cc. 32, 33, where Athanasius especially refers to Hebrews i. 3, and says that the radiance or splendour is of the substance of the Son, yet not a part. The Oxford translator renders *χαρακτήρ τῆς ὑποστάσεως αὐτοῦ*, *the expression of his subsistence*; yet the reasoning of Athanasius seems to imply that he here understood by the word *ὑπόστασις*, *substance*. In a note on c. 33, we find the following remark:—"Thus there are two Persons in each other ineffably, each being wholly one and the same Divine Substance, yet not being merely aspects of the same; each being God as absolutely as if there were no other Divine Person but Himself." The annotator adds that this statement is not only a contradiction in the terms used, but in our ideas.

³ p. 89.

again they reasoned from their own imperfect nature to the perfect nature of the Father; from things corporeal to things incorporeal.

If the objections were well-founded, the Father could not have a Son, notwithstanding the express declaration of Scripture that He has. For a son must be of the same essence as his father; and the Father's essence not being divisible, He cannot, on the Arian supposition, have a Son. According to the Arians, the Son was made of things which were not, and was not before He was begotten; He must, therefore, be called Son, and God, and Wisdom, by participation; since it is by participation that all created things subsist, and are carried on through sanctification to glory. They partake of the Spirit; but of what does the Son partake? Not of the Spirit, ¹ for the Spirit receives of the Son: it is absurd, therefore, to say that He is sanctified by the Spirit. Not of any thing intermediate and external to the Father; for then He would be called Son with reference to that external thing. He can only, therefore, partake of the essence of the Father.

To say that the essence of the Father is partaken of is to say that He begets; yet no one would say that to be partaken of is an affection or division of

¹ John xvi. 14.

God's essence ; neither, therefore, is the generation of the Son such an affection or division. All things partake of the Son through the grace of the Spirit given by Him : and when we partake of the Son, we ¹ are said to partake of the Father ; when we see the Son, we see the Father ; for the ² notion and comprehension of the Son is knowledge concerning the Father, because the Son is His proper offspring from His essence. The Son partakes of nothing, but is Himself that which is partaken of from the Father.

Athanasius proceeds to point out the absurd consequences which flow from the Arian tenets. ³ If God is Maker and Creator, and creates by His Son, and nothing is made but that which is made by the Son, to say that there was a time when His creative Word and Wisdom were not, is equivalent to saying that God is not Maker and Creator. Again, if the Word was not with the Father from eternity, the Trinity is not eternal : there was first a Monad, which, by addition, became a Trinity, and this a Trinity ⁴ composed of foreign and alien natures and essences. Since, if the Son is not the proper offspring of the Father's essence, but made from things

¹ c. 16, Athanasius refers to 2 Pet. i. 4. 1 Cor. iii. 16. Compare c. 46.

² ἔννοια καὶ κατάληψις.

³ cc. 17, 18.

⁴ ξέναις καὶ ἀλλοτρίαις φύσεσιν τε καὶ ταῖς οὐσίαις συνισταμένη.

that were not, that which is created is numbered with the Creator, and that which was not is deified and glorified with that which always existed; and the Trinity is ¹ dissimilar to itself.

Such being the consequences flowing from the assertion, that there was a time when the Son was not, and that He was made of things which were not, we must conclude that, as the Father is eternal, the Son is eternal. ² God is called, and is, the Fountain of Wisdom and Life, and Christ calls Himself ³ Wisdom and ⁴ Life. As, therefore, Wisdom and Life are of the essence of the Fountain, Christ is of the essence of God. The Fountain being eternal, Wisdom and Life must be eternal. ⁵ God made all things in Wisdom, and this Wisdom is the Word ⁶ by whom all things were made. He who calls Him, by whom all things were made, one of those things, will be led on to say the same of God, ⁷ from whom are all things. But he who rejects this notion as absurd, and distinguishes God from created things, will also distinguish the only

¹ Athanasius has elsewhere said that Arius and his first supporters were Anomœans.

² Athanasius refers to Jeremiah ii. 13; xvii. 10.

³ Proverbs viii. 12.

⁴ John xiv. 6.

⁵ Psalm civ. 24. Proverbs iii. 19.

⁶ John i. 3. On the reading of this verse see the note on Oratio ii. c. 39.

⁷ 1 Cor. viii. 6.

begotten Son, who is proper to His Father's essence, from created things : he will not say that there was a time when the Son was not, and that He was not before He was begotten, such expressions being applicable only to created things. Such as the Father is, such is the Son, being the proper offspring of His essence, His Word and Wisdom. The Father and Son, therefore, are mutually proper to each other, so that God was never without the Word, *ἄλογος*, nor was the Son ever non-subsistent, *ἀνύπαρκτος*. For why is He a Son, unless from God? or why Word and Wisdom, unless eternally proper to Him?

¹ The Son is the image and brightness or radiance of the Father, the ² expression, the Truth; where there is light there is its image, the brightness; where there is a ³ substance, there is its full expression; where there is the Father, there is the truth. It is impious, therefore, to limit the Image and ⁴ Form of the Godhead by time. If the Son was not before He was begotten, Truth was not always in God; but the Son says of Himself, “⁵ I am the Truth.” The Image of God is not delineated externally to Himself; He is the begetter of it, and He delights to see Himself in it, that is, in the Son, who says: “⁶ I was His delight.” To say, therefore,

¹ c. 20. Heb. i. 3.

² *χαρακτήρ*.

³ *ὑπόστασις*.

⁴ *τὸ εἶδος*.

⁵ John xiv. 6.

⁶ Proverbs viii. 30. According to this representation, the

that the Son was not before He was begotten, is to say that there was a time when the Father did not see Himself in Him and had no delight. The Creator cannot see Himself in a created Essence; such as is the Father of the Image, such must be the Image.

¹ If the Son is the Image of the Father, all the attributes of the Father must be in Him, so that he ² who truly sees the Son may see the Father. But if the Son is created, and not eternal, He cannot be the Image of the Father; unless we are prepared to say that the Image is not of a ³ similar Essence to the Father. The Arians appear to have made one very strange objection to the Homoousian doctrine. If, they said, the Son is the offspring and image of the Father, and in all respects like Him, He ought to be like in respect of generation, and as He was Himself begotten, in turn to beget; so that there would be an infinite succession of offspring. This

happiness of God, if I may use the expression, consists in the contemplation of Himself in His perfect Image, the Son; not of the works of creation. See Oratio ii. c. 82.

¹ c. 21.

² John xiv. 9.

³ οὐχ ὁμοίας οὐσίας. Compare c. 20. Oratio iii. c. 26. The Oxford annotator observes that Athanasius, in the tracts against the Arians, is sparing of the use of the word ὁμοούσιος. See p. 57, note ². He might wish to conciliate those who, though they objected to the word, were ready to say that the Son is ὅμοιος κατὰ πάντα, κατ' οὐσίαν. His own expression is: ἴδιος τῆς τοῦ πατρὸς οὐσίας: c. 58.

objection, Athanasius replies, is another instance of erroneous reasoning from the imperfection of human to the perfection of Divine nature. Succession implies imperfection. A human father begets a son, who in turn begets another, and thus becomes himself a father; so that the title *father* is not peculiar to any one individual of a generation, but passing from one to another, is in perpetual flux. But the Son is begotten of the Father, who is Himself unbegotten; He, therefore, is not subject to the condition of human sons, that of begetting in turn; there being no succession in the Godhead, the Father is always Father, the Son always Son. To ask why the Son does not beget a son is as absurd as to ask why the Father had not a father.

We have noticed the attempts of the Arians to turn the doctrine of their opponents into ridicule by putting perplexing or ludicrous questions. ¹ They asked, for instance: Did the Self-Existent, ὁ ὢν, make from that which existed Him who is not,

¹ c. 22. ὁ ὢν τὸν μὴ ὄντα ἐκ τοῦ ὄντος πεποίηκεν, ἢ τὸν ὄντα : ὄντα οὖν αὐτὸν πεποίηκεν, ἢ μὴ ὄντα : καὶ πάλιν, ἐν τῷ ἀγέννητον, ἢ ἐύο : καὶ αὐτεξούσιός ἐστι καὶ ἰδίᾳ προαιρέσει οὐ τρέπεται, τρεπτῆς ὢν φύσεως : οὐ γὰρ ὡς λίθος ἐστὶν ἀφ' ἑαυτοῦ μένων ἀκίνητος. This is an instance of the justice of the remark made at the commencement of the chapter, that to one conversant with the Greek language the questions discussed are often more intelligible in the original than they can be made by a translation. Athanasius states that Eusebius of Nicomedia and his followers went about putting these questions to women and children.

or Him who is? Did He make Him already existing or not existing? Again: Is there one In-generate, or two? Has He freedom of will—and though of a changeable nature, does not change by His own choice? For He is not like a stone, which has in itself no power of motion.

¹ Athanasius says of these questions that they are so senseless and foolish as scarcely to deserve an answer. It were as reasonable to argue that, because an architect cannot build a house without materials, God required matter out of which to frame the universe; or that, because man can only exist in a place, God must also be limited to a place; as to contend that the manner of Divine generation must be the same as of human. Still, he will proceed to answer them in detail, lest they should be deemed unanswerable by those to whom they were addressed.

² With respect to the first question, the Arians should specify whom they mean ³ by *Him who is and Him who is not*. There is no doubt, if the question were put with reference to the works of creation, God ὁ ὢν can cause to be that which was not, and can form that which was into that which was not; He formed the dust from the earth into a man, who

¹ c. 23.² c. 24.³ ὁ ὢν and τὸν μὴ ὄντα.

was not before, having previously caused by His Word the earth, which was not, to be. But if the question were put with reference to God and His Word, then the objectors should alter its form, and ask whether God, who is $\acute{\omicron} \omega\acute{\nu}$, was ever without the Word or Reason, $\acute{\alpha}\lambda\omicron\gamma\omicron\varsigma$? or being Light, was ever without radiance? or was always Father of the Word? Or again: did the Self-Existent Father make the Word who was not, or had He always with Him the Word, the proper offspring of His Essence? Put in this form, the questions would carry with them their own refutation; for who would tolerate the assertion, that God was ever ¹ without the Word, or was not always Father. ² Athanasius goes on to say that the same questions might with equal reason be put with reference to the Father, as to the Word who is ³ His radiance; not extrinsical to Him, but ever in Him, as the radiance in the sun. Still, in one sense, the Father, $\acute{\omicron} \omega\acute{\nu}$, may be said to have made the Son, $\tau\acute{\omicron}\nu \acute{\upsilon}\nu\tau\alpha$; for the Word was made flesh, and in the consummation of ages God made the Son of God also Son of man.

⁴ The Arians said that God made the Son from that which was not, that He might use Him as an instrument in making all things. Thus they represented God as unable to make all things without

¹ See c. 14.

² c. 25.

³ Compare Oratio ii. c. 33.

⁴ c. 26.

the aid of an instrument made out of that which was not, and consequently dependent upon it.

We have noticed the question put by them to women, in order to turn the doctrine of the co-eternity of the Son into ridicule, "whether they had a son before they bare him?" This question Athanasius converts into an argument for the co-essentiality. Ask the mother whence is the child who is born to her? Did she obtain him from without, like a house, or any other possession? ¹ She will

¹ On this passage the Oxford annotator remarks: "It is from expressions such as this, that the Greek Fathers have been accused of Tritheism. The truth is, every illustration, as being incomplete on one or other side of it, taken by itself tends to heresy. The title Son by itself suggests a second God, as the title Word, a mere attribute, and the title Instrument, a creature. All heresies are partial views of the truth, and are wrong, not so much in what they say, as in what they deny. The truth, on the other hand, is a positive and comprehensive doctrine, and, in consequence, necessarily mysterious and open to misconception." The object of this remark is to defend from the charge of Tritheism Cyril of Alexandria and Gregory of Nyssa, who, according to Cudworth (p. 604), held that the three hypostases of the Trinity have no otherwise one and the same essence of the Godhead in them, nor are one God, than three individual men have one common specific essence of manhood in them, and are all one man. I doubt not that, if Cyril and Gregory had been charged with affirming that there are three Gods, they would indignantly have denied the charge. I think, however, that we may draw two very useful practical inferences from the annotator's remark,—that we ought to be cautious in using illustrations on points connected with the relation of the three Persons in the Holy Trinity, lest we should unconsciously be betrayed into

reply, No; he is from myself; proper to my own essence, born from myself; wherefore I am wholly in him, remaining myself what I am. So the Word is from the Father, and of the same essence. So far the reasoning from human to Divine generation holds good. But we must not infer that because human generation takes place in time, and by division, the case is the same with Divine generation. ¹ We observe in nature, instances of things generated, which always exist in union with that which generates them, as the brightness or radiance with the sun, the stream with the fountain; why then may not the Word, by whom the sun and the fountain were made, co-exist eternally with the Father, by whom He was begotten?

² Athanasius returns to the objection, that the doctrine of the co-essentiality makes the Son a part of God, and His generation an affection. He says that man is subject to affection when he begets, his nature being in continual flux; and, on account of his imperfection, he is dependent on time. But God is not composed of parts: He is without affection and uncompounded, and consequently Father of the Son, without affection and without division of heresy; and that we should not, in theological controversy, ascribe to our adversaries conclusions, which to us appear to flow logically from their statements, but which they themselves disavow.

¹ c. 27.

² c. 28.

parts. This is plain from Scripture, which calls the Word of God His Son, and His Son the Word and Wisdom of the Father, uniting both in the Son, in order to show that He is by nature and in truth the offspring of His essence, without affection or division of parts. As the Arians appealed to woman respecting the Son, let them appeal to man respecting the Word. Is the word which he utters an affection or part of his understanding? Why then should they ascribe affection or division into parts to the generation of the Word of the incorporeal and indivisible God. So also with respect to wisdom: men become wise by receiving or partaking of wisdom; God partakes of nothing; but is the Father of His own Wisdom, who is not an affection nor a part, but His proper offspring.

¹ The Arians further objected that, if God was always Creator, the things created always existed, and it could not be said of them, that they were not before they were generated. Athanasius insists in answer on the distinction between things created and things generated, *ποίημα* and *γέννημα*:—that which is created or made is external to the Creator, and does not necessarily exist: the Creator makes it when He thinks fit; but the Son is the proper offspring (*γέννημα*) of the Father's essence, and is not subject to the Creator's will; He is proper to His

¹ c. 29.

essence. God might be called Creator, though nothing had been created: He had always the power to create: the non-existence of created things would be no diminution of His perfection. But He could not be called a Father, unless He had a Son. If the Son did not always subsist with the Father, there would be a diminution of the perfection of the Father's essence. In other words, the Son is necessarily existent in the same sense in which we say that the Father is necessarily existent.

Athanasius now proceeds to another of the cavilling questions of the Arians:—"Is there one Ingenerate or two?" ¹ By this question they meant to place their opponents in a dilemma. If the answer was, one, then they rejoined, the Son is one of things generate, and we are right in asserting that He was not before He was begotten. Athanasius replies, "We must consider the different meanings of the word ingenerate. ² It is sometimes used to signify that which is not yet, but may be made: as the wood which is not yet a vessel may be made one. Sometimes to signify that which is not, and

¹ c. 30.

² Athanasius appears to employ indifferently the words ἀγένητος and ἀγέννητος, increate and ingenerate or unbegotten. The signification added by Asterius applies to the former. See c. 56, and the note of the Oxford annotator. De Dec. Syn. Nic. c. 28, and the notice prefixed to the Tract by the Benedictine editor, de Synodis, c. 48. Epiphanius, Hær. lxxvi.

never can be made: as a triangle can never become a square, nor even odd. Sometimes to signify that which is, but was not generated from any, nor had any father; i. e. unbegotten. ¹ Asterius added another signification: that which was not made, but always is.

² Athanasius says that the Arians ought to explain in which of these senses they understand the word. If in that of Asterius, then the Son is ἀγέννητος, increate; but if in the sense of that which is, but was not generate from any, nor had any father, then the Son is not ἀγέννητος, ingenerate. The Father alone is ingenerate. Such as the Father is, such must be the Son in essence, increate; but He is the offspring of the Father, consequently, not ingenerate.

³ It appears, however, from a quotation made by Athanasius from the works of Asterius, that he held the Wisdom of God to be ⁴ increate and unoriginate. For with reference to 1 Cor. i. 24, he observes, “The blessed Paul did not say that he preached Christ the Power of God or the Wisdom of God, but without the article, Power of God, and Wisdom of God; thus preaching that there is another

¹ The same, to whose interpretation of Rom. i. 20, reference has already been made.

² c. 31.

³ c. 32.

⁴ ἀγέννητον καὶ ἀναρχον.

Power of God, proper to Him, innate in Him, and co-existent with Him, and increate.” And again, ¹“Although His eternal power and wisdom, which right reason declares to be without origin and increate, must be one and the same.” The error of Asterius consisted in misinterpreting the Apostle’s words, by supposing that there are two Wisdoms (one ever co-existing with God, the other Christ); yet by speaking of an increate Wisdom co-existing with Him, he has admitted that there is not only one Increate, but another Increate co-existent with Him; since that which co-exists, co-exists not with itself, but with something else. The Arians, therefore, must not appeal to the authority of Asterius: he confutes their cavilling question, by saying that there are two Increate. Athanasius charges them with introducing questions whether the ἀγένητον or ἀγέννητον is one or two, in order to insinuate indirectly that Christ is of the number of created beings. They were afraid to say directly that He was made from things that were not, or that He was not before He was begotten; these expressions having been condemned by the Council.

² The title of ἀγένητος, Increate, is applied to God with reference to created things. The Arians, therefore, in confining this title to the Father, wished to

¹ This is in reference to Rom. i. 20.

² c. 33. Compare de Dec. Syn. Nic. c. 30.

insinuate that the Son is of the number of created things. But the title applied to God in Scripture with reference to the Son, is that of Father, who made all things by Him: He, therefore, cannot be numbered among the things which He made. In like manner God is called Almighty, and Lord of Hosts, not with reference to the Son, but to the things over which as the Word and Image of the Father, the Son has dominion.

It bespoke, ¹ Athanasius contended, a want of piety and reverence on the part of the Arians to attempt to substitute the word ἀγέννητος, increate, a word borrowed from the Greeks, for that of Father, the title which Christ Himself always used in speaking of His relation to God, by which He taught His disciples to address God, and which He commanded them to use when they received converts into the Church by baptism. ² Athanasius proceeds to another of the Arian questions: whether the Word is liable to change, τρεπτός. If He is not, then He is holy not by choice, but by necessity; He possesses not freedom of will. Athanasius shows that the supposition that the Son is liable to change cannot be reconciled to the representations given in Scripture of His relation to the Father. How can He who is changeable be like the Father who is un-

¹ c. 34.

² c. 35.

changeable? How can the Father be seen in Him? How can He be the Image of the Father, who is always the same? How can He who has a variable will, and is advancing towards perfection, being not yet perfect, be one with the Father? The Essence of the Father being unchangeable, the proper offspring of that Essence must be unchangeable also.

¹The Apostle, in the Epistle to the Hebrews, says: "Jesus Christ the same yesterday, to-day, and for ever." And ²Christ says of Himself, "I am the Truth." But the Truth is unchangeable. The ³Psalmist, also, after declaring the changeable and perishable nature of all created things, says to the Son: "Thou art the same, and thy years shall not fail." How can the Son be the Word, if He is liable to change? How Wisdom, if He is liable to alteration; unless we suppose that a certain grace or habit of virtue has been accidentally infused into Him (as an accident in a substance), and that this is called Word, and Son, and Wisdom, being liable to diminution and increase?

⁴But the Arians also appealed to Scripture, and

¹ c. 36. Heb. xiii. 8. ² John xiv. 6. ³ Ps. cii. 26.

⁴ c. 37. "Wherefore God has highly exalted Him, and given, *ἐχαρίσατο*, Him a name above every name," &c.; and, "Therefore God, thy God, hath anointed Thee with the oil of gladness above thy fellows." Athanasius says that these passages were alleged by Arius and Eusebius of Nicomedia. See Theodoret, L. 1. c. 5.

quoted Philippians ii. 9, and Psalm xlv. 7. From these passages they argued that Christ received His exaltation and His anointing as the reward of His choice; but to act by choice is indicative of an alterable nature. Athanasius answers this argument by pointing to the consequences which would flow from it. If Christ received the name above every name as a reward, on account of ¹ His virtue and advancement in goodness, He received it as men, who partake of the Spirit of God, receive the title of the sons of God, and may lose it if the Spirit is withdrawn from them. ² Christ, therefore, not being Son from the beginning nor by nature, must have received the name when He was made man and took the form of a servant, inasmuch as He then became subject to death. What then was He before He received the name? Will the Arians say with Paul of Samosata that He did not exist before He became man? or that He was something else than God, Son, Word? If either He was not at all, or if He was and afterwards advanced in goodness, how can the Scripture declarations be true, that ³ all things were made by Him? how, if He was not perfect, that He was the delight of His Father, rejoicing before Him? how, if He became entitled to adoration only after His death, that ⁴ Abraham worshipped Him in the

¹ ἐξ ἀρετῆς καὶ βελτιώσεως.

² c. 38.

³ John i. 3.

⁴ Gen. xviii. ὑπὸ μὲν τῶν πατριαρχῶν προσεκυνεῖτο. c. 40.
Oratio ii. c. 13.

tent, and ¹ Moses in the bush, and that ² thousands and tens of thousands ministered unto Him? What is the meaning of His address to the Father: “³ Father, glorify Me with the glory which I had with Thee before the world was?” Christ came down not in order Himself to advance in goodness, but to enable those to advance who needed advancement. He did not, therefore, receive the titles of Son and God as a reward, but rather made us sons to His Father, and, being Himself made man, made men gods. ⁴ Christ, being man, was not afterwards made God; but, being God, was afterwards made man, in order that He might ⁵ make men gods. Yet the Scripture tells us that God ⁶ made Moses a god to Pharaoh, and says that ⁷ God stood in the congregation of the gods. If, therefore, Christ was called Son and God after He became man, it is plain that He was so called after the title had been given to Him. How, then, could all things be made by Him? or how could He be before all things, and the first-born of all creatures? ⁸ But, continues Athanasius, the very

¹ Exod. iii. ² Dan. vii. 10. ³ John xvii. 5. ⁴ c. 39.

⁵ *θεοποιήση*. See c. 42, and the interpretation of 1 Cor. xiv. 25 in c. 43. They “report that God is in you of a truth.” God is in us through our relationship to His human body, and by His Spirit which He has given us. Compare c. 47. Oratio ii. c. 70; ii. c. 23.

⁶ Exod. vii. 1.

⁷ Psalm lxxxii. 1.

⁸ c. 40. In the beginning of this chapter Athanasius opposes the word *ἐννοια* to *ἐπίνοια*, the former to express true, the latter false conceptions respecting the Son: *ταῖς περὶ τοῦ υἱοῦ ἐννοίαις*

passage alleged by the Arians proves that Christ did not receive His exaltation as a reward. Christ is therein described as being in the form of God, and humbling Himself by taking the form of a servant. His exaltation, then, was not a reward, but a resumption on His part of the glory which He had with the Father before the world was, and which He voluntarily laid aside in order to save man. He who is in the Father, and ¹ in all things like the Father, cannot be exalted.

² The true interpretation of the passage is to be sought in the mystery of the incarnation. "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God." This Word afterwards for our sakes was made flesh. The exaltation, therefore, of which the Apostle speaks, was not the exaltation of the Essence of the Word, for in that He was always equal to God; but of the human nature. Being the Image of God and immortal, He took the form of a servant, in order that He might by His death offer Himself to the Father for us; as, therefore, He died for us, so He was highly exalted for us; by His death we all died in Christ, and we are highly exalted in Christ, being raised from the

χρόμενοι πρὸς τὰς ἀλόγους αὐτῶν ἐπινόας ἀπηντήσαμεν. Compare Oratio ii. c. 37, where the Oxford translator renders *κατ' ἐπίνοιαν notionally*.

¹ ὅμοιος κατὰ πάντα τοῦ πατρὸς.

² c. 41.

dead to ascend into heaven, whither our Forerunner, Jesus, has entered for us.

¹ So also, when it is said that God “gave Him a name above every name,” we must understand the words to mean that He received, as man, a name which He had always possessed, as God. He received exaltation, as man, in order that He might communicate it to us, of whose flesh He became partaker. If He had not become partaker of our flesh, He could not have redeemed us from sin, nor raised us from the dead, nor exalted us into heaven.

² Athanasius calls the foregoing interpretation of the passage a very ecclesiastical interpretation, in accordance with the teaching of the Church: but he gives another, in which he refers the exaltation to Christ’s resurrection. His argument is: All men

¹ cc. 42, 43. The Oxford annotator, in his note on c. 43, refers to Hooker, L. 5. c. 52: “It pleased not the Word or Wisdom of God to take to itself some one person among men, for then should that one have been advanced which was assumed, and no more; but Wisdom, to the end that she might save many, built her house of that nature which is common unto all; she made not this or that man her habitation, but dwelt in us.” The Arians seem to have laid some stress on the word *διὰ*, as implying that Christ had received exaltation *because* He had humbled Himself—as the reward of His self-humiliation.

² cc. 44, 45. In c. 44 is the following passage: συγχωρήσας μέχρι θανάτου φθάσαι τὸ ἴδιον σῶμι, διὰ τὸ εἶναι αὐτὸ δεκτικὸν θανάτου. On this passage the Oxford annotator refers to the question, whether Christ’s body was naturally subject to death. See Oratio ii. c. 66; iii. c. 31.

derive their descent from Adam, and therefore die, and death hath dominion over them: but the second Adam is from heaven; they, therefore, who are His sons, cannot, as He cannot, be held in the bonds of death. He died in the flesh, in order that He might quicken us by His power. The Arians seem to have contended that to be exalted necessarily implied¹ a previous depression or affection of the essence of the Word; but Athanasius repeats that the expression applies to the body of Christ, which, having assumed it on earth, He bore with Him to heaven. It is doubtless wonderful, and calculated to strike with astonishment, that the Son should, as if He were Himself exalted, be said to receive the exaltation which He gains from the Father; but He receives it as the Son of man, since the body which He assumed is His own, and by nature capable of receiving exaltation.

² Athanasius proceeds to the consideration of Psalm xlv., in which God is said “to have anointed Christ with the oil of gladness³ above His fellows.” From these words the Arians inferred that the anointing was a reward or a promotion (*βελτίωσις*) conferred for superior virtue; and that Christ was

¹ ἐλάττωμα εἶναι ἢ πάθος τῆς τοῦ λόγου οὐσίας. See the note of the Oxford annotator, respecting the sense in which the word *οὐσία* is used. It seems to be synonymous with *φύσις*, which is applied to the human body towards the end of the chapter.

² cc. 46, 47, 48.

³ παρὰ τοὺς μετόχους σου.

anointed to become God. Athanasius replies, that in the preceding verses Christ is addressed as God, and His throne is said to be for all ages, and we all are said to partake of Him. If then we all partake of Him, He cannot be, as we are, one of the things made. He was anointed, therefore, not to become God or King, since He always was both God and King; nor to receive the Spirit, since He is Himself the Giver of the Spirit; but He was anointed with the Spirit as man, in order that He might make us the habitation of the Spirit. He is not sanctified, but the Sanctifier; ¹ He sanctified Himself, in order that we might be sanctified through the truth. The ² Spirit descended upon Him in the Jordan, not for His improvement, but for our sakes; for inasmuch as He bore our body we are all baptized in Him, and have the ³ origin or beginning of receiving improvement

¹ John xvii. 19.

² Athanasius interprets Isaiah lxi. 1 and Acts x. 38, of Christ's baptism.

³ οἱ ἀρχὴν ἔχοντες τοῦ λαμβάνειν ἐν αὐτῷ καὶ δι' αὐτοῦ. c. 48. The Oxford annotator says, "The word origin, ἀρχή, implies the doctrine more fully brought out in other passages of the Fathers, that our Lord has deigned to become an instrumental cause, as it may be called, of the life of each individual Christian." He quotes passages from Chrysostom, Cyril of Alexandria, Gregory of Nyssa, and a remarkable passage from Paulinus, "Decoctâ quasi per ollam carnis nostræ cruditate, sanctificavit in æternum nobis cibum carnem suam." He then adds, "Of course in such statements nothing *material* is implied; or, as Hooker says, the mixture of His bodily substance with ours is a thing which the ancient Fathers disclaim. Yet the mixture of His

in and through Him. Christ, therefore, was anointed, not in His divine, but in His human nature. ¹ He alone, who is the Image of the Father, in whose likeness man was in the beginning made, He alone, whose is the Spirit, could unite men to the Spirit, and thus effect our redemption. All this He effected by taking upon Him our nature. ² In like manner, when Christ, in answer to the assertion of the Jews that He cast out devils by Beelzebub, the prince of the devils, said that He cast them out *in the Spirit of God*, and that blasphemy against Himself is remissible, but not that against the Holy Ghost, the dependence upon and inferiority to the Holy Spirit, implied in both the passages, is to be understood of His human

flesh with ours they speak of to signify what our very bodies, through mystical conjunction, receive from that vital efficacy which we know to be in His: and from bodily mixtures they borrow Divine similitudes, rather to declare the truth, than the manner, of coherence between His sacred and the sanctified bodies of Saints." L. 5. c. 56. Our Lord has deigned to become a cause of life generally to the Church by the sending of the Holy Spirit, and an instrumental cause of life to each individual Christian by becoming one with us in the Eucharist through the Holy Spirit. But if we construe the passages quoted from the Fathers in their natural sense, they certainly imply a bodily, and therefore a material, union.

¹ c. 49.

² c. 50. Matt. xii. 24. 32. Athanasius expressly says that the blasphemy against the Holy Ghost consisted in ascribing His miracles to dæmoniacal agency; and alleges, Matt. xiii. 55, "Is not this the carpenter's Son?" as an instance of speaking against the Son of man. See on this subject the 4th Epistle to Serapion, c. 8, where the opinions of Origen and Theognostus are discussed.

nature : He could not, as man, cast out devils, nor was blasphemy against Him, as man, irremissible.

¹ But the Arians discovered in the reason assigned for the anointing of Christ, "because Thou hast loved righteousness and hated iniquity," a proof that He was of a changeable nature. The words implied that He *might not* have loved righteousness and hated iniquity. Athanasius answers, that the words must be understood in the same sense in which the Father is said to love righteousness and hate iniquity, through the essential righteousness and holiness of His nature. They express, therefore, not the mutability, but the immutability of Christ's nature. Adam's nature was mutable, and the serpent took advantage of its mutability to seduce him into sin ; and thus sin was transmitted to all mankind. It was necessary, therefore, that ² He who came to deliver man should be of an unchangeable nature, in order that, although He took upon Him changeable flesh, He might always remain the same, and thus condemn sin in the flesh, and render it free to fulfil the righteousness of the law.

³ Athanasius proceeds to consider the texts from which the Arians inferred that Christ was created or made,—Proverbs viii. 22. Heb. i. 4 and iii. 2. Acts ii. 36 ; and having observed in general that they are

¹ cc. 51, 52.

² Compare Oratio ii. c. 68.

³ c. 53.

to be understood with reference to the appearance of Christ in the flesh, ¹ he first considers Heb. i. 4: “Being *made* so much better than the angels, as He hath by inheritance obtained a more excellent name than they.” ² He observes, that God is said to have spoken to us in the last days by His Son, having before spoken to the Fathers by the prophets. It is clear, therefore, that the passage relates to the Gospel dispensation, in which the Son by Himself purged our sins. In this respect Christ was made better than the angels,—that the Gospel of which He was the Bearer, is better than the law which was given by the dispensation of angels. The Apostle does not say greater or more honourable, words which imply a comparison between things of the same kind, but ³ *better*, which implies a superiority of kind or nature. The passage, rightly understood, therefore, proves that the Son is by nature more excellent than angels, who are ministering spirits to Him who sitteth at the right hand of God. ⁴ If the

¹ c. 54. τοσούτῳ κρείττων γειόμενος τῶν ἀγγέλων, ὅσῳ δια-φορώτερον παρ’ αὐτοῦς κεκληρονόμηκεν ὄνομα.

² c. 55.

³ Athanasius endeavours to show, by reference to various passages of Scripture,—Psalm lxxiv. 10. Proverbs viii. 10. Isaiah lvi. 4,—that this meaning is conveyed by the word κρείττων, better. He pursues this argument in c. 57; and in c. 58 observes that, if Christ had said (John xiv. 28), my Father *is better*—not *is greater*—than I, it might have been supposed that they are of a different nature; whereas the word *greater* proved that they are of the same. Athanasius refers also to Hebrews vii. 19. 22; viii. 6; ix. 23. Compare Oratio ii. c. 20.

⁴ c. 56.

Apostle had simply said, *being made*, the Arian argument might have carried with it some show of reason; but the words are, *being made better*, showing that they are not to be understood with reference to the manner of His generation; that had already been declared by giving Him the title of Son.

¹ Comparisons are between things of the same kind: we do not compare God to man, nor man to irrational animals, nor wood to stone; but man to man, wood to wood. But with respect to things of a different kind, we say that one is better than the other: the very expression, therefore, *made better*, shows that the Son is of a superior nature to angels. This is also evident from the Apostle's question. To which of the angels said He at any time, "Thou art my son; this day have I begotten thee?" ² The same inference is to be drawn also from the manner in which, in the third verse, the Apostle speaks of the perishable nature of created things, and of the ever-enduring existence of the Son; ³ and from the severer punishment denounced, in the following chapter, against the violation of the commandment given by the Son than against the violation of the law given by the ministry of angels.

⁴ In the seventh chapter of the Epistle, Christ is

¹ c. 57. καὶ οὐκ ἂν τις ἐπὶ τούτων εἴποι τὸ κρεῖττον, ἀλλὰ τὸ μᾶλλον καὶ τὸ πλέον.

² c. 58.

³ Hebrews ii. 1.

⁴ c. 60. Hebrews vii. 22, ἔγγυος κρείττονος διαθήκης.

said to be *made* the Sponsor of a better covenant; but it is evident that the word *made* is not to be referred to His generation, but to the time when He assumed the office of Sponsor, that is, when He was made flesh. ¹ Athanasius, in pursuing this argument, produces ² passages in which the Father Himself is spoken of as *made* a Protector or Refuge, and in the same sense the Son is said to be *made* Sponsor. All such expressions are to be understood, not with reference to the generation of the Son, but to His assumption of the flesh in order to confer on us salvation.

³ Athanasius next considers Hebrews iii. 2: "Who was faithful to Him that made Him." He begins by saying, that if the Son is, as the Arians assert, a Created Being, let Him no longer be called Son: nor the Father Father, but Creator. Yet if, as the Scriptures declare, all ⁴ things were created by the Word and in Wisdom, the title of Creator is improperly ascribed to the Father; unless He has that by which and in which He can create; unless He has the Word. According to them, the Divine Essence is not generative, but barren,—a light which does not lighten,—a dry fountain. They suppose God to have created all things by His will, but deprive

¹ cc. 61, 62, 63, 64.

² Psalm xxxi. 2; ix. 9.

³ Oratio ii. c. 2, πιστὸν ὄντα τῷ ποιήσαντι αὐτόν. Our translators, by rendering τῷ ποιήσαντι αὐτόν, to Him who appointed Him, have deprived the Arians of the argument founded on this text.

⁴ Compare c. 5, sub fin.

Him of that which is superior to His will, His generative power. His will is creative, and He has His creative Word; not external, but proper to Himself, by whom He creates. The Word, therefore, is creative, and is the Living Will or Council of the Father, and His essential Energy, and true Word. It is impossible to separate the ¹ creative from the generative power of God. The Father generates the Son, and by the Son creates all things.

² Since, then, Christ is the Son of God, the word γέννημα is that which ³ *properly* expresses His relation to the Father; and if the words ἐποίησε, γέγονε are applied to Him, they must be interpreted, with reference, not to His generation, but in an *improper* sense; as when Eve said, on the birth of Cain, "I have ⁴ gotten a man from the Lord," she did not mean that she had *purchased*, but that she had

¹ To explain the meaning of Athanasius, the Oxford annotator quotes a passage from Thomassin, in which he says, that the nature and essence of Deity, in its fountain or source, is the fulness of all existence. But this must necessarily overflow from its native fecundity. According to Athanasius, it overflows into a perfect Image of Deity; in other words, generates the Son. The essence of the Father cannot be otherwise than generative.

² cc. 3, 4, 5, 6. In c. 4, Athanasius says of the Arians, πῶς οὐ πολλῶς ἀπολωλέναι δίκαιοί εἰσιν; on which the Oxford annotator has a remarkable note, showing how gradually from declaring heretics worthy of punishment, those in power proceeded actually to inflict it.

³ κυρίως.

⁴ In the Septuagint, ἐκτησύμην.

borne a Son. The words ¹ ἐποίησε, ποίημα apply, *properly*, to created things; and the Arians, unfairly inferring that they were to be understood *properly*, when used in Scripture with reference to the Son, wrest those passages in which He is spoken of as the Begotten, the Word, and Wisdom, in order to accommodate them to their own views, and to prove that He is a created Being. This ² is the more inexcusable in them, because they might see that the expressions are to be understood of the appearance of Christ in the flesh. He is, in the passage quoted, first called the Apostle and High Priest of our Profession. He became the Apostle when He put on our flesh, and High Priest of our Profession when, having offered Himself for us, He raised His body from the dead, in order that He may Himself bring men, and offer to the Father

¹ In order to prove that Christ is not a created Being, Athanasius quotes Ecclesiastes xii. 14, ὅτι σύμπαν τὸ ποίημα ἄξει ὁ Θεὸς εἰς κρίσιν, and argues that, as Christ is to judge the world, He cannot be ποίημα, one of the things judged; but according to our translation, "God shall bring every *work* into judgment," the passage is wholly inapplicable. Athanasius says, c. 11, that if ἐποίησε is used with reference to the Word Himself, it must be understood to be equivalent to ἐγέννησε.

² cc. 7, 8, Athanasius says of the Incarnation of Christ, αὐτὸς ἔλαβε τὴν ἀπὸ γῆς σάρκα, Μαρίαν ἀντὶ τῆς ἀνεργάστου γῆς ἐσχηκὼς μητέρα τοῦ σώματος. Had Hooker this passage in view when he said that Christ took to Himself, in the Virgin's womb, the very first original element of our nature? L. 5. c. 52. Christ became High Priest by putting on our flesh, as Aaron became high priest by putting on the coat, ποδήρη; as, therefore, no change took place in Adam, but he still remained a man; so no change took place

those who in faith approach Him. ¹ In like manner, when He is said to be faithful to Him who *made* Him, we must understand by the word faithful, not that He partakes of the gift of faith, or believes in any one, but that He is worthy to be trusted, in the same sense in which God is Himself said to be faithful, i. e. faithful to His promises. He is a faithful Priest also in this respect, that, while the Aaronic Priests remained for a time only, and passed away, He is a Priest for ever. It is to be observed, too, that the Apostle, having introduced the mention of His humanity through His Priesthood, immediately adds expressions which indicate His Divinity. Moses was faithful, as a servant, in all his house; but Christ, as a Son, over His own house, which He Himself prepared, of which He is Lord and Master, and which as God He sanctifies.

² Christ, therefore, is not a creature, *ποίημα*, but

in Christ in consequence of the assumption of our flesh—He still remains the Word. The Oxford annotator calls this illustration, a protest, by anticipation, against Nestorianism; but liable to be abused to the purposes of the opposite heresy. He takes occasion also from this passage to refer to the question, whether our Lord's Priesthood belongeth to His Divine or human nature; and states the Catholic doctrine to be, that the Divine Word is Priest, *in* and *according to* His manhood. He seems, however, to admit that there is not a Catholic consensus in favour of this view. In a note on c. 16, he says that the priesthood is the office of God in the form of man; it could not, therefore, be exercised previously to the Incarnation.

¹ cc. 9, 10.

² c. 11.

being in His essence the offspring of His Father, *γέννημα*, was, in the dispensation of the Gospel, *οικο-νομία*, according to the good pleasure of His Father, made man for us.

¹ Athanasius reasons nearly in the same manner respecting another text alleged by the Arians, Acts ii. 36: "He hath *made* both Lord and Christ this same Jesus whom ye crucified." He was from eternity Lord and King; but that which He always was, He was made after the flesh, that He might redeem all and be Lord of all, both quick and dead; that He might have dominion over all, and, being made Christ, sanctify all by His unction.

² He now goes on to Proverbs viii. 22: *κύριος ἔκτισέ με ἀρχὴν ὁδῶν αὐτοῦ εἰς ἔργα αὐτοῦ*. The Arians confidently alleged this text in proof that Christ is *κτίσμα*, a creature. Having briefly referred to the different Arian objections, which he had already answered, he says that by proving that Christ was not *ποίημα*, He was proved not to be *κτίσμα*. He then exposes their disingenuousness in endeavouring to conceal their real belief, ³ by saying that Christ

¹ cc. 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17. In cc. 15, 16, Athanasius gives his view of St. Peter's reasoning against the Jews in Acts ii.

² c. 18. In our translation: "The Lord possessed me (*ἐκτέθη-σατο*) in the beginning of His way, before His works of old."

³ c. 19. *κτίσμα, ἀλλ' οὐχ ὡς ἐν τῶν κτισμάτων· ποίημα, ἀλλ' οὐχ ὡς ἐν τῶν ποιημάτων· γέννημα, ἀλλ' οὐχ ὡς ἐν τῶν γεννη-*

was a creature, but not as one of the creatures; an offspring, but not as one of the offsprings. One creature differs from another creature—the sun from a star; but both are creatures: the distinction, therefore, which the Arians attempt to draw has no foundation: Christ, according to them, is a creature. ¹ But Scripture distinctly says that all things were created by Him ² as an efficient cause; if then He is a creature, He must be His own Creator. He is described also ³ as working the things of the Father; He cannot, therefore, be a work.

⁴ How are the declarations of Christ that He is in the Father and the Father in Him,—that He that hath seen Him hath seen the Father,—that He alone knows and reveals the Father, reconcilable to the notion that He is a creature? These declarations could be true only of Him who is proper to the Father—His true Son.

⁵ Again: to God alone appertains worship; this the angels knew, and refused to receive worship.

μάτων. He observes that in speaking of *γεννήματα*, they in fact denied that Christ was *μονογενής*.

¹ cc. 20, 21.

² ποιητικὸν αἴτιον.

³ John v. 17.

⁴ c. 22. John xiv. 9, 10.

⁵ c. 23. The Oxford annotator says that, according to Augustine, the characteristic of Divine worship consists in sacrifice; are we, therefore, to infer that worship, unaccompanied by sacrifice, may be paid to created beings?

But the ¹angels ministered to Christ, and ²are directed to worship Him; and when ³Thomas said to Him, "My Lord and my God," Christ accepted the titles, as belonging to Him. This He would not have done if He were not the proper offspring of the Essence of God—His Son by nature.

⁴ Asterius contended that God, willing to create generate nature, when He saw that it could not endure the untempered hand of the Father, made and created, being first Himself alone, one only, and called Him Son and Word, that through Him, as a medium, all things might be brought to be. Athanasius answers, that God by His mere will and command might have created all things, by the same will and command by which, according to Asterius, He created the Son. If the Son is a creature, as the Arians say, why was He more capable of enduring the untempered hand of the Father than the rest of generate nature? ⁵ Asterius also said, that the Son, though a creature and one of things generate, yet learned from God to create, and thus ministered to God who taught Him. But how could He, who is the Wisdom of God, need teaching? If the power of framing accrues by teaching, why is it confined to the Word? He became Framer not by teaching, but being the Image and Wisdom; He works the works of the

¹ Matt. iii. 17.

² Heb. i. 6.

³ John xx. 28.

⁴ cc. 24, 25, 26, 27. See c. 64.

⁵ cc. 28, 29.

Father. ¹ Another absurd consequence which flowed from this notion of Asterius was, that Christ was rather created for our sakes than for His; ² as the woman was created for the man, not the man for the woman: so that He was indebted to us for His creation. He is placed in the scale of creation below man. Man is the Image of God, and created to His glory; Christ is His Image, and created to our glory.

³ If God had not willed to create man, the Word would still have been with God, and the Father in Him; but created things could not have been without the Word, as nothing can be ⁴ lightened without the radiance. Man, when he wishes any work to be done, commands another to do it, who obeys the command. But this is not so with God. For the Word of God, His Son proper to His Essence, being His ⁵ Will or Council, is Creator and Framer. God said, "Let there be light, and there was light;" His Will sufficed, and the effect followed. He gave no command to the Son, since the Son is His will.

⁶ Having said that the creation is sufficient to make known the existence and providence of God, Atha-

¹ c. 30. See Oratio i. c. 26.

² 1 Cor. xi. 9.

³ c. 31.

⁴ οὐκ ἂν τι φωτισθείη.

⁵ βουλῇ. See Oratio iii. c. 63.

⁶ cc. 32, 33, 34.

nasius contends that it is ¹ sufficient also to confute the Arian doctrine. The illustration which he brings forward is that of the sun and its radiance. ² Who would say that the sun was ever without radiance? or that the radiance is not proper to the nature of the light? or that being proper, it is a part of the

¹ *αὐτάρκης*, which the Oxford translator paraphrases, “contains abundant matter.” In c. 41, it is rendered “all-sufficient.”

² He had before said: “That the radiance from the sun is proper to it, and the sun’s essence is not divided nor impaired; but its essence is whole, and its radiance perfect and whole; and without impairing the substance of light, is a true offspring from it.” On this the Oxford annotator remarks: “The second person in the Holy Trinity is not a quality, or attribute, or relation, but the one Eternal Substance; not a part of the first Person, but whole or entire God; nor does the generation impair the Father’s substance, which is, antecedently to it, whole and entire God. Thus there are two persons in each other ineffably. Each being wholly one and the same Divine Substance, yet not being merely separate aspects of the same, each being God as absolutely as if there were no other Divine Person but Himself. Such a statement, indeed, is not only a contradiction in the terms used, but in our ideas, yet not therefore a contradiction in fact; unless, indeed, any one will say that human words can express in one formula, or human thought embrace in one idea, the unknown and infinite God.” The object of the concluding observation is not very clear; it seems to be an assertion of which all must admit the truth, of the inability of the human mind to comprehend the mode of the Divine existence, and of the union of three persons in the Godhead. Why then enter into a statement on the subject, which affects to be an explanation, but is wholly incomprehensible, inasmuch as it is a contradiction in our ideas? See the note on c. 38, where it is said that the Father and Son do in no way share Divinity between them; each is *ὁλος Θεός*: and the note on Oratio iii. c. 28, where the statement respecting the contradiction in our ideas is repeated. Also the note on Oratio iii. c. 36.

light by division? Why then do they venture to say, that God was ever without the Word? or that the Word is not proper to the Essence of the Father? or being proper to His Essence, is a part of Him by division? The doctrine sown from the beginning in every soul is, that God has a Son, the Word, and Wisdom, and Power, and that these are His Image and Radiance. Hence naturally follow, the being from the Father, τὸ ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς, the likeness, the eternity of the offspring of His Essence; no notion of a thing created or made occurs to the mind; it naturally rejects the Arian tenets.

¹ We may thus far reason from the relation of a human son to his father. They are of the same nature or essence: the Son of God, therefore, is of the same essence as the Father; but we must not reason from it with reference to the manner of generation. Man, being from things which were not, and begotten in time, begets in time, and his word (λόγος) is not permanent. But God, being self-existent and always existing, ² His word is self-existent, and always exists with the Father, as the Radiance with Light.

¹ c. 35.

² Athanasius seems to object to the distinction between the λόγος ἐνδιάθετος and προφορικός· ὁ δὲ τοῦ Θεοῦ λόγος οὐχ ὡς ἄν τις εἴποι, προφορικός ἐστίν. He interprets Heb. iv. 12, of the Word.

¹ Having dwelt at some length on the presumption of enquiring into the mode of generation of the Son, and of measuring God and His wisdom by our weakness, as well as on the duty of acquiescing in that which is plainly declared in Scripture, although it may be above our comprehension, ² Athanasius proceeds to consider an Arian notion, to which ³ reference has been already made: that the Son is not the proper Word and Wisdom of the Father, ⁴ but one of many words made by the proper Word who co-exists with the Father, and called Word as He is called the Vine, and the Way, and the Door, and the Tree of Life; and called Wisdom, because He partakes of the wisdom co-existing eternally with God. The only respect in which the Son is distinguished from the other words is, that He is the first-born and only-begotten. Asterius went so far as to say, that the expression Power of God, when applied to Christ, is to be understood in the same sense in which the Prophet calls the ⁵ locust, not merely the power, but the great power of God.

¹ c. 36.² c. 37.³ p. 10.

⁴ Athanasius refers to the *Thalia* of Arius, and to a work of Asterius. The latter alleged in support of this notion 1 Cor. i. 24, where the Apostle calls Christ Θεοῦ δύναμιν καὶ Θεοῦ σοφίαν, without the article, a Power and a Wisdom of God, as if there were other powers and wisdoms.

⁵ Joel ii. 25, οὐ δύναμιν μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ μεγάλην. Here, however, our version again deprives the Arians of their argument, by translating δύναμιν, army: "my great army which I sent among you."

¹ If the Son is only the Word or Reason for the sake of things rational, Wisdom for the sake of things receiving wisdom, Power for the sake of things receiving power, then is He the Son only for the sake of those who receive the adoption of sons; and He exists only ² notionally for the sake of things existing:—He is reduced to a mere name.

Asterius accused the Catholics of holding that there were two ³ Increate; yet he himself held that the Increate Wisdom co-existent with God is God Himself. “How,” asks Athanasius, “can this be? a thing cannot co-exist with itself, it must co-exist with something else.” Either, therefore, according to Asterius, the Divine nature is compound, or there are two Increate. ⁴ Athanasius challenges the Arians to produce from Scripture passages in which any other word or wisdom than the Son is mentioned. The Fathers also all concurred in stating, that the Wisdom which co-existed, being increate, with the Father, being proper to Him, and the Framer of the

¹ c. 38. Asterius seems to have made the proper Word or Wisdom an attribute by which the Son was created, and after which He was named; and thus to have approached to Sabellianism.

² κατ’ ἐπίνοιαν.

³ In the text, ἀγέννητα, which the editor translates non facta or ingenita. The Oxford translator has two ingenerates, reading ἀγέννητα.

⁴ cc. 39, 40. The word “Fathers” seems here to mean the tradition of the Church.

universe, is the Son, who ever, according to them, co-exists eternally with the Father. And Asterius elsewhere says: "There is one God, the Word or Reason—but many things endowed with reason; one Essence and Nature of Wisdom, but many wise and excellent things;" thus contradicting himself.

¹The Catholics maintained against the Manichæans that the Father of Christ is one, the Lord of the universe, and its Maker by His proper Word: against the Arians, that the Word of God is one, the only proper and genuine Son, being of His essence, inseparably united to the Father in the oneness of the Godhead. Thus it is that the Son is joined with the Father in the formula of Baptism. This would be absurd if the Son were a creature; we should then be baptized into a profession of faith in one Creator and one Creature. A creature, far from conferring grace, needs it from the Creator. The grace of the Father must be given in the Son, because the Son is in the Father, as the radiance in the light.

²Athanasius now enters upon the consideration of the text itself, Proverbs viii. 22. He begins with saying, that passages in the Book of Proverbs are

¹ cc. 41, 42, 43. Athanasius dwells at considerable length on the invalidity and inefficacy of Arian baptism, and says that they who receive it are polluted rather than redeemed.

² c. 44.

not to be understood literally, but as containing a hidden meaning; and that this passage must be interpreted with reference to ix. 1: "Wisdom hath builded her house," where by "her house," the sacred writer evidently meant our body, which the Wisdom of God assumed. ¹The word ἐκτίσει does not indicate essence or generation, but signifies that something different has taken place with respect to that which is the subject of discussion, not that what is said to be created is a created thing by nature and essence. The words "The Lord created me," are equivalent to "The Lord hath prepared for me a body, and hath created me unto men for the salvation of men." The passage is to be understood of the ²Incarnation of Christ.

¹ cc. 45, 46, 47.

² Epiphanius, *Hæres.* lxi. cc. 20—25, in commenting on this verse, first says that, as none of the Evangelists or Apostles have quoted this passage with reference to Christ, doubts may be entertained whether it is applicable to Him at all. He says also that the passage is mistranslated, that the Hebrew word בָּנָה should be rendered ἐκτίσατο, not ἐκτίσει, a rendering fatal to the inference drawn by the Arians from the verse. He adds, however, that many ancient Fathers understood it of the Incarnation, and that this is a pious interpretation. In the tract *De Incarnatione et contra Arianos*, it is interpreted of the Church, *περὶ τῆς ἐκκλησίας λέγοντες ἐν αὐτῇ κτιζομένης.* c. 6. See also c. 12, where it is connected with v. 25: *πρὸ πάντων τῶν βουνῶν γεννᾷ με.* Compare Epiphanius, c. 24. It is certain that the ante-Nicene Fathers, in general, understood it of the generation of the Son before all ages. The Oxford annotator, in a note on c. 45, introduces the question, whether the manhood of Christ can be called a creature? We hear much about reverence: the wanton discussion of such a

¹ He is no where in Scripture called κτίσμα, but γέννημα, and μονογενής with reference to His generation from the Father; the expressions κτίσμα and ἀρχὴν ὁδῶν, therefore, contrasted as they are with γέννημα and μονογενής, show that the passage is to be understood, not of His generation, but of His assumption of the flesh. *The beginning of ways* necessarily implies that He is the first among others who are to follow Him in the ways, and is inconsistent with the title μονογενής, only-begotten. ² The expression ἔκτισέ με was fulfilled in Him when He put on created flesh. The expression ³ also, *for his works*, εἰς τὰ ἔργα, proves that the Son did not intend to indicate His essence when He said, "The Lord created me," but spake with reference to the dispensation which He was to administer. Created things are not primarily created for any work, but simply in order that they may exist: the work is a secondary or after-consideration. Christ, in saying that He was created for the works of the Lord, manifestly declared that He was not a creature. He was in the beginning, and afterwards was sent forth to conduct the dispensation. ⁴ He was not

question appears to me the height of irreverence. Surely those who raise it require to be reminded of the rebuke administered to the professors of dialectics by the Confessor at Nicæa. See p. 33.

¹ cc. 48, 49.

² c. 50. ὅτε τὴν κτίστην ἐνεδύσατο σάρκα.

³ c. 51.

⁴ c. 52.

formed as created things are, in order that He might exist, but that He might ¹ collect the tribes which existed before He was formed. The words *ἔκτισε* and *ἐπλάσσε* relate to a time posterior to His existence as the Word, and to the purpose for which He came in the flesh,—the renovation of the human race. ² Athanasius observes generally, that whenever the sacred writer speaks of the birth (*γένεσιν*) of the Word in the flesh, the purpose for which He became man is stated; but when of His divinity, then the fact is stated simply and absolutely, without any mention of causes or purposes. Thus, in Philippians ii. 6, it is said absolutely of Christ, that “He was in the form of God;” but the Apostle goes on to say, that “He took the form of a servant,” and then adds the purpose, in order that He might humble Himself unto death, even the death of the cross.

³ Christ is the offspring and only-begotten Wisdom of the Father, but became man. The purpose, therefore, for which He became man must precede the fact: that purpose was the restoration of fallen man. If man had not stood in need of His assistance, He would not have put on flesh. ⁴ Unless

¹ Isaiah xlix. 5.

² c. 53.

³ c. 54. See c. 56.

⁴ c. 55. Athanasius here uses a comparison, which seems at first sight at variance with the reality of Christ's body. “For as,” he says, “Christ taking our infirmities, *ἀσθενεῖαι*, is said

death had been brought in, there could have been no resurrection; and death could not have been brought in, unless He who died had possessed a body. Christ, therefore, took our body, in order that He might overcome death in it.

¹ If, as the Arians assert, the essence of the Word is created, Christ was not created for our sakes, nor have we been created in Him, nor have we Him within us, but He is external to us, and we receive instruction from Him as from a master. Sin is not expelled from our flesh, but still reigns in it. All this is directly at variance with the teaching of St. Paul, who ² says that we are His workmanship, created in Christ Jesus. Christ, "having been made man for our sakes," applies to Himself expressions properly belonging to humanity, and says, "The Lord created me." He does not say, "in the beginning I was man."

Himself to be weak, *ἀσθενεῖν*, though He is not weak, inasmuch as He is the Power, *ἐνέργεια*, of God: so He became sin and a curse for us, although He did not Himself sin, but bore our sins and curse." The Oxford annotator is aware of this, and accounts or apologizes for it by saying, "That nothing is more common in theology, than comparisons which are only parallel to a certain point as regards the matter in hand; especially since many doctrines do not admit of exact illustrations." Would not the safer course then be to abstain from such illustrations, which certainly tend to mislead?

¹ c. 56.

² Ephes. ii. 10.

¹ Moses, when speaking of created things, does not say that *they were* in the beginning, ἐν ἀρχῇ, but that God *made them* in the beginning; but of the Word it is said, that *He was*, not *He was made* in the beginning. They have a beginning of existence, He has none, but exists eternally, having His existence in no other beginning than the Father, whom the Arians themselves admit to be ²unoriginate. The Word, therefore, exists unoriginately in the Father, being His offspring, not a creature.

³ The Arians appear to have contended, that the sacred writers did not always observe this distinction between the words *begat* and *created*, ἐγέννησε and ἐποίησε or ἔκτισε. Thus, in Deuteronomy xxxii. 6 we find, “Hath He not made, ἐποίησε, and established thee?” but in ver. 18, “Thou art unmindful of the Rock that begat thee,”—τὸν γεννήσαντά σε,—where the two words appear to be used indifferently. Athanasius observes that the word *made* occurs in the former passage, which refers to the first creation of man; the word *begat* in the latter, which refers to the new creation of man under the Gospel. ⁴ Such is the loving-kindness of God, that He becomes the Father of those of whom He is the Creator or Maker; and this takes place when men, being

¹ c. 57. Athanasius here quotes Psalm xlv. 1, with reference to the generation of the Son.

² ἀνάρχω.

³ c. 58.

⁴ c. 59.

already created, receive into their hearts the Spirit of His Son, crying Abba, Father. These are they, who, having received the Word, receive ¹power from Him to become the children of God; a power which, being by nature creatures, they cannot receive, unless they receive the Spirit of Him who is by nature the true Son. To this end He was made flesh, in order that He might make man capable of receiving Deity. *We* are not sons by nature, but the *Son who is in us* is: nor is God *our* Father by nature, but of the Son in us, in whom, and through whom, we cry, Abba, Father.

The conclusion at which Athanasius arrives is, that the expression τὸν γεννήσαντά σε in Deuteronomy must be understood of the sons whom God begets through His Spirit under the Gospel. Man is first made, and then begotten; ² on the contrary, the Son was first begotten, then made or created when He assumed our human body. Hence He is called first-born, πρωτότοκος, among many brethren, because all men being lost through the transgression of Adam, His flesh was first saved and redeemed, inasmuch as it is the body of the very Word; and we afterwards, being of the same body, are saved through it. He is the beginning of the Lord's ways

¹ John i. 12. ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς ἐξουσίαν τέκνα Θεοῦ γενέσθαι. Compare de Dec. Syn. Nic. c. 31.

² cc. 60, 61.

for *His works*, for ¹ He is the Way and the Door through which we must all enter. He is the first-born from the dead, because He first rose, that we might in our order rise by and through Him.

² The Arians seem to have contended that, as Christ is called the first-born of all creation, He must be numbered among things created. Athanasius answers, that the expression must be understood with reference, not to His generation, but to His condescension to the creation. With respect to His generation from the Father, He is called the *only-begotten*, *μονογενής*, absolutely; but He is called *first-born* with reference to the purpose for which He came down,—³ that all things might be created in Him. If the Apostle had called Christ first-born of all creatures, *πρωτότοκος πάντων* ⁴ *τῶν κτισμάτων*, the Arians might have some ground for saying, that He was one of those creatures: but the expression is *πρωτότοκος πάσης κτίσεως*, which clearly proves Him to

¹ John x. 9.

² c. 62. *πρωτότοκος πάσης κτίσεως*. Coloss. i. 15. The Oxford annotator says that we should render the words, “first-born to, not of, all creation.”

³ *ὅτι ἐν αὐτῷ ἐκτίσθη τὰ πάντα*. According to the context, this verse rather relates to the creation of the world, and so far favours Bull’s interpretation of the word *συγκατάβασις*, the going forth of the Son to create the world. But see the note of the Oxford annotator, c. 62 and c. 81.

⁴ c. 63.

be different from creation, otherwise He would be first-born of Himself. He is called "first-born among many brethren," on account of His relationship to them in the flesh; "first-born from the dead," because the resurrection of the dead was of Him and after Him; "first-born of all creation," on account of the love of the Father to men, because not only all things consist in His Word, but because the ¹ creature, expecting the revelation of the Son of God, will be delivered from the bondage of corruption, into the liberty of the glory of the children of God.

² If the expression that He is first-born of all creation, implied a similarity of essence with the creation, then would He be like irrational and inanimate things, which are parts of creation. But this is too absurd even for the Arians to maintain. On two occasions the Word condescended to created things; first, when He gave them the capacity of being created,—since if He had not condescended, they could not have endured the unmixed brightness which He has with the Father. Secondly, He con-

¹ Romans viii. 19. Athanasius quotes Hebrews i. 6,—“When he bringeth in the first-born into the world,”—to prove that He is called first-born, *πρωτότοκος*, with reference to His assumption of our flesh. Our translators, by rendering *πρωτότοκος* first-begotten, have rather weakened this argument.

² c. 64.

descended, in that the creature is ¹ adopted as a son through Him.

Athanasius next goes on to explain in what sense Christ is the ² beginning of ways. The first way was lost through the transgression of Adam; but the Word of God, through love to man and by the will of the Father, put on created flesh, that He might, in the blood of His own body, quicken that which the first man had subjected to death by transgression, and ³ consecrate for us a new and living way through the veil, that is, His flesh. It was necessary that some one should be first of the new creation: but a mere man from the earth, earthly, could not be: there was need of some one who should renew the old, and preserve the new creation. The Lord took upon Himself this office, and being the beginning of the new creation, was created to be the Way which man was thenceforward to follow, renouncing his former conversation after the old creation. ⁴ Man stood in need of immortality and

¹ The Oxford annotator remarks, "As God *created* Him in that He created human nature in Him, so is He *first-born* in that human nature is adopted in Him." This is the right meaning of *υιοποιεῖται*, but the translator renders it "is made." The annotator quotes also a passage from Leo: "Human nature has been taken into so close an union by the Son of God, that not only in that man who is the first-born of the whole creation, but even in all His saints is one and the same Christ;" he means, I suppose, by His Spirit. See de Dec. Syn. Nic. c. 31.

² c. 65.

³ Heb. x. 20.

⁴ c. 66.

of a way to Paradise. The perfect Word of God, therefore, took an imperfect body, and is said to be created *for His works*, inasmuch as by paying our debt He supplied what was wanting to man. ¹ The expression *for His works* must be understood, not of the creation of all things out of nothing, nor of the time which preceded Christ's assumption of the flesh, but of the time when He was made flesh, and created anew and perfected the works which had been made imperfect and maimed by transgression. If, being a creature, He had been made man, men would have remained in their former state, not united to God. ² Being Himself in want of assistance, He could have afforded none, nor could He have annulled the ³ sentence of God nor remitted sin; since God alone can remit sins. But He, as the proper Word and Image of the Father's essence, was made man, and gave man liberty and released him from condemnation.

⁴ The Arians argued that, even if the Saviour were a creature, God might, by merely speaking the word, have undone the curse. Athanasius answers, that we are to consider, not what God can do, but what He has done. In all that He does, He con-

¹ c. 67.

² Compare c. 72.

³ Genesis iii. 19: "Dust thou art, and to dust shalt thou return."

⁴ c. 68.

sults the good of man. If He had undone the curse by a word, His power would have been displayed, but man would have been what Adam was before the transgression, ¹ receiving grace from without, and not having it connected with his body. Being such he would have been placed in Paradise, and would quickly have become worse, because he had learned to sin. God must, therefore, have again interposed, and removed the curse; and there would have been an endless succession of transgression, curse, and pardon.

God, therefore, sent His own Son, that He might take created flesh, and offer His ² body to death, and, we all dying in Him, the letter of the sentence might be fulfilled; for we all died in Christ, to the end that, being free from sin, and the curse on account of sin, we might all truly remain for ever, having risen from the dead, and put on immortality and incorruption. Christ was manifested that He might destroy the works of the Devil; and ³ thus,

¹ The Oxford annotator observes, "Athanasius here seems to say that Adam, in a state of innocence, had but an external divine assistance, not an habitual grace; this, however, is contrary to his own statement already referred to and the general doctrine of the fathers." It appears to me that the translator has misunderstood the passage; *τοιούτος γὰρ ὢν καὶ τότε τέθειτο ἐν τῷ παραδείσῳ* does not relate to Adam, but to man, when, by the undoing of the curse, he would be replaced in Paradise.

² c. 69.

³ Athanasius seems to admit that the carnal motions still re-

being destroyed in the flesh, we are all delivered by the relationship to His flesh, and are henceforward united to the Word. Thus united to God, we no longer remain on earth ; but where He is, there we shall be : we are a new creation in Him. ¹ This could not have been effected if Christ had been a creature. But the Word took a created and human body, that, creating it anew, He might ² render it Divine in Himself, and thus introduce us all in His likeness into the kingdom of Heaven. We could not have been delivered from sin and the curse, unless the Word had put on naturally human flesh, ³ from Mary the ever Virgin : so neither could man have been made divine, if the Word of the Father, ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς, by nature His true and proper Word, had not become flesh.

⁴ Athanasius points out the peculiar force of the expression, *for His works*, as it proves that Christ must be by nature different from His works : it is

main ; but says that they are cut out, and with them is destroyed death, the consequence of sin, εἴ τι ἐκ τῶν σαρκικῶν κινήματων ἀνεφύετο κακὸν ἐξεκόπτετο καὶ συνανηρείτο τούτοις ὁ τῆς ἁμαρτίας ἀκόλουθος θάνατος. This seems equivalent to saying that the infection of nature remains, but is not imputed to us unto condemnation and death.

¹ c. 70.

² ἐν ἑαυτῷ θεοποιήσῃ.

³ ἐκ Μαρίας τῆς ἀειπαρθένου. See Pearson on the Creed, Art. iii.

⁴ c. 71. He says of the Word, ὑμνούμενος καὶ προσκυνούμενός ἐστι καὶ θεολογούμενος, declared to be God.

equivalent to saying, *the Father created me for the flesh, that I might be made man.*

¹ He goes on to the consideration of the next verse, "*He founded me before the world,*" which the Arians interpreted of the generation of the Son. It is written, he says, ² "The Lord by wisdom hath founded the earth." If, therefore, the former words are to be understood of the generation of the Son, we must say that the Son, the Wisdom of God, was founded by Himself. We must first ascertain whether Christ is in Scripture called the Son of God, and then what meaning is to be attached to the expression; on neither point can there be any doubt, since, when Christ said that He was the Son of God, the Jews accused Him of making Himself equal to God. Christ does not say He founded me as Word or Son, but simply me, to show that He says this, not for His own sake, but ³ after the way of proverbs for the sake of those who are built upon Him. The foundation must be such as are the things built upon it. Christ, who is the foundation, has not, as the Word, any who are such as He is to be compacted with Him;

¹ cc. 72, 73, 74. *πρὸ τοῦ αἰῶνος ἐθεμελίωσέ με.* In our version, "I was set up from everlasting."

² Proverbs iii. 19.

³ *παροιμιωδῶς—ἐποικοδομουμένους.* Athanasius refers to 1 Cor. iii. 11, "for other foundation can no man lay than that is laid, which is Jesus Christ."

for He is the only-begotten. But being made man, He has those who are like Him, the likeness of whose flesh He put on. ¹ The verse must, therefore, be understood with reference to His Incarnation, to the time when He put on our body, which he took ² being cut from Mary.

³ In like manner, when He is said to be founded from everlasting, before the earth was, before the mountains were settled, we must refer the expressions to the economy of His appearance in the flesh. The grace ⁴ of God that bringeth salvation then appeared to all men, but it had been prepared before we were created, or rather before the foundation of the world. For the God of the universe, having created us by His proper Word, knowing what we are better than we know ourselves, foreknowing that being born innocent we should afterwards transgress the commandment, and be expelled from Paradise for our transgression; being good and loving mankind, prepared the dispensation of our salvation in His proper Word, by whom He created us, to the end that, though being deceived by the Serpent we should fall, we should not remain altogether dead,

¹ Athanasius, in c. 74, says, that when Christ compares Himself to a vine, and His disciples to branches, the comparison must be understood with reference to His human nature, since the vine and the branches must be like, and the disciples are like Him as to the flesh.

² *τμηθέν*; the Oxford translator renders it *severed*.

³ cc. 75, 76, 77. Proverbs viii. 23. 25.

⁴ Titus ii. 11.

but, having in the Word redemption and salvation prepared for us, should rise again and remain immortal, when He should be created for our sake the beginning of ways and the first-born of Creation should be made the first-born of brethren, and He should rise again the first-fruits of the dead. If, then, before men were created, the Son pre-ordained them to the adoption of sons, He must have been founded from everlasting, and have taken upon Him the dispensation for our sakes. The grace which was to extend to us was ¹ laid up in Christ. If the hope of life and salvation had not been prepared for us from everlasting in Christ, we, who are from the earth, could not have been ² capable of everlasting life; but the Word entering into our flesh, and being in it created the beginning of ways to His works, is founded, inasmuch as the will of the Father is in Him from everlasting, before the earth was, before the mountains were settled and the springs flowed; that, although created things should pass away in the consummation of the present age, we may still live, having the life and spiritual blessing prepared for us, according to election, in the Word before created things were. Before we existed, the

¹ ἤν' ἀποκειμένη.

² See the note of the Oxford annotator: "The Catholic doctrine seems to be, that Adam was mortal, yet would not in fact have died; that he had no principle of eternal life within him, but was sustained continually by Divine power, till such time as immortality should have been given him." See Oratio i. c. 44.

renewal of our salvation is founded in Christ, that we may be also new-created in Him. The counsel and purpose were prepared before ¹ the age or world ; but it became an act, when the need required, and the Saviour came among us ; for the Lord Himself will be to us in the place of all things in the Heavens, taking us to Him into everlasting life. This suffices to show, then, that the Word of God is not a creation : the Word has not said that He is by nature a creature ; but as in a proverb, the Lord created man, a beginning of ways for His works ; and this proverb must be so interpreted as to be brought into accordance with those passages in which Wisdom is said to exist, and the Word is called the only-begotten Son.

The Only-begotten and ² very Wisdom of God is the Creator and Framers of all things ; but in order that the created things might not only exist, but ³ exist well, God was pleased that His Wisdom should ⁴ condescend to the creatures, in order to impress on all in common, and on each a sort of type and semblance of its Image, and to make the created works appear wise and worthy of God. For as our word is the Image of the Word who is the Son of God, so the wisdom which is in us, is the

¹ πρὸ τοῦ αἰῶνος.

³ καλῶς ὑπάρχῃ.

² c. 78. ἡ αὐτοσοφία.

⁴ συγκαταβῆναι.

image of the Word who is His Wisdom ; in which we, being capable of knowing and understanding, become capable of receiving the Wisdom of the Creator, and through it we are enabled to ¹ know its Father. The true and creative Wisdom, therefore, taking to itself that which belongs to its type, says, “The Lord created me the beginning of ways for His works,” with reference to the image of itself created in the works, not as if, being as it is the Creator, it were itself created.

² The sacred writers speak of a wisdom in man and in the world, which is the type of the true and creative Wisdom. The wisdom in the world is not the creative Wisdom, but is created in the works ; but men, if they possess it in themselves, will attain to the knowledge of the true wisdom of God, and will know that they are really made after the ³ image of God. To those then who admire the wisdom in the creature, the true Wisdom says, God created me for His works, for my type is in them, and thus I ⁴ condescended to the work of creation.

¹ Athanasius afterwards says, that the type of wisdom was made in the works, that the world in it might know the Word its Creator, and through Him, the Father ; and quotes in support of his statement Romans i. 19. See the note on Oratio i. cc. 11, 12.

² c. 79.

³ Athanasius seems here to make the image of God in which man was created, consist in the type of the true Wisdom impressed upon him.

⁴ *συνκατέβην.*

¹ The Son speaks of His type in us as of Himself : as He asks Saul, when persecuting the Church in which is His type and image, “Why persecutest thou me?” When, therefore Wisdom says, “The Lord created me for His works,” we must not understand the words of the essence of the very ² Wisdom which creates, but of its type created in the works. This type is called also the beginning of ways, because it is, as it were, a beginning or ³ elementary principle of the knowledge of God : for he who enters upon this way and keeps it in the fear of God, which, according to Solomon, is the beginning of wisdom, then, going forward in thought and recognizing the creative Wisdom in the creation, will recognize also its Father in it, as Christ Himself says : “He who has seen me, has seen the Father.” But that we may not transfer what is said of the type to the very Wisdom, and suppose the very Wisdom to be a creature, it is added, “He begat me before the mountains, and the earth, before all created things,” in order to show that the very Wisdom, as to its essence, was not created with the works, and is not a creature, but an offspring. ⁴ Wisdom is also represented as saying, “When He prepared the heaven, I was present with Him.” This, Athanasius says, does not mean that the

¹ c. 80.² τῆς αὐτοσοφίας.³ στοιχείωσις.

⁴ cc. 81, 82. ἡνίκα ἡτοίμαζε τὸν οὐρανὸν συμπαρήμην αὐτῷ.
Prov. viii. 27. In our version, “When He prepared the heavens, I was there.”

Father did not prepare the heaven through Wisdom, it being certain that all things were made in Wisdom; but it being necessary that Wisdom should be created in the works, I, it says, was as to my essence with the Father, but in my condescension to created things, ¹ I was fitting the type in me to the works, that the universe, being in one body, might not be disturbed by dissension, but might be in accordance with itself. But under the New, it is not as under the Old Testament: God was then known through the image and shadow of Wisdom which was in the creature; but now He has caused the true Wisdom to take flesh, and to become man, and to suffer the death of the cross, to the end that through faith in Him, all who should thenceforward believe should be capable of salvation. It is the same Wisdom of God which before manifested itself, and through itself, its Father, by its image in the creatures, on which account it is said to be created; and which afterwards, being itself the Word, was made flesh, and after having destroyed death and saved our race, still further revealed itself and through itself its Father, saying: ² “Give them to know thee the only true God, and Jesus Christ, whom thou hast sent.” Again, Wisdom says: ³ “I was daily His delight, rejoicing daily before Him.” Was there ever a time when God was not delighted? If then

¹ τῇ δὲ πρὸς τὰ γεινητὰ συγκαταβάσει ἡμην ἀρμόζουσα τὸν παρ’ ἐμοὶ τύπον τοῦτε ἔργοις.

² John xvii. 3.

³ Proverbs viii. 30.

He was always delighted, He in whom He was delighted must have always existed. His delight consisted in seeing Himself in His own image, which is His Word; and if He is said to rejoice in the sons of men, He rejoices because He sees the works made according to His image. Athanasius concludes with saying, that Proverbs viii. 22 lends no support to the Arian doctrine.

¹ The next text considered is John xiv. 10: "I in the Father, and the Father in me." The Arians asked, "How can the Father, who is greater, be contained in the Son, who is less?" ² Athanasius

¹ Oratio iii. c. 1.

² Art. xvii. 28. Here the Oxford annotator takes occasion to remark, that the doctrine of the Perichoresis, which this objection introduces, is the test of orthodoxy opposed to Arianism. The doctrine is, "That the Son is literally and numerically one with the Father, and therefore His person dwells in the Father's person by an ineffable union." The Athanasian Creed says that there is one Person of the Father, another of the Son: notwithstanding, therefore, this ineffable union, the persons are distinct. The annotator then quotes a passage from Jerome, on Ezekiel iii. 12: "Filius locus est Patris, sicut et Pater locus est Filii;" and adds, that at first sight it is inconsistent with what Athanasius says respecting the illustration taken from vessels, and the filling one from the other: but it is not so in reality. He thus reconciles the two statements: The Father is the τόπος or 'locus' of the Son, because when we contemplate the Son in His fulness or ὅλος Θεός, we do not view the Father as that person in whom God the Son is; our mind abstracts His substance, which is the Son, for a moment from Him, and regards Him merely as Father. It is, however, but an operation of the mind, and not a real emptying of Godhead from the Father, if such words may be

replies, that there is nothing more surprising in the statement that the Son is in the Father, than in the statement that “we live, and move, and are in Him.” But the objection arises out of the gross carnal notions of the Arians, who think that God is a body, and understand neither what is true Father and true Son, nor what is invisible, eternal light, and its invisible radiance, nor what is an invisible substance and incorporeal expression (*χαρακτήρ*) and image. They, in consequence, interpret the text as if, like vessels, they were mutually poured into each other, the Son filling up the emptiness of the Father, and the Father that of the Son, and as if neither of them were full and perfect; whereas the Father is full and perfect, and the Son is the fulness of the Godhead. The Father is not, however, in the Son as He is in the saints, to whom He gives power;

used. Father and Son are both the same God, though really and eternally distinct from each other: and each is full of the other; that is, their substance is one and the same. He had before observed of a statement respecting the ineffable union of the two persons, that it was not only a contradiction in the terms used, but in our ideas, yet not, therefore, a contradiction in fact. See note on Oratio ii. c. 33. In a note on c. 3 he says, that the Father and the Son are the numerically one God; and in another note he quotes Thomassin, to the effect that, by the mutual indwelling or co-inherence of the three Persons is meant, not a commingling as of material liquids, nor as of soul with body, nor as the union of our Lord’s Godhead and humanity, but it is such, that the whole power, life, substance, wisdom, essence, of the Father, should be the very essence, substance, wisdom, life, and power of the Son.

for He is the power and wisdom of the Father. Created beings are sanctified by a participation of Him in the Spirit; He is the Son, not by participation, but as the proper offspring of the Father. So again is the Son in the Father, as we live, and move, and are in Him: for He is the Life from the fountain of the Father, in which all things are quickened and consist. The Life does not live in life, since then it could not be life; but rather He gives life to all things. ¹ Asterius argued that Christ said that He was in the Father and the Father in Him, for this reason, that He said that neither the word which He delivered was His own, but the Father's, nor the works which He did His own, but those of the Father who gave the power. This, Athanasius answers, is to say, that the Power of God received power; whence it would follow, that the Son is made Son in the Son, and the Word received the power of (uttering) the word; and the Son did not speak as Son, but as a learner and on a level with created beings. Moses, David, and Elias also said, that they spoke not their own words, but those from the Father, and that the works which they did were not their own, but the Father's who gave the power: they, therefore, according to the interpretation of Asterius, might also have said that they were in the Father, and the Father in them.

¹ c. 2.

¹ The error of the Arians arises from not acknowledging the Lord to be the true Son from the Father. The Son is in the Father, because the whole being (τὸ εἶναι) of the Son is proper to the essence of the Father, as radiance from light, and the river from the fountain, so that he who sees the Son sees that which is proper to the essence of the Father, and understands that the Being of the Son, inasmuch as it is from the Father, is therefore in the Father. Again, as the Son is that which is proper from the Father, the Father is in the Son, as the Son in the radiance, the understanding in the Word, the fountain in the river. Having before said, ² “I and my Father are one,” Christ adds: ³ “I in the Father, and the Father in me,” to show the identity (ταυτότητα) of the Godhead and the unity of the essence.

⁴ The Father and the Son are one, ἐν, not as one thing divided into two parts, which are still nothing but one; nor as one thing under two names, so that the same is sometimes Father and sometimes His own Son, according to the doctrine of Sabellius, which was pronounced heretical. But

¹ c. 3.

² John x. 30.

³ John xiv. 10. In a note the Oxford annotator observes: “Α περιχώρησις of persons is implied in the unity of substance: this is the connexion of the two texts here quoted; and the cause of this unity and περιχώρησις is the divine γέννησις.”

⁴ c. 4. Compare Oratio iv. cc. 9, 10.

they are two, inasmuch as the Father is Father, and the same is not the Son; and the Son is Son, and the same is not the Father: but there is ¹ one nature; for the offspring cannot be unlike Him who begat it, for He is His Image; and all that belongs to the Father, belongs also to the Son. Wherefore the Son is not another God; for He was not ² imagined from without, since if a Godhead were imagined foreign from the Father, there would be many Gods. If the Son is another as offspring, He is the same as God; and He and the Father are one by ³ propriety and peculiarity of nature, and the identity of the one Godhead. Athanasius here introduces his favourite illustration drawn from light and its radiance; and then goes on. The Godhead of the Son is that of the Father, wherefore it is indivisible; so that there is one God and none beside Him. Hence they being one, and the Godhead being one, whatever is said of the Father, the same is said of the Son, save that He is never called Father: He is called God, and Almighty, and the Lord and Light, and is said to remit sins.

⁴ That which is said of the Father could not be said of the Son, unless the Son were the Father's offspring, the proper offspring of His essence. Christ

¹ φύσις, which seems here to be equivalent to οὐσία.

² ἐπενοήθη.

³ τῇ ιδιότητι καὶ οικειότητι τῆς φύσεως.

⁴ c. 5.

says, "He who has seen me, has seen the Father," because the Godhead of the Father is in the Son. Athanasius here introduces another ¹ illustration drawn from the image of the Emperor. The face and form of the Emperor are in the image, and the face in the image is in the Emperor. The exact likeness of the Emperor is in the image, so that he who looks upon the image sees in it the Emperor; and he who sees the Emperor, knows that he is in the image; and to one who, having seen the image, wished to see the Emperor, the image would say: "I and the Emperor are one: I am in him and he

¹ It is clear that this illustration is defective, for the Emperor and his image are certainly not ὁμοούσιοι. The Oxford annotator says, however, that "a mistake as to the meaning of Athanasius is impossible, and that the passage affords a good instance of the imperfect and partial character of all illustrations of the Divine Mystery. What it is taken to symbolize is the unity of the Father and Son, for the image is not a second emperor but the same." In what sense can the image be called an emperor at all? The annotator goes on to say: "No one who bowed before the Emperor's statue can be supposed to have really worshipped it; whereas our Lord is the object of supreme worship, which terminates in Him, as being really one with Him whose image He is. From the custom of paying honour to the imperial statue, the 'Cultus Imaginum' was introduced into the Eastern Church. The Western Church, not having had the civil custom, resisted. The Fathers, e. g. S. Jerome on Dan. iii. 18, set themselves against the civil custom as idolatrous, comparing it to that paid to Nebuchadnezzar's statue. Incense was burned before those of the emperors, as afterwards before the images of the saints." Would the annotator now subscribe to this account of the origin of the 'Cultus Imaginum,' and of burning incense before the images of the saints?

in me: what you see in me you see in him, and what you see in him you see in me.” He, therefore, who worships the image, worships the Emperor; for the image is his form and face. Since, therefore, the Son is the image of the Father, we must necessarily understand that the Godhead and propriety of the Father is the Being of the Son; and this is meant when the Son is said to be in the form of God, and the Father is said to be in Him.

¹ The Being of the Son is not in part the form of the Godhead, but is the fulness of the Father’s Godhead, and the Son is proper God. Hence, ² the Son thought it not robbery to be equal to God: and God is said to be in Christ, reconciling the world to Himself; and the works which the Son works are said to be the works of the Father; and he who sees the Son sees the Father. When we call God Creator, we do thereby indicate the existence of created things, for the Creator is before them; but when we call Him Father, we indicate ³ the subsistence of the Son together with Him. He, therefore, who believes in the Son, believes in the Father; for he believes in that which is proper to the essence of the Father, and thus there is one Faith in one God. He who worships and honours the Son, worships and honours the Father in the Son; for

¹ c. 6.² Philip. ii. 6. 2 Cor. v. 19.³ ὑπαρξιν.

the Godhead is one; and there is one honour and worship, that paid to the Father in and through the Son; so that he who thus worships, worships one God, and the worship of the Son is not at variance with the declarations of the Old Testament: ¹ "That there is one God, and there is no other beside Him." Athanasius seems to have thought it necessary to guard against the mistaken inference which might have been drawn from the illustration of the Emperor's image in the last chapter.

² Still the Arians contended that the expressions, one God, one only God, are at variance with the doctrine that the Son is God. Athanasius answers that this objection supposes the Son, by taking the title of God, to be setting Himself in opposition to the Father, as Absalom rebelled against David; whereas Christ uniformly declares that He came to reveal His Father, and to do His Father's will. The declarations respecting the unity of God were made in exclusion of the gods, falsely so called, whom men had framed to themselves, not of His own Son. Athanasius adds, that they may be considered as directed against the folly of the Arians, to teach them that the God whom they imagine to themselves external to the essence of the Father, is not the true God, nor the Image and

¹ Exodus iii. 14. Deut. xxxii. 39. Isaiah xliv. 6.

² cc. 7, 8.

Son of the only and first God. ¹ Christ says, “that they might know Thee the only true God, and Him whom Thou hast sent, Jesus Christ;” thus coupling Himself with God. This He would not have done if He had been a creature, and not of the ² nature of God; if He had not been the true offspring of the true Father. Christ is called first-born, not because He is numbered with the creatures, but to show the creation and adoption of all things through Him: for He is first as the Father is ³ first; and as He is

¹ c. 9. John xvii. 3.

² τῆς φύσεως.

³ The reference is to Isaiah xlv. 6:—“I am the first and I am the last:” in the Septuagint, ἐγὼ πρῶτος καὶ ἐγὼ μετὰ ταῦτα. On this passage the Oxford annotator thus remarks:—“It is no inconsistency to say that the Father is first and the Son first also; for comparison in number does not enter into this mystery: since each is ὁλος θεός, each, as contemplated by our finite reason, at the moment of contemplation excludes the other. Though we say Three Persons, person hardly denotes one abstract idea, certainly not as containing under it three individual subjects; but it is a term applied to the one God in three ways. It is the doctrine of the Fathers that, though we use words expressive of a Trinity, yet that God is beyond number,” (what does this mean—that number does not apply to God? why then talk at all of Three Persons?) “and that Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, though eternally distinct from each other, can scarcely be viewed together in common, except as One Substance, as if they could not be generalized into Three Any whatever; and as if it were, strictly speaking, incorrect to speak of *a* person, or otherwise than of *the* person, whether of Father, or of Son, or of Spirit. The question has almost been admitted by St. Austin, whether it is not possible to say that God is One Person, for He is wholly and entirely Father, and at the same time wholly and entirely Son, and wholly and entirely Holy Ghost.” It may be possible to say that God is One Person, but this certainly is not the language of the Atha-

image of the first, the first being in Him, and He is the offspring from the Father, and in Him the whole creation is created and adopted.

¹ The Arians contended that the unity implied in that text, as "I and my Father are one," is an unity, not of essence, but of will and doctrine and teaching. If this were so, then the angels and the Heavenly Powers may be said to be one with the Father, since they also will what the Father wills. Even among men we find some, as the martyrs, apostles, prophets, patriarchs, who have kept the commandment of the Saviour, and have been followers of God, as dear children, and have walked in love, as Christ also loved us. Yet neither of any angel nor of any holy man is it ever said that he is Word, or Wisdom, or Only-begotten Son, or Image; nor did any one of them ever venture to say, "I and the Father are one; or I in the Father and the Father in me." We were made indeed in the image, and are called the image and glory of God; but we receive the grace of this name, not on account of ourselves, but on account of the image

nasian Creed: to say that God is One Person, is surely to confound the Persons. But why raise these subtle questions? How Three Persons can each be God, and yet there be only One God, is a mystery unfathomable by the human intellect, to be received on the authority of God's Word; the attempt to explain it only serves to perplex and bewilder the mind.

¹ cc. 10, 11.

and true glory of God indwelling in us, which is His Word, who for our sakes was afterwards made flesh. If the likeness to the Father is only a likeness of doctrine and teaching, He is Father only in name, and the Son is not the exact Image, or rather has no propriety nor likeness to the Father. St. Paul taught as the Saviour taught, yet was not like Him in essence. The Father and the Son are essentially one, so that when the Son comes to the saints, the Father comes in Him, as He said,¹ “I and my Father will come unto Him, and make our abode in Him.” The Father is seen in the Image, and the Light is in the Radiance.

² Such language would not be used, if the Son differed ³by nature from the Father; for then it would be sufficient to say that the Father gave grace to His disciples; whereas it is said ⁴to be from God the Father and from the Lord Jesus Christ. No one, in praying for any blessing, prays to receive it from ⁵God and the angels, but from the Father and the Son, on account of their unity and

¹ John xiv. 23.

² cc. 12, 13.

³ φύσει.

⁴ Rom. i. 7.

⁵ The Oxford annotator here refers to passages from Basil, Theodoret, Origen, in which it is expressly said that we are not to pray to angels, nor to seek access to God through them, but through Christ. He adds, however, that they do not contain the whole doctrine of those Fathers respecting the cultus angelorum, and of course are not inconsistent with 1 Tim. v. 21. He does not tell us what this doctrine was.

oneness in giving. What is given, is given through the Son. When Jacob, blessing his grandchildren Ephraim and Manasseh, said, ¹ “The God which fed me all my life long unto this day; the Angel which redeemed me from all evil, bless the lads,” he did not mean to couple one of the created angels with God who created them; but plainly declared that He who delivered him from all evil was the Word of God; the same whom ² Isaiah calls “the angel of great counsel;” the same of whom he said, ³ “I will not let thee go, except thou bless me,” and “I have seen God face to face.” Jacob would not have prayed, in behalf of his posterity, to any other than to Him who had fed him from his youth. The angel, therefore, whom Jacob coupled with God in his prayer, is no other than the Word of God, who is called in the Old Testament an angel, because it is He alone who reveals the Father.

⁴ It cannot be said of angels, or of any creatures, that when the Father works they work, nor that they impart grace when the Father imparts it; nor would any one say, when an angel appeared, that

¹ Gen. xlviii. 15, 16.

² Isaiah ix. 6. *μεγάλης βουλήs ἀγγελoς*, in the Septuagint; Counsellor, in our version.

³ Gen. xxxii. 26. 30. Athanasius says that it was the Second Person in the Holy Trinity who appeared to Laban, xxxi. 24.

⁴ c. 14.

he had seen the Father. ¹ Angels are ministering Spirits sent to minister, and they announce the gifts, given through the Word, to those who receive them. When an angel appears, he states that he is sent by the Lord; as did Gabriel, who appeared to Zechariah, and to Mary ² the mother of God. Manoah, the father of Samson, saw an angel; Moses saw God. ³ Gideon saw an angel; God appeared to Abraham: and neither did he who saw God, see an angel; nor he who saw an angel, think that he saw God. If, on an occasion when an angel appeared, he who saw the angel heard the voice of God,—as when the angel of the Lord appeared in the flame of fire in the bush, and the Lord spake to Moses from the bush,—the God of Abraham was not an angel, but God spake in the angel, as He spake to Moses in the pillar of the cloud in the Tabernacle. But whenever God speaks, He speaks through His Word; and he who hears the Word, knows that He hears the Father.

⁴ Athanasius goes on to say, that in holding the

¹ Hebrews i. 14.

² τῆς θεοτόκου Μαρίας.

³ Athanasius seems here to distinguish three cases of appearance:—those in which an angel appeared, as to Manoah and Gideon; those in which the Word appeared, as to Jacob and Laban; and those in which an angel was seen, but the Word spake in him. The Oxford annotator in c. 12, says, that the doctrine of Athanasius does not differ from that of Augustine.

⁴ c. 15. See Oration iv. c. 10, where Athanasius is refuting the Sabellians.

Trinity the Catholics are not guilty of introducing polytheism : for they do not introduce three Fathers nor three Principles ; since they do not use the illustration of three suns, but of the Sun and Radiance. They admit only one Principle,—they say that the Creator Word has no other mode of Godhead than that of the Only God, since ¹ He is by nature from Him. The Arians are more justly open to the charge of polytheism or atheism, because they speak of the Son as a creature external to the Father, and say that the Spirit is from that which was not. Either they say that the Word is not God ; or, being compelled by the letter of Scripture to admit that He is God, yet, by asserting that He is not proper to the Essence of the Father, they give opportunity for the introduction of many Gods, ² because of their difference in kind.

¹ διὰ τὸ ἐξ αὐτοῦ πεφυκέναι.

² διὰ τὸ ἑτεροειδὲς αὐτῶν. If the Son is a creature of a different essence or nature from the Father, and yet is God, why may not other creatures be Gods? In c. 16 Athanasius says, the Word is God, and alone has the Father's form, τὸ πατρικὸν εἶδος. He then refers to John v. 35, οὕτε εἶδος αὐτοῦ ἑώρακατε,—where our translators render εἶδος shape,—and adds, that the λόγος is well coupled with the word εἶδος, to show that He is the image, and expression, and εἶδος of His Father. He next refers to Genesis xxxii. 31 in the Septuagint: ἀνέτειλε δὲ ὁ ἥλιος αὐτῷ ἡνίκα παρῆλθε τὸ εἶδος τοῦ Θεοῦ, in our version, “as He passed over Peniel;” Peniel meaning the face of God. The Oxford translator renders ἑτεροειδὲς in this chapter “different in kind :” he afterwards renders ἐν εἶδος θεότητος “one face or kind of Godhead :” in c. 16 he renders it *face*, and in a note says, that the words form and face, μορφή and εἶδος, are rather descriptive

The Catholics only admit one kind of Godhead, which is also in the Word. There is one God, the Father subsisting in Himself, in that He is over all; appearing in the Son, in that He pervades all things: in the Spirit, in that He works in the Spirit in all through the Word. Thus we confess one Godhead in Trinity. ¹ Athanasius enlarges upon the absurdities which flow from the Arian doctrine. By making the Son a creature, and yet acknowledging Him to be God, they introduce two Gods, one the Creator, the other a creature; one increate, the other created: and they have a twofold faith, one in the true God, the other in Him whom they have made and framed, and called God. They are, therefore, to be numbered with the Gentiles, inasmuch as they worship the creature. They charge the Catholics with saying, that there are two increate; but while they deny that there are two increate, they introduce two Gods, and these having different natures, one created, the other increate.

² Again, the Arians contended that the Father is

of the Divine substance in the Person of the Son. To render *ἐτεροειδὲς* "different in face" in this chapter, would convey no intelligible meaning to an English reader.

¹ c. 16.

² cc. 17, 18, 19, 20, 21. The reference is to John xvii. 11. Epiphanius answers this objection (*Hæresis*, lxix. c. 6). He makes the prayer of Christ to the Father to mean, that the disciples, being sanctified by the relationship to Him through the flesh by the good pleasure of the Father, might be united in the

in the Son and the Son in the Father, as we are in Him. If, then, the Son is proper to and like the Father's essence, we must be the same. Thus, Athanasius answers, they put that which is given to men of grace or favour on a level with the Godhead of the Giver; just as when they read that men are called sons, they fancy themselves equal to Him who is the true Son by nature. The true explanation of the text is this:—As Christ called Herod a fox, and exhorted his disciples to be wise as serpents and innocent as doves; not meaning that Herod was by nature a fox, but describing his moral character; nor meaning that the disciples were to become serpents and doves, but describing the wisdom and innocence which they were to try to acquire: so when He prayed that the disciples should be one in Him and the Father, as He is one in the Father, He did not mean that they should be one in nature and essence, but in union of heart and spirit. We cannot be indissolubly united to the Father in essence, as the Son is; but we can take their indissoluble union in essence as an example of the unity of heart which ought to subsist among believers. If it were possible that we should be as the Son in the Father, it ought to have been written, “that they may be one in thee, as the Son is in the

unity of good pleasure and adoption. The union could not have taken place, if the Divine Word had not partaken of the flesh of man.

Father :” whereas our Saviour’s words are, “¹ as thou, Father, art in Me, and I in Thee, that they also may be one *in us*.” The words *in us*, show that He only is in the Father, being the only Word and Wisdom ; but we are in the Son, and through Him in the Father. Christ means to say, “that by Our unity they may be one with each other, as We are one by nature and in truth ; otherwise they cannot be one, unless they learn in Us what unity is.” The words *in us*, do not mean that the disciple is in the Father, as the Son is ; but are an example and image, as if it were said, “let them learn *of us*.” Or, again, the words may be understood to mean that they by the power of the Father and Son may be one, speaking the same things ; for without God this cannot be. In the name of Father and Son being made one, men may hold firm the bond of love. The text, therefore, “that they may be one *as we are*,” does not imply identity, but an image and example. ² The Word, therefore, has really and truly an identity of nature with the Father : it is our part to imitate Him ; for He adds, “I in them, and Thou in Me, that they may be made perfect in one.” Here the Lord asks something greater and more perfect on our account. It is plain that the Word was made, γέγονεν, in us, since He put on our body. He adds, “Thou in Me,” for I am Thy Word : and since Thou art in Me, because I am Thy

¹ John xvii. 21.

² cc. 22, 23. John xvii. 23.

Word, and I am in them through the body, and the salvation of men is perfected through Thee in Me; I ask that they may be made one according to the body in Me and its perfection, that they also may be made perfect, having unity in it, and being made one in it: so that all being borne by Me, may be one body and one spirit, and may grow up to the perfect man. All partaking of the same, are made one body, having the one Lord in themselves. The use of the word καθώς, “¹ as Thou, Father, art in Me, and I in Thee, that they also may be one in us,” shows that Christ did not mean to express our identity or equality with the Father and Himself, but merely proposes their unity as an example. The Son is simply and ² without complexity in the Father, for this belongs to Him by nature: but we, not having this by nature, require an image and example, that He may say of us, “as thou in Me, and I in thee.” Christ adds, “that they may be made perfect in Me, and that the world may know that Thou hast sent Me.” As if He had said, If I had

¹ John xvii. 21 : καθώς σὺ, πάτερ, ἐν ἐμοὶ, καὶ γὰρ ἐν σοὶ, ἵνα καὶ αὐτοὶ ἐν ἡμῖν ἐν ᾧ σουν. Athanasius observes that Christ, in His allusion to Jonas, using the word καθώς, καθώς ἦν Ἰωάννης ἐν τῇ κοιλίᾳ, κ.τ.έ., did not mean to say that Jonas was identical or equal to Himself, but merely meant that his abode for three days and nights in the whale’s belly was a type of His own abode three days and nights in the heart of the earth. In the received text, the word is ὥσπερ, not καθώς.

² χωρὶς συμπλοκῆς.

not come, bearing their body, no one of them would have been made perfect, but all would have remained corruptible. Work, therefore, in them, O Father; and as Thou hast given to Me to bear this body, so give them Thy Spirit, that they may be made one in it, and may be perfected in Me. For their perfection shows the sojourn of Thy Word; and the world seeing them perfect and ¹ borne by God, will believe that Thou hast sent Me, and that I have sojourned among men. For whence could they have attained perfection, if I, Thy Word, taking their body, had not been made man and perfected the work which Thou, O Father, gavest Me; and the work is perfected because men, redeemed from sin, no longer remain dead, but being deified, looking to us, hold with each other the bond of love.

² Athanasius produces, in support of his interpretation, 1 John iv. 13: "Thereby we know that we dwell in Him, and He in us, because He hath given us of His Spirit." We, therefore, are in Him, and He in us, by the grace of the Spirit given to us; and as the Spirit is the Spirit of God, therefore we, having the Spirit, are reckoned to be in God; and thus God is in us. We are not in the Father, as the Son is in the Father: we are in Him by partaking of the Spirit: but the Son does not receive of the Spirit, He supplies the Spirit to all: nor does

¹ θεοφορουμένους.

² cc. 24, 25.

the Spirit unite the Word to the Father, but the Spirit receives from the Word. What then is our likeness or equality to the Son? unless the Arians should venture to say that the Son is in the Father through participation of the Spirit and improvement in conversation? The petition of Christ, "As Thou, O Father, art in Me, and I in Thee, that they also may be one in us," is a petition to the Father that, since the Word is in the Father, and the Spirit is given from the Word, we may receive the Spirit; that when we receive it, then having the Spirit of the Word who is in the Father, we also may appear to be one through the Spirit in the Word, and through Him in the Father. In saying ¹ ὥς ἡμεῖς, Christ prays that the grace of the Spirit given to the disciples, may be unfailing and ² irrevocable. He wishes that which belongs by nature to the Word in the Father to be given to us irrevocably through the Spirit.

The Arians referred to the ³ texts in which power, judgment, all things are said to be given to the Son; and contended that, if He were Son by nature and of like essence, He would possess all those

¹ John xvii. 1.

² ἀμεταμέλητος, which our translators in Rom. xi. 29 render "without repentance." Athanasius here incidentally says, that they who have received grace may fall from it finally.

³ c. 26. Matt. xxviii. 18. John v. 22; iii. 35; vi. 37. Luke x. 22. Compare Oration iv. cc. 6, 7.

things by nature, and would not need that they should be *given* to Him. They quoted those texts in which ¹He described the trouble of His soul, and prayed that the cup might pass from Him; and argued, that He would not have been thus fearful if He had been the power of God, but would rather have imparted power to others. Nor, if He had been by nature the true and proper Wisdom of the Father, would it have been said that ²He grew in wisdom, and stature, and favour with God and man; nor would ³He have asked His disciples whom men declared Him to be; ⁴nor where Lazarus lay; nor ⁵how many loaves they had; questions all implying ignorance. How could He be the proper Word of the Father, without whom the Father never was, by whom He makes all things, and yet say upon the cross, ⁶“My God, My God, why hast Thou forsaken Me?” and pray that ⁷the Father would glorify Him with the glory which He had before the world

¹ John xii. 27; xiii. 21. Matt. xxvi. 38.

² Luke ii. 52.

³ Matt. xvi. 13. In c. 46 Athanasius says, that if St. Peter knew by revelation from the Father that Christ was “the Son of the Living God,” the revelation must have been made through the Son, since no one knows the Son but the Father, nor the Father, but the Son, and he to whom the Son is willing to reveal Him. It is plain, therefore, that Christ intended to show that He asked the question after the fashion of men, but that He knew in the Godhead (θεικῶς) what answer St. Peter would return.

⁴ John xi. 34.

⁵ Mark vi. 38.

⁶ Matt. xxvii. 46.

⁷ John xvii. 5.

began? and ¹ profess ignorance of the day and hour of the final judgment? All this is consistent with the belief that He is a creature and one of created things; but not with the belief that He is of the essence of the Father. ² Athanasius replies, that the Arians would do better to ask at once, How could He who is God become man? or how could He who is incorporeal bear a body?—let them altogether deny the presence of the Saviour in the flesh. After briefly noticing one of their cavils, that the Catholics held ³ *two everlasting*, he says that the Arians misinterpret the texts quoted, which can only be rightly understood by those who take in the whole scope ⁴ or bearing of the Christian faith, and using it as a rule, then apply themselves to the reading of the divinely-inspired Scriptures.

⁵ The scope, then, of the scriptural teaching respecting the Son is this: He was always God and is the Son, being the Word, and Radiance, and Wisdom of the Father; and afterwards taking flesh

¹ Mark xiii. 32.

² cc. 27, 28. In these two chapters Athanasius couples the Arians with the Jews, and exhorts them in very energetic language to renounce their error.

³ *ὁὐο αἰδία*. He says that the Lord is the true Son of God by nature, and not simply *αἰδιος*, but co-existent with the eternity of the Father. There are eternal things of which He is the Creator: His proper distinction is not that He is *αἰδιος*, but that He is the Son. Athanasius refers to Psalm xxiv. 7: ἄρατε πύλας, οἱ ἄρχοντες ὑμῶν, καὶ ἐπάροητε πύλαι αἰώνιοι.

⁴ See c. 58.

⁵ cc. 29, 30, 31.

for our sake from the Virgin, Mary ¹ the mother of God, He became man. He is throughout the divinely-inspired Scriptures represented under this twofold character. Athanasius then ² refers to particular passages of Scripture in proof of his statement, and says that this great truth pervades the writings both of the Old and New Testament. As at the creation the Father said to the Son, ³ "Let there be light," "Let us make man," so in the last days, ἐπὶ συντελείᾳ τῶν αἰώνων, ⁴ He sent the Son into the world, not that He might judge the world, but that the world might be saved through Him. The Word was made man: ⁵ He did not come to an individual man; for then it might be supposed that He now dwells with that man, as He did in the days of old with each of the saints, sanctifying him and manifested in him as in others. He being the Word of God by whom all things were made, submitted to become the Son of man, and humbled Himself; taking the form of a servant, of old He came to each of the saints and sanctified those who truly received Him. He was not made man, when they were created; nor is it said that He suffered, when they suffered; but once in the last days, when

¹ τῇς θεοτόκου Μαρίας. So also in c. 33.

² He refers to John i. 1. 14. Philipp. ii. 6. Matt. i. 13.

³ Gen. i. 3. 6.

⁴ John iii. 17.

⁵ "It pleased not the Word or Wisdom of God to take to itself some one person amongst men, etc." Hooker, Book iv. c. 53. § 3.

being born of Mary, He came in order to abolish sin. Our belief, therefore, is, that being always God, and sanctifying those to whom He came, and administering all things ¹ according to the will of the Father, He afterwards was made man, and the Godhead dwelt bodily in the flesh; in other words, being God, He had His proper body, and using it as an instrument, ὁργανον, He was made man for our sake. Whatever is proper to the flesh, as hunger, thirst, suffering, weariness, is ascribed to Him, because He was in it, being the affections of which the flesh is capable. The works also proper to the Word Himself, such as the raising of the dead, the giving of sight to the blind, He performed through ² His proper body; the Word carried also the infirmities of the flesh as His own, for the flesh was His; and the flesh ministered to the works of the Godhead, for the Godhead was in it, since it was the body of God. The Prophet with great propriety said, He ³ *carried*, not He *healed* our infirmities: least it should be thought that, being external to the body, and only healing it as He had

¹ κατὰ τὸ βούλημα. The Son was Himself the Will of the Father.

² Hence we find names belonging to the Divine nature applied to the human; this is what is called ἀντίδοσις τῶν ἰδιωμάτων.

³ ἐβάσταζε, not ἐθεράπευσεν. Isaiah liii. 4. Matt. vii. 17. Athanasius here says that the Word received no hurt, οὐδὲν ἐβλάπτετο, by bearing our sins in His own body on the tree.

always done, He left man still subject to death. ¹ When therefore the flesh suffered, the Word was not external to it: on this account the passion is said to be His; nor was the flesh external to Him, when He, in His Divine nature, *θεικῶς*, did the works of the Father. When He healed the mother-in-law of Peter, He stretched out His hand as man, but healed the disease as God. The case was the same when He gave sight to him who was blind from his birth, and raised Lazarus from the dead. He did this in order to show that He had a real body, and was not a phantom. It was fitting that the Lord, when He put on human flesh, should put it on entire, *όλην*, with its proper affections; so that as we say that the body was proper to Him, the affections of the body may be said to be proper only to Him, even if they did not touch Him as to the Godhead.

² If the works of the Godhead of the Word had not been done through the body, man would not have been ³ deified; and again, if the things proper to the flesh had not been ascribed to the Word, man would not have been wholly delivered from them: if they had ceased for a brief space, sin and corruption would have remained in man, as in the

¹ c. 32. Compare c. 41. Oration iv. c. 7.

² c. 33.

³ *ἐθεοποιήθη*.

men who lived before. For ¹death reigned from Adam unto Moses, even over those that had not sinned after the similitude of Adam's transgression: but now, the Word having been made man, and having appropriated to Himself the things of the flesh, they no longer touch the body, through the Word who is in it, for they are destroyed by Him; and men no longer remain sinners and dead according to their proper affections, but raised up according to the power of the Word remain for ever immortal and incorruptible. Henceforward our generation, γενέσεως, and every fleshly infirmity being transferred to Him, the Word, we are raised from the earth, the curse through sin being loosed through Him who is in us, and became a curse for us. For as being from the earth we all die in Adam; so being born again from above by water and Spirit, we are all quickened in Christ; the flesh being no longer earthly, but being ²made the Word through the Word of God who became flesh for our sake.

¹ Rom. v. 14. Athanasius here says that many have been holy and pure from all sin, that is, have not sinned after the similitude of Adam's transgression, yet have died. He mentions Jeremiah and John the Baptist. The Oxford annotator says, "It is remarkable that no ancient writer (unless indeed we except St. Austin) refers to the instance of St. Mary, perhaps from the circumstance of it not being mentioned in Scripture." Is not this a sufficient reason for being silent on the subject?

² λογωθείσης τῆς σαρκὸς διὰ τὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ λόγον.

¹The Word is impassible: yet ²St. Peter says Christ suffered in the flesh, so that all the affections of the flesh are ascribed to Him, being proper to the flesh, and the body being proper to the Saviour; still He remains as He is, impassible, not being hurt by the affections, but rather blotting them out and destroying them; while we, our affections having been transferred to Him who is impassible and blotted out, we also become impassible and free from them for ever. If, therefore, any heretic should ask the flesh, Why it, being by nature mortal, rises again? or if it rises, why it no longer hungers, and thirsts, and suffers, and remains mortal? the flesh would reply, I am from the earth by nature mortal, but afterwards I became the flesh of the Word, and He carried my affections although impassible; and I was made free from them, being no longer given up to serve them, through the Lord, who delivered me from them. Take care, lest in objecting to the removal of my natural corruption, you do not object to the Word of God for taking upon Him my form of servitude. ³It is only by having regard to the twofold character of Christ, that we can reconcile those passages in which He is represented as acting or speaking as God (*θεϊκῶς*), through the instrument, His proper body, to those in which He is represented as speaking or suffering

¹ c. 34. Oration iv. c. 7.² 1 Pet. iv. 1.³ c. 35.

as man; and thus escape the error either of looking exclusively at the former and denying the reality of His body, or of looking exclusively at the latter, and denying the presence of the Word in the flesh.

¹The texts in which power, judgment, &c. are said to be given to the Son, show that He is *not* the Father, and thus serve to refute the error of Sabellius. He is not the Father, but the Word and eternal Son of the Father; and on account of His likeness to the Father and because He is Son, He has from the Father that which He eternally has. The expressions *is given*, *is delivered*, and the like, do not detract from the Godhead of the Son, but rather show Him to be truly Son. For if all things are given to Him, He is different from the things which He has received; and if He is Heir of all things, He is not one of them, but is the only Son and proper to the Father according to His essence. Christ Himself ²says, “As the Father has life in Himself, so has He given also to the Son to have life in Himself.” The particle *so* bespeaks His natural likeness and propriety to the Father: As the Father has life, so the Son has. There never was a time when the Son had it not, unless there was also a time when the Father had it not. Whatever the Son says that He has received, He always has, yet He has from the Father. The Son has it

¹ c. 36.

² John ii. 26.

from the Father, the Father from no one. The Father, having given all things to the Son, has them again in the Son; and the Son having them, the Father ¹ again has them: for the Godhead of the Son is the Godhead of the Father.

¹ The Oxford annotator here observes on the word again, *πάλιν*:—"this iteration is not duplicative in respect to God; though *how* this is, is the inscrutable mystery of the Trinity in Unity. Nothing can be named which the Son is in Himself as distinct from the Father; we are but told His relation towards the Father, and thus the sole meaning which we are able to attach to Person, is a relation of the Son towards the Father; and distinct from and beyond that relation, He is but the one God, who is also the Father. In other words, there is an indestructible essential relation existing in the one indivisible infinitely simple God, such as to constitute Him, viewed on each side of that relation, what (in human language we call) two, yet without the notion of number really coming in. See note on Oration iv. c. 2. When we speak of 'Person,' we mean nothing more than the one God in substance, viewed relatively to Him the one God, as viewed in that correlative which we therefore call another Person. These various statements are not here intended to explain, but to bring home to the mind *what* it is which faith receives. We say Father, Son, and Spirit, but when we would abstract a general idea of them in order to number them, our abstraction does but really carry us back to the one Substance." The statements certainly explain nothing, but they appear to me to destroy the notion of the distinct personality of the Father, Son, and the Spirit; and the author of the Athanasian Creed, according to this view, was ill-employed in introducing so repeatedly as he has the notion of number. Every one who recites that Creed, supposes it to assert that there are three distinct persons, not merely three relations in the Godhead. See the note on Oration ii. c. 33. Cudworth states the doctrine of the ancient orthodox Fathers to be, that the essence of the Godhead, in which three persons or hypostases agree, as each of them is God, is not one singular and individual, but one common

¹ With respect to the texts, which, according to the Arians, implied ignorance on the part of Christ, Athanasius answers, That sometimes, as ² in the case of the loaves, Christ put the question, not because He was ignorant, but in order to prove Philip. The same answer is applicable to the inquiry respecting the place where Lazarus was laid, and respecting the opinion entertained by men of His own origin. There is no ignorance in the Godhead: to be ignorant is proper to the flesh. He who asked where Lazarus was laid, pronounced, ³ while yet afar off, that Lazarus was dead. He whom the Arians suppose to be ignorant, foreknew the reasonings of the disciples, and knew what was in the heart of each, and what is in man; and above all, He alone knows the Father. As the Word, He could not but know all things: He knew, therefore, where Lazarus was laid; but having endured all things for our sake, He also ⁴ carried our ignorance, in order that He might of free grace give us to know His own, the only true

essence: that there is a sameness, not of singular or numerical, but of generical essence. Still there are three *οὐσίαι*, three singular existent essences, as well as three *υποστάσεις*. pp. 601. 608. He states the notion of the Lateran Council to be, that there is a Trinity of persons, numerically the same, or having one and the same singular essence. p. 604. Is this the notion of the annotator?

¹ cc. 37, 38.

² John vi. 6. *τοῦτο δὲ ἔλεγε πειράζων αὐτόν· αὐτὸς γὰρ ᾔδει τί ἔμελλε ποιῆν.*

³ John xi. 19.

⁴ *βαστάξας.*

Father, and Himself who was sent for our sakes for the salvation of all. When, therefore, He speaks of being ignorant, of power being given to Him, of receiving glory, He must be understood to speak after the fashion of men in respect to His body. He is said to receive what He received after the fashion of men, not because He had need of it, but that He receiving *as the Lord*, and the gift resting in Him, the grace might remain sure. For if He received it *as a man*, He might have lost it, as Adam lost what he received. But that the grace may be inadmissible and sure to man, He appropriates the gift to Himself, and says that He has received as man the power which He always had as God; and He who glorifies others, asks the Father to glorify Him, in order to show that He has flesh which needs to be glorified. Wherefore the flesh, receiving power and glory, since while it receives them it is in Him, and He by taking it was made man, He is said Himself to receive them.

¹ If it were otherwise, and the Word became flesh in order that He might receive that which He had not before, far from promoting the body, He must be rather said to be ² promoted by the body; and man could derive no benefit from His incarnation. But if the Word came in order that He might re-

¹ cc. 39, 40, 41.

² βελατιωθείς.

deem the human race, and became flesh in order that He might sanctify and deify man, it is plain that He received what He is said to have received when He became flesh, not on His own account, but on account of the flesh. Before He said ¹ that all things were delivered to Him, He was Lord of all, for all things were made by Him; and ² He was one Lord, by whom are all things; and before He asked for glory, ³ He was and is the Lord of glory. So also with respect to the power which He said that He received after the resurrection, He had it before the resurrection; for ⁴ He rebuked Satan, and gave His disciples power over him: He expelled devils, and forgave sins, and raised the dead. That which He had being the Word, He, when He was made man and after His resurrection, states Himself to have received after the fashion of man; to the end that upon earth, through Him, men, as partakers of the Divine nature, may henceforward have power over devils; and in heaven, as being delivered from corruption, may reign for ever. The Word was made flesh; He wrought the works of the Father through the flesh; and ⁵ the affections of the flesh

¹ Luke x. 22.

² 1 Cor. viii. 6.

³ 1 Cor. ii. 8.

⁴ Luke iv. 8.

⁵ One instance given by Athanasius of the exhibition of human affections by Christ, is when He chid (*ἐπέληττε*) His mother, saying, "Woman, what have I to do with thee? mine hour is not yet come." John ii. 4. On this the Oxford annotator observes, "It is remarkable that Athanasius dwells on these words as im-

were exhibited in Him. He was true God in the flesh, and true flesh in the Word: by His works He made Himself known as the Son of God, and made known His own Father; and by the affections of the flesh He showed that He bore a true body, which was proper to Him.

¹ Athanasius proceeds to Mark xiii. 32, in which

plying our Lord's humanity, i. e. because Christ appeared to *decline* a miracle" (he should have added, as Athanasius adds, "and immediately performed it"), "when one reason assigned for them by the Fathers is, that He wished, in the words *τί μοι καί σοι*, to remind St. Mary that He was the Son of God, and must be about His Father's business. Nothing can be argued from St. Athanasius's particular word here commented on how he would have taken the passage" (the annotator means, I conclude, what sense he meant to convey by the word *ἐπέπληττε*, for it is certain that he understood the *passage* of the humanity of our Lord). "That the tone of our Lord's words is indeed (judging humanly and speaking humanly) cold and distant, is a simple fact, but it may be explained variously. It is observable that *ἐπιπλήττει* and *ἐπιτιμᾷ* are the words used, for our Lord's treatment of His own sacred body; but they are very vague words, and have a strong meaning or not, as the case may be." The annotator refers to a note on c. 55, in which there is a reference to a comment of Theophylact on John xi. 33, who says that in that verse He chides and rebukes His human nature by the Spirit. The words of St. John are *ἐνεβριμήσατο τῷ πνεύματι καὶ ἐτύραξεν ἑαυτόν*. I see nothing in the context to justify Theophylact's interpretation. The words are expressive of the deep sympathy felt by Christ with Mary and Martha in their grief, and thus give proof of His human nature. The object of the annotator is sufficiently obvious; he does not wish the authority of Athanasius to be produced, to show that the blessed Virgin could be the object of rebuke by her Son; and he, therefore, endeavours to explain away the meaning of the word *ἐπέπληττε*.

¹ cc. 42, 43, 44.

Christ says that the Son knew not of the day and hour of judgment. It is absurd, he says, to suppose that He, by whom all things were made, times and seasons, and night and day, should be ignorant of His own work. Christ enumerated all the works which were to precede the day and hour of His second coming: He must, therefore, have known the day and hour. Why, when He knew them, He did not reveal them to His disciples, it would be presumptuous to inquire. It is plain that He meant to say that He was ignorant of them, according to the flesh, as man. He knew them as Word, but ¹ was

¹ The Oxford annotator here remarks that "the doctrine of the Church is, that in fact Christ was not ignorant, even in His human nature, according to its capacity, since it was from the first taken out of its original and natural condition, and deified by its union with the Word. — Though Christ took on Him a soul which, left to itself, had been partially ignorant, as other human souls, yet as ever enjoying the beatific vision from its oneness with the Word, it never was ignorant really, but knew all things which human souls can know. However, this view of the sacred subject was received by the Church after St. Athanasius's day, and it cannot be denied that he, and others of the most eminent Fathers, use language which, *primâ facie*, is inconsistent with it." What is here meant by *primâ facie*, I do not understand; the language of Athanasius is as express as language can be: he asserts distinctly that Christ was ignorant as man; his answer to the Arian objection turns entirely upon this supposition. The annotator adds, "Of course it is not meant that our Lord's soul has the same perfect knowledge as He has as God." But in the text under discussion, the Son is placed, with reference to ignorance of the day and hour, on the same footing with men and angels. Athanasius makes no allusion to *different degrees* of knowledge in Him as man and as God. In the text Christ is said not to know; He must know as God; it is, therefore, as

ignorant as man. He says, “neither the Son:” not “neither the Son of God:” lest the Godhead should appear to be ignorant: the ignorance belonged to the Son who was born of man. Christ, after saying that the angels did not know, does not say that the Holy Spirit was also ignorant. If, therefore, the

man that He is ignorant. I would ask further, when was the doctrine put forth by the annotator,—a doctrine not possessing the qualification, “quod semper, quod ubique, quod ab omnibus,”—received as the *doctrine of the Church*, and why was the clearly-expressed opinion of Athanasius and others of the most eminent Fathers not only set aside, in order to make way for the opinion of later Fathers, but even, according to Petavius, marked as heresy? See note on cc. 44. 46. The Benedictine editor, however, says that the opinion of Athanasius does not appear to have been condemned anciently, unless it was connected with some other error. The later opinion certainly affords no answer to the Arian objection: unless we say, with some of the Fathers, that Christ spoke œconomically, that He professed ignorance, though He was not ignorant. This the annotator feels; for in a note on c. 45, he adds, “It is a question to be decided, whether our Lord speaks of actual ignorance in His human mind, or of the natural ignorance of that mind considered as human; ignorance *in* or *ex naturâ*, or which comes to the same thing, whether He spoke of a real ignorance, or of an œconomical or professed ignorance in a certain view of His incarnation or office.” By whom can this question be decided, excepting by Christ Himself; and is there no presumption in raising it? The early Fathers drew a distinction between that which Christ did or said as God, and as the Conductor of the Gospel œconomy or dispensation: and this is equivalent to what Athanasius says. Theodoret, however, as quoted by the annotator, was far from approving of the principle of œconomy:—“If He knew the day, and wishing to conceal it, said He was ignorant, see what blasphemy is the result: Truth tells an untruth.” But this, according to the annotator, was said in controversy.

Holy Spirit was not ignorant, much less could the Word, in that He is Word, from whom the Spirit receives, be ignorant: and the silence of Christ, respecting the Holy Spirit, also shows that when He said, *neither the Son*, He spoke of His human ministry, λειτουργίας. In thus saying that He was ignorant in His human, He shows that He knew all things in His Divine nature. Of the Son who knew not the day, it is written that He alone knows the Father. ¹ If, therefore, He knows the Father, He must know the whole of creation, and, consequently, the end. If the day and hour are ordained by the Father, they are ordained by the Son; for the Father does every thing by the Son. If whatever is the Father's is the Son's; if the Father is in the Son, and the Son in the Father; if the Son is the true image of the Father, He must know what the Father knows, and, consequently, the day and hour.

² Athanasius, still pursuing the same train of reasoning, refers to the parallel passage in St. Matthew's Gospel, in which Christ, having said that the Father alone knows the day and the hour, introduces a description of the careless security in which men were

¹ This argument is used by Epiphanius, lxi. c. 43, who says also, that to suppose Christ to be ignorant of the day of judgment is to place Him on a level with His disciples, whom He exhorted to watch because they were ignorant of it. c. 44.

² c. 45. Matthew xxiv. 36. It is observable that the Son is not mentioned as ignorant of the day.

living in the days of Noah, and of their ignorance of the approach of the deluge until it actually came. But though they did not know, the Word did; for He it was who brought on the deluge, and 'opened the windows of heaven, and broke up the fountains of the great deep. It is not easy to see in what manner this passage bears upon the question. The only inference from it seems to be, that as the Son, as Word, before He took flesh, foreknew the time of the deluge; so, after He took flesh, He must foreknow the day of judgment. ² Athanasius draws his next illustration from the parable of the wise and foolish virgins, and from the exhortation with which Christ concludes it. He tells his disciples to watch, because they know not the day and hour of the coming of the Son of man. The virgins knew not the hour of the coming of the Bridegroom; but Christ, who is the Bridegroom, knew. So the Son, who appointed the day and hour of His coming, must know them. He said, *neither the Son*, according to the flesh, *σαρκικῶς*, on account of the body, to show that He was ignorant as man; for ignorance is proper to man; but as the Word He knew. ³ St. Paul, in describing what he

¹ Genesis vii. 11.

² c. 46. Athanasius here says that as Christ, having been made man, hungered, and thirsted, and suffered with man, so also with man, He was ignorant as man. If we call in question the ignorance of Christ in His human nature, are we also to doubt the reality of His suffering in His human nature?

³ c. 47. 2 Cor. xii. 2.

saw when he was caught up into the third heaven, says that he knows not whether he was in or out of the body, but that God knoweth. Either, then, he knew, or did not know, what happened to him in the vision. If we say that he did not know, we run the hazard of falling into the error of Montanus, who held that the prophets know neither what they do, nor concerning what they announce. But if we say that he did know, although he said that he did not (for he had within himself Christ revealing all things to him), why will not the Arians allow that Christ also knew, although He said that He did not? St. Paul, who was caught up, must have known how he was caught up; but he professed ignorance for two reasons: ¹ one assigned by himself, lest, through the abundance of the revelation, any one should think of him above what he saw in him: the other, that, as the Saviour had said, *I know not*, it was fitting that St. Paul also should say *I know not*, lest the servant should appear to be above his Lord, and the disciple above the Master.

² Why, then, did Christ say that He did not know? Athanasius answers, in so saying He ³ con-

¹ It is very difficult to believe that the latter of these reasons occurred to St. Paul.

² c. 48.

³ The Oxford annotator here remarks: "This expression, which repeatedly occurs in this and the following sections, surely im-

sulted our advantage. He foretold the events to precede the end, that we might not think them strange, nor be troubled when they happened, but might from them be prepared to expect the end; and He chose not to say, according to the Godhead, that He knew the day and the hour; but He said, according to the flesh, for the sake of the flesh which was ignorant, that He did not know; that His disciples might no longer question Him, and He might not thenceforward, either by not speaking grieve them, or, by speaking, do that which might be prejudicial to them and to us all. As He was made flesh for our sakes, so, for our sakes, He said that He did not know. After His resurrection He used a different language; and when the disciples questioned Him, He did not answer, *I do not know*, but ¹ “It is not for you to know the times or the seasons, which the Father hath put in His own power.” The flesh had risen, and had put off mortality, and was deified: He was now about to ascend into Heaven; it was, therefore, no longer fitting that He should speak as a man according to the flesh.

plies that there was something œconomical in our Lord’s profession of ignorance. He said with a purpose, not as a mere plain fact or doctrine.” Athanasius himself seems to have felt that his interpretation of the words *neither the Son*, laid Christ open to the charge of saying what was not true; and he adds, that Christ did not tell an untruth, because He spoke humanly, as a man.

¹ Acts i. 7.

¹ In saying that no one, neither the angels nor the Son, knew, Christ has furnished us with a warning not to be misled by deceivers who may arise and pretend to predict the end. We may reply to them, You cannot know the end, for the Son knew it not. It is moreover much for the profit of men that they should not know the day of the end, lest they should become careless in the intermediate time, and defer the work of repentance and amendment till its near approach. The uncertainty in which they are impresses upon them the necessity of being always in a state of preparation. ² Athanasius produces texts in which God asks questions, as of Adam, "Where art thou?" of Cain, "Where is Abel, thy brother?" Unless, therefore, we are prepared to say that these questions prove ignorance in God, why should similar questions prove ignorance in the Son?

¹ c. 49.

² c. 50. Genesis iii. 9. iv. 9. But Athanasius adds that God asked these questions in the Son, ὁ υἱὸς, ἐν ᾧ τότε ἐπυρθάνετο ὁ Θεός. The Oxford annotator remarks, "But the difficulty of the passage lies in its signifying that there is a sense in which the Father knows what the Son knows not." Petavius, after St. Augustine, meets this by explaining it to mean that our Lord, *as sent* from the Father on a mission, was not to reveal all things, but observed a silence and professed an ignorance on those points which it was not good for His brethren to know. "*As Mediator and Prophet He was ignorant;*" in other words, as the Conductor of the Gospel dispensation.

¹ Athanasius goes on to the consideration of Luke ii. 52: "Jesus advanced in wisdom and stature, and in favour with God and man." Christ is God bearing flesh, for the Word became flesh. But it is evident that the Word cannot advance; if He could, He must have been imperfect before He became flesh, and the flesh was rather a cause of perfection to Him, than He to the flesh. But He who supplies perfection to others, cannot Himself be imperfect; nor He who is the Wisdom of God grow in wisdom; nor He who supplies grace grow in grace (favour). ² Advance belongs to men; and the Son of God, since He could not advance, being perfect in the Father, humbled Himself for us, that in His humiliation we might be able to increase. His humiliation consisted in taking our flesh; our advance in renouncing things sensible and coming to the Word Himself. The evangelist, by introducing the word "stature," shows that the text is to be

¹ cc. 51, 52, 53. Θεός ἐστι σάρκα φέρων.

² The Oxford annotator here remarks, "It is the doctrine of the Church that Christ, as man, was perfect in knowledge from first, as if ignorance were scarcely separable from sin, and were the direct consequence and accompaniment of original sin." After quoting St. Austin, he goes on, "as to the limits of Christ's perfect knowledge as man, Petavius observes, that we must consider that the soul of Christ knew all things that are, or ever will be, or ever have been, but not what are only in part, not in full." I would fain ask, whence Petavius obtained his knowledge?

understood of the body. ¹ As the body advanced, the manifestation of the Godhead advanced in it. The advance was gradual: as a child, Christ was carried to the Temple; as a boy, he remained there and questioned the priests about the law; till at length the body coming to maturity, and the Word manifesting Himself in it, He was confessed by St. Peter first, then by all, to be truly the Son of God. Thus it was that, as the Godhead was more and more revealed in Him, Jesus grew in grace before men.

² Athanasius gives the same answer to the ob-

¹ "It is remarkable," the Oxford annotator observes, "that here Athanasius should resolve our Lord's advance in wisdom merely to its gradual manifestation through the flesh; and it increases the proof that his statements are not to be taken in the letter, and as if fully brought out and settled." This is an ingenious mode of setting aside any statements which are at variance with what the annotator calls the doctrine of the Church. Yet he admits that some of the Fathers took the same view, though others spoke of Jesus as growing in wisdom *as man*. The Benedictine editor of Ambrose considers the advancement of knowledge spoken of to be that of the *scientia experimentalis*, alluded to in Heb. v. 8: "He learned obedience through the things which He suffered," which is one of the three kinds of knowledge possessed by Christ as man. Petavius, however, omits the consideration of this knowledge, which St. Thomas first denied in the Lord, and in his *Summa* ascribes to Him, as lying beyond his province. "De hac lite neutram in partem pronuntiare audeo. Hujusmodi enim quæstiones ad scholas relegandæ sunt, de quibus nihil apud antiquos liquidi ac definiti reperitur." Is not this remark equally applicable to his own speculations respecting the limits of Christ's perfect knowledge as man?

² cc. 54, 55, 56. Athanasius says, in c. 55, that the Word who performed the miracles, showed that He had a body liable

jections founded by the Arians on the texts in which Christ is said to have been troubled, to have wept, to have prayed that the cup might pass from Him, to have said that God had forsaken Him. These texts cannot be understood of the Word, in His own nature as the Word; but the Word was in the flesh which is subject to these affections: they must be understood, therefore, of His human body. If He had not taken a corruptible and mortal body,—for the holy Mary, from whom His body was, was mortal,—the affections of His body could not have taken place in one who was incorporeal. But as they were proper to the flesh, and He was in the flesh, they are ascribed to Him, ¹ although He suffered nothing, for the Word is impassible.

² With respect to Christ's prayer that the cup might pass from Him, Athanasius says that ³He willed

to affections, τὸ σῶμα παθητὸν δεικνύς, by permitting it to weep and hunger. On this the Oxford annotator says, "This our Lord's suspense or permission at His will of the operations of His manhood, is a great principle in the doctrine of the Incarnation." He adds, "The Eutychians perverted this doctrine, as if it implied that our Lord was not subject to the laws of human nature." Undoubtedly, the language of Athanasius implies that He was not subject to them, excepting when He *permitted* His body to be subject to them.

¹ καίτοι μηδὲν πάσχωτος· ἀπαθὴς γὰρ ἦν ὁ λόγος. c. 56.

² cc. 57, 58.

³ Athanasius seems here to represent the two wills of Christ—the divine and human, as opposed to each other; the human, because of the weakness of the flesh, prays against the passion, but

that which He deprecated, since He came for that very end : it was His to will, but it belonged to the flesh to fear. He uttered the prayer, therefore, in order to show that He was God who willed, but that having been made man He had flesh which feared, and for the sake of which He mingled His own will with human weakness, to the end that, in turn destroying ¹it, He might render man fearless as to death : hence the boldness of the apostles and martyrs. It was not the Godhead that was fearful ; but the Saviour was taking away our fearfulness. After having quoted Psalm xv. 10, Athanasius says it was fitting that the flesh, being corruptible, should not

the divine is willing. The Oxford annotator admits that such an objection may be drawn from the passage ; and says, "The whole of our Lord's prayer is offered by Him as man, because it is a prayer : the first part is not from Him as man, but the second, which corrects it, is from Him as God : but the former part is from the sinless infirmity of our nature, the latter from His human will, expressing its acquiescence in His Father's will, that is, in the Divine will." I am not sure that I understand this passage ; but if I do, I concur in the annotator's interpretation of the prayer. In both parts Christ speaks as man : in the first part He speaks from the natural infirmity of the flesh : "Let this cup pass from Me ;" in the second, from the spirit of pious submission to the Divine will, which in man would be the fruit of Divine grace : "Nevertheless, not as I will, but as Thou wilt." We may conceive a pious man uttering both parts of the prayer. Compare *de Incarnatione et contra Arianos*, c. 21. In a subsequent note the annotator observes, "It is Catholic doctrine that our Lord, as man, submitted to death of His free will, and not as obeying an express command of the Father."

¹ *τοῦτο*, which seems to mean the affection rising from the mingling of His will with human fear.

continue mortal according to its own nature, but through the Word which put it on, should remain permanently, διαμένειν, incorruptible; for as He, being in our body, imitated our affections, so we, receiving Him, partake of immortality from Him. The Word permitted His proper body to suffer; for He came for the very purpose that He might suffer in the flesh, and the flesh thereby be rendered impassible and immortal; and that the reproach and the other sufferings having reached unto Him, they might no longer touch men, but be entirely blotted out by Him; and that man might for ever remain incorruptible, as the temple of the Word.

¹ Having answered the Arian objections founded on texts of Scripture, Athanasius proceeds to an objection of a different character. The Arians said, you must admit that the Son was begotten by the Father, ² at His will and pleasure. Athanasius answers, this language in the mouth of a Catholic would excite no suspicion, but in the mouth of an Arian it means, that there was a time when the Son was not, and the Son was made from things that were not, and is a creature. In every part of Scrip-

¹ cc. 59, 60.

² βουλήσει καὶ θελήσει. Athanasius charges the Arians with borrowing these words from the Valentinians. The ante-Nicene Fathers speak of Christ as being the Son of God according to the will and power of God. See the note of the Oxford annotator.

ture the existence of the Word is affirmed, but no where is He said to be by will, nor indeed to be *made* at all. The words will and pleasure are used only of created things, since by nature they once did not exist, and a precedent will and pleasure were necessary to call them into existence. Asterius, who appears to have been the chief advocate of the objection, puts it in the form of a dilemma: "Either it is unworthy of the Creator to make at will, τὸ θέλοντα ποιεῖν;—then let the willing, τὸ θέλειν, be put aside in all cases, that His dignity may be preserved unimpaired;—or it is fitting to God to will: then let it obtain also in the case of the first offspring. For it is not possible that it should be fitting for the one and the same God, with reference to created things, to will and not to will." Athanasius says that Asterius has here confounded that which is begotten with that which is made, γέννημα with ποίημα, and has concluded the Son to be one of all things begotten, because it is fitting to use the terms will and pleasure with reference to things made.

¹The Creator deliberated before He made the things which were not, but were made externally to Himself; but He did not deliberate before He begat His proper Word, begotten from Him by nature: for in Him God the Father makes and frames those

things on which He deliberates. With respect to all things which are regenerated or at the first made, the will of God is in His Word, in which He makes or regenerates that which seems right to Him. If, therefore, His will is in Him in whom He makes, and the will of the Father is in Christ, how can Christ be made at will and pleasure? If He were, the will concerning Him must necessarily consist in some other Word, through whom He Himself was made. For it has been shown that the will of God is not in the things made, but in Him through whom and in whom all things were made.

¹ Asterius rejoined, If His Son did not come into being by will, then God had a Son by necessity, and against His will. Athanasius answers, that as that which is beside our mind is opposed to will, so that which is ² by nature transcends and precedes deliberation. That which is prepared by deliberation has a beginning of existence, and is external to the Maker: but the Son is the proper offspring of the Father's essence, and is not external to the Father; wherefore the Father does not deliberate concerning Him, lest He should appear to deliberate concerning

¹ c. 62.

² The Oxford annotator observes, "Really nature and will go together in the Divine Being, but in order, as we regard them, nature is first, will second, and the generation belongs to nature, not to will."

Himself. God is good and pitiful: is He so by will? if by will, it is possible that He may cease to be good and pitiful. But this is absurd. Is He then good and pitiful of necessity? It is absurd to suppose that God is subject to necessity: He is good and pitiful by nature; much more is He Father of the Son by nature, not by will.

¹ Athanasius goes on to say, that the question raised by the Arians applies to the Father as well as to the Son; and they might as well ask whether the Father exists, having first deliberated and then willed, or whether He existed before deliberation? It is not allowable to put such a question; for it is sufficient for us merely to hear God spoken of, and to know and understand that He is the self-existent. Nor is the question more allowable with reference to the Word of God; since it is sufficient for us merely to hear the Word of God spoken of, and to know and understand that God, who exists not by will, has His proper Word not by will, but by nature. ² The Son, being the living will or counsel and power of the Father, and the Maker of that which seems good to the Father, does not allow us to think of any will before Himself.

¹ c. 63.

² αὐτὸς ὡς βουλὴ ζωσα τοῦ πατρός. Athanasius here refers to Isaiah ix. 6, where the Son is called in the Septuagint, ἄγγελος τῆς μεράλης βουλῆς.

¹ If the Word is the Counsel and Will of the Father, He cannot Himself come into being by counsel and will like created things. If He could, He must come into being by Himself, or by some other, who must also in turn come to be; so that we shall, like Valentinus, introduce a succession of Words. If will precedes in the Father, then the Son does not truly say, "I in the Father," or at least He only holds a second place, since will precedes Him, in which all things were made, and He Himself subsisted, according to the Arians.

² If they say that the Son is by will, or counsel, let them also say that He is by understanding *φρόνησει*, since counsel and understanding are the same. But instead of acknowledging the Son to be Word and living Counsel of God, they make understanding, wisdom, counsel in God, as in man, a habit, ³ which comes to and departs from Him. The Son of God is the Word and the Wisdom, the Understanding and the living Counsel; in Him is the good pleasure of the Father: He is Truth, and Light, and Power of the Father. The Apostle does not say that He is the proper radiance and expression of the Father's will, but of the Father's essence. If the Father's

⁴ Essence and Subsistence be not from will, neither is

¹ c. 64.

² c. 65.

³ ὥς ἔστιν συμβαίνουσιν καὶ ἀποσυμβαίνουσιν.

⁴ οὐσία καὶ ὑπόστασις, which seem here to be synonymous.

that which is proper to the Father's subsistence from will. The Father does not say of Him, "This is my Son, whom I have brought into being by my will, nor whom I had according to my good pleasure;" but "This is my Son in whom I am well pleased;" meaning, "This is my Son by nature, and in Him is deposited my will about those things which please me."

¹ Since then the Son is by nature and not by will, is He not with the Father's will and pleasure? He is; for as the Father did not begin to be good from will, and yet is not good without will and pleasure; for what is, that is also willed by Him; so the being of the Son, though He began not to be from will, is not without the Father's pleasure. As He is the willer of His own subsistence, so also the Son, being proper to His essence, is by His pleasure. To say that He came to be of will, implies that once He was not; and the possibility that the Father might not even will the Son. But to say that the Son might not have been, is to say that what is proper to the Father might not have been. It is the same as to say that the Father might not have been good. But

The Oxford annotator remarks, that in these orations the word *ὑπόστασις* seldom occurs, excepting as contained in Hebrews i. 3; though *τρεῖς ὑποστάσεις* occurs in other works of Athanasius. See Oratio iv. c. 1.

¹ c. 66.

as the Father ¹ is always good, so is He always generative by nature ; and there is no preceding will in the generation of the Son, but He is the Father's natural offspring, and the Father's good pleasure is in Him.

² Athanasius concludes with saying that the Arians should not ask women whether they had a child before they bare him ; but should ask fathers, whether they by deliberation became fathers, or by nature and of their will ? or whether their children were like to them in nature and essence ? The fathers would answer, ³ “ What we begat is not of will, but is like to us : nor did we become parents by deliberation, but it is proper to nature to beget ; for we are also the image of them who begat us.” It is fitting, Athanasius says, to use these illustrations drawn from human things, because the Arians reason from human things to the Godhead.

I concur in the opinion expressed by the Oxford annotator in the Introduction to the fourth Discourse, that it cannot be called a Discourse against the Arians, but is rather a collection of remarks on different heresies, the Photinian, Sabellian, and that of Paul of Samosata : a very small portion being

¹ ἀεὶ γεννητικός τῇ φύσει. See Oration iv. c. 4.

² c. 67. Athanasius in this chapter also quotes Psalm xlv. 1.

³ This illustration is scarcely applicable : for in the case of human parents an act of the will precedes begetting : though this is not the case in the generation of the Son.

directed against the Arians. The annotator thinks that the remarks are more immediately directed against Marcellus, whose disciple Photinus was.

The fourth chapter is directed against the Arian notion, that God has within Himself His proper Wisdom and proper Word, not Christ, but Him in whom God made Christ. If this is so, if Christ was made in that Word, it is plain that it must be the Word, of whom St. John says, that all things were made by Him. Christ, therefore, must have spoken untruly, when He said, "*I in the Father*," since it is another who is in the Father. Nor is it true according to them that the Word was made flesh; for if He in whom all things were made, was made flesh, and Christ is not the Word in the Father, by whom all things were made, then Christ was not made flesh. But Christ was perhaps named the Word. If this be so, then first He is ¹ some one else beside the name, He bears the name of another; and, next, all things were made, not by Him, but in Him in whom Christ was also made. Or, perhaps, they will say that Wisdom in the Father is a quality, or ² very Wisdom: but various absurdities will flow from this supposition; for He will be compounded, and be His own Father and Son. Let them then acknowledge the truth, that the Word is in God, and that

¹ ἄλλος ἂν εἴη παρὰ τὸ ὄνομα.

² αὐτοσοφίαν.

it is Christ who says, "I in the Father, and the Father in Me:" and on this account is called only-begotten, because no other was begotten from the Father. He is the one Son, who is Word, Wisdom, Power: God is not compounded of these, but is generator, *γεννητικός*, of them, since He has the Word, by nature the offspring of His essence, by whom He frames, and creates, and administers all things.

¹ Moses, addressing the Israelites, says to them, "Ye who have attached yourselves to God:" from this we may collect that the Son is not a creature. For the Son says, "I and the Father are one;" and "I in the Father, and the Father in Me:" but created things, when they advance, or improve, are attached to the Lord; for they are external to Him, foreign by nature, but attaching themselves by choice: whereas the Son, being proper to the Father, is in Him. Again, God is said ² to draw nigh to created things, as being foreign to them; but He is in the Son, as ³ His own. The Son is not attached to the Father, but co-exists with Him.

⁴ Athanasius next notices the objection founded by the Arians on the texts in which the Lord is said

¹ c. 5. Deut. iv. 4: *προσκέμενοι*. "Ye that did cleave," in our version.

² *ἐγγίζει*. Jer. xxiii. 23.

³ *ὡς ἰδίῳ*.

⁴ c. 6. Oration iii. c. 26, et seq.

to receive, to be exalted, to hunger, to weep, to be weary. Our Lord, he says, being Word and Son of God, bore a body, and became the Son of man, that, becoming the Mediator between God and man, He might minister the things of God to us, and our things to God. He received from us our human affections, in order that He might offer them to the Father; interceding for us, that they might be destroyed in Him. What He received were gifts given from God to us. He became man, in order that the gifts, given as to Him, might pass to us. A mere man would not have been deemed worthy of them; the mere Word would not have needed them: but the Word was united to us, and then made us partakers of power, and highly exalted us. As the Word became flesh, so man received the gifts through the Word; and the Word is said to receive whatever man receives. ¹ As He takes our infirmities, Himself not being infirm, and hungers, not being hungry, but ² offers up that which belongs to us, in order that it may be abolished, so He again receives, instead of our infirmities, gifts from God, that man, being united to Him, may be able to partake of them. Since, therefore, the Word being united to man, God, looking to the Word, gratuitously gave to man to be exalted, to possess all

¹ c. 7. τὰς ἀσθενείας ἡμῶν λαμβάνει οὐκ ἀσθενῶν, καὶ πεινᾷ οὐ πεινῶν. See Oration iii. cc. 32. 41.

² ἀναπέμπει.

power, and other such gifts: on this account they are all referred to the Word, and what we receive through Him, is as if it were given to Him. We must, therefore, understand the expression, "*God gave to Him*," to mean, *gave to us through Him*, and "*God highly exalted*," to mean *highly exalted us in Him*.

¹ Athanasius says that the Eusebians, while they ascribed to the Son a beginning of being, affected not to wish to ascribe a beginning to His reign: but this, he observes, is ridiculous, since the one involves the other. They said also that He was not Word by nature, but only externally.

² Athanasius notices a notion of the Arians, to which reference has been already made,—that the Son was created for our sakes, that He might create us; as if God had waited till our creation, in order that He might emit (the Son) according to some, or create according to others. Thus they ascribed more to men than to the Son; for men were not created for His sake, but He for the sake of men. Nay, they ascribed more to men than to God: for men, though silent and merely thinking, frequently act, inasmuch as their thoughts ³ form themselves

¹ Athanasius here opposes the Arians to the Sabellians for the purpose of exposing the errors of both. Compare Oration iii. cc. 4, 5.

² c. 11.

³ εἰδωλοποιεῖσθαι.

into images; but God, they say, when silent, is ¹ inactive, and only exerts power when He speaks; for while He was silent He could not create, but when He spake He began to create. Again, if the Son was imperfect while existing in God, but, being begotten, became perfect, we are the cause of His perfection, if He was begotten for our sake.

In chap. xv. Athanasius refers to those heretics who separated the Word from the Son, and said that the Word first existed, then the Son. Some said that the man, whom the Saviour took, is the Son; in other words, that the human nature constitutes the Son; others, that the compound, if we may so speak, of the man and the Word, became the Son, when they were united: others, that the Word Himself became the Son, when He became man, inasmuch as He then, from being Word, became Son, not being previously Son, but only Word. All these notions agree in this, that He was not Son previously to the incarnation: Athanasius calls them ² Stoic notions, because they imply that God has been ³ dilated, and deny the Son; and lays down this axiom, ⁴ “That that which is from any thing, is

¹ ἀνενέργητον.

² The doctrine of the Stoics was pantheistic; they supposed the Deity to pervade all creation, in other words, denied His personality; and consequently, that He could have a Son.

³ τό τε πλατύνεσθαι λέγειν τὸν Θεὸν καὶ ἀρνεῖσθαι τὸν υἱόν.

⁴ τὸ ἕκ τινος ὑπάρχον υἱὸς ἐστὶν ἐκείνου, ἐξ οὗ καὶ ἔστιν.

the son of him from whom it is." On this the Oxford annotator observes: "In consequence, it is a very difficult question in theology, why the Holy Spirit is not called 'a Son,' and His procession, generation. This was an objection of the Arians, and Athanasius only answers it by denying that we may speculate. *Ad Serap.* i. 15. Other writers apply, as in other cases, the theological language of the Church to a solution of this question. It is carefully discussed in Petavius." They who feel a real reverence for divine things will agree with Athanasius; and they who raise the question require to be reminded of the layman's rebuke of the disputants at Nicæa, "Christ did not come to teach dialectics." It is enough for us to know that the Holy Spirit is never called Son in Scripture. Athanasius observes that, according to the Arian doctrine, God was first God, and afterwards Father: He was not Father till the Son was begotten.

In the twenty-second chapter Athanasius says, "To this end the Word was made flesh, that, since the Word is Son, He (God) may be called also our Father, through the Son indwelling in us; ¹ for He has sent forth the Spirit of His Son into our hearts, crying *Abba, Father*. Wherefore the Son in us, calling upon His proper Father, causes Him to be

¹ Galatians iv. 6.

called also our Father; for certainly God cannot be called the Father of those in whose hearts the Son is not." The object of Athanasius is to prove that, as some under the Old Testament are spoken of as sons, the Spirit of the Son must have been in their hearts, and consequently the Son must have pre-existed. I refer to the passage, in order to show that, according to Athanasius, the indwelling of the Son in Christians is a spiritual indwelling.

In the twenty-sixth chapter, having said that the words of St. John, ¹ "the only-begotten Son, who is in the bosom of the Father," prove the Son's eternal existence, Athanasius goes on to say, that He whom St. John calls the Son, is called by David the hand, in the following passage: ² "Why withholdest thou thy hand, even thy right hand? pluck it out of thy bosom." His reasoning on the text is, the hand is in the bosom, and the Son is in the bosom; the Son, therefore, is the hand, and the hand the Son, by whom the Father made all things. They whose opinions Athanasius is here confuting, affirmed that there is no mention of the Son in the Old Testament. Without denying the ingenuity

¹ Chap. i. 18.

² Psalm lxxiv. 11. The Oxford annotator refers to Oration ii. c. 31, where the Father is said to have wrought all things in the Word, as by a hand.

displayed by Athanasius in converting this text to his purpose, we may, on looking at it in connexion with the context, be permitted to express a doubt, whether the application which he has made of it ever entered into the mind of the Psalmist himself.

¹ It has been observed that Psalm cx. 3 is quoted by the Fathers in proof of the co-eternity of the Son. Some, however, appear to have interpreted the verse literally, understanding it to be prophetic of the fact that Christ was born of the Virgin by night, before the rising of the morning star; contending also, that the expression *ἐκ γαστροῦς* could not be applied to God. Athanasius answers, that the Scriptures speak of the heart, why not then of the womb of God? It is usual also with the sacred writers to speak of superhuman things in the language of man. If the interpretation of the text thus put forth is the true one, then there was nothing more wonderful in the birth of Christ, than of many others; for many have been born at night, before the rising of the morning star. If, however, we are to interpret the text with reference to the body, the beginning of Christ's generation took place, not when it was announced to the shepherds, but when the angel spake to the Virgin, and then it was not night.

¹ cc. 27, 28. *ἐκ γαστροῦς πρὸ ἑωσφόρου ἐγέννησά σε.* See p. 12, and c. 24 of this tract.

We must observe also that the words are, not *before the rising of the morning star*, but *before the morning star*, that is, before its creation: and as the stars were created before Adam, the body must have existed before Adam. We must look, however, for the interpretation of the passage to Apocalypse xxii. 16, where Jesus testifies of Himself, "I am the root and offspring of David, and the bright and morning star." In the text, therefore, the flesh of the Saviour is called the morning star, before which the offspring of God existed; so that the meaning is, "I begat Thee from Myself before the manifestation in the flesh:" *before the morning star* is equivalent to before the incarnation of the Word.

¹ Athanasius adds that, if the absence of all mention of the Son in the Old Testament proves that He and the Word are not the same, the same reason might be urged for denying that the Paraclete and the Holy Spirit are the same, since there is no mention of the Paraclete in the Old Testament.

² But Christ Himself calls the Holy Spirit the Paraclete, and St. John calls the Word the only-begotten Son.

It appears from the foregoing account of the

¹ c. 29. Athanasius quotes the Odyssey, to prove that the word ἀγαπητός is equivalent to *μοιρογενής*.

² John xiv. 26; i. 24.

Discourses against the Arians, that the objections which they urged against the Catholic doctrine may be classed under two general heads: first, those founded on inferences drawn from the relation between human parents and their children—such as that He who begets must be prior in time to Him who is begotten, and that, consequently, there must have been a time when the Son was not, and God was not a Father—that generation implies an affection in Him who begets, an emission, an efflux, or a division into parts; and that thus the accidents of corporeal things are attributed to the incorporeal God, while the Arian doctrine—that the Son was made of things that were not—leads to none of these consequences. To this class of objections Athanasius replies, that the inference drawn from human generation holds good as to the nature or essence of the Son, since every son is from the essence of his father; but not as to the mode of generation, since we cannot reason from the human to the Divine nature, to which the ideas of time, succession, division are wholly inapplicable. The second class of objections was founded on those texts of Scripture which imply an inferiority in the Son to the Father. Athanasius, as we have seen, enters into a very minute examination of some of the texts, but he gives this general answer with respect to all—that they are to be understood of the state of humiliation in which the Son voluntarily placed Himself, when He took upon

Him our nature in order to effect our redemption. We may think that some of his arguments are rather specious than convincing; that some of the texts which he quotes are inapplicable to the point at issue: and that his interpretations of others are fanciful and far-fetched; but we must, I think, rise from the perusal of the Discourses with the conviction, that the doctrine which he maintains is that which is most in accordance with the natural sense of the language of Scripture, and best harmonizes its apparent discrepancies. I have quoted the judgment of Cudworth respecting the service which Athanasius was appointed to render to the Church of Christ; I will conclude this chapter with a summary of his statement of the doctrine of the Trinity in Unity, as it was maintained by Athanasius.

¹ That the Trinity is not a *Trinity of independent principles*. There is only *one principle or Fountain of the Godhead*, from which the others are derived.

¹ p. 616. ed. fol. He had before shown that Athanasius did not hold the *three hypostases of the Trinity to have one and the same singular essence*, that is, to be monousian or tautoousian. Epiphanius, Hæresis, lxxvi. c. 7. He refers to Oratio iv. c. 1. ὥσπερ δὲ μία ἀρχὴ, καὶ κατὰ τοῦτο εἷς Θεός. De Syn. c. 45. τὴν οὐσίαν τοῦ πατρὸς ἀρχὴν καὶ ῥίζαν καὶ πηγὴν εἶναι τοῦ υἱοῦ. De Dec. Syn. Nic. c. 26. ἥδη καὶ τὴν θεϊαν τριάδα εἰς ἓνα, ὥσπερ εἰς κορυφὴν τινα, τὸν Θεὸν τὸν ὅλων τὸν παντοκράτορα λέγω, συγκεφαλαιοῦσθαι καὶ συνάγεσθαι πᾶσα ἀνάγκη, quoted by Athanasius from a letter of Dionysius of Rome.

If the three hypostases of the Trinity were three independent principles, there could not be any coalescence of them into *one*; but they are closely conjoined into *one God*.

The ¹ three Divine hypostases are not *separate and disjoined* Beings, μεμερισμέναι καὶ κεχωρισμέναι, but *indivisibly united to one another*, ἀδιαίρετοι. This indivisibility is not to be understood as if there were not three in it; but so that neither of them could be without the other; and that they are so nearly and intimately conjoined together, that there is a kind of continuity, συνέχεια, between them, which is not, however, to be understood in the way of corporeal things.

² But not only are the three hypostases *indivisibly conjoined* with one another; they have also a *mutual inexistence* in each other, called by the Greek Fathers ἐμπεριχώρησις, and to be understood after

¹ Hypostasis, according to the sense of the ancient Fathers, meant a singular essence, p. 605. He refers to Oratio iv. c. 10. οὕτως ὁ λέγων ἓνα Θεὸν δύο φρονεῖτω πατέρα καὶ υἱόν, ἔν ὄντας τῇ θεότητι καὶ τῷ ἕξ αὐτοῦ ἀμέριστον καὶ ἀδιαίρετον καὶ ἀχώριστον εἶναι τὸν λόγον ἀπὸ τοῦ πατρός. De Sententia Dionysii, c. 24. ὁ δὲ ἴδιον καὶ ἀδιαίρετον τῆς τοῦ πατρὸς οὐσίας τὸν υἱὸν εἶναι διδάσκει, ὥς ἐστιν ὁ λόγος πρὸς τὸν νοῦν, καὶ ποταμὸς πρὸς τὴν πηγὴν.

² Cudworth refers to a passage in Oratio iii. c. 3: ἔστι γὰρ ὁ υἱὸς ἐν τῷ πατρὶ, κ. τ. ἐ., and de Sent. Dionysii, c. 23: ἀπόρροια γὰρ τοῦ λόγου, κ. τ. ἐ.

a peculiar manner, so as that they are really thereby One; and what the Son and Holy Ghost doth, the Father doth in them.

¹ The *three Divine hypostases* make up *one entire Divinity*; and in this sense the whole Trinity is said by Athanasius to be *μία θεότης, μία φύσις, μία οὐσία, εἰς Θεός*. The word *ὁμοούσιος* is taken by him, not merely for things agreeing in one common and general essence, as *three individual men* are *co-essential* with one another; but also for such as concurrently together make up *one entire thing*, and are therefore jointly essential thereunto. The three hypostases, are not only *congenerous* and *co-essential*, as having all *the essence of the Godhead* alike in them, but also as *concurrently making up one entire Divinity*. Whence Athanasius concludes that they have not a *consent of will* only, but essentially one and the *self-same will*; and that they also jointly produce, *ad extra, μίαν ἐνέργειαν, one and the self-same energy, operation, or action*, nothing being peculiar to the Son as such, but only the œconomy of the incarnation.

¹ Cudworth refers to the first Epistle to Serapion, c. 28 : *τριάς τοίνυν ἁγία καὶ τελεία ἐστὶν, κ. τ. ἔ.*

SOME ACCOUNT
OF THE
TRACT
DE INCARNATIONE CHRISTI.

THIS was one of the earliest works of Athanasius, being a sequel to the Discourse against the Gentiles. There is another tract, entitled *De Incarnatione et Contra Arianos*, the genuineness of which has been questioned. The Benedictine editor, however, deems it genuine, and supposes it to have been written about the year 364. Only a very small portion relates to the doctrine of the Incarnation; the rest is occupied in the discussion of the texts alleged by the Arians to prove the inferiority of the Son to the Father, and in a defence of the doctrine of the Divinity of the Holy Spirit.

¹ Athanasius begins with stating that he shall, before he proceeds to treat of the Incarnation of

¹ c. 1. In c. 4, Athanasius says that, as he was about to treat of the appearance of the Saviour in the flesh, it was necessary for him to refer to the creation of man: inasmuch as man's transgression was the cause of the Saviour's Incarnation.

Christ, speak of the creation of all things, and of God their Creator, since we shall thus be able better to discern the ¹ congruity of the dispensation under which He, who originally created, afterward renewed them. ² Having briefly confuted the notions of the Epicureans, who said that all things came into being spontaneously and by chance; of Plato, who said that they were made out of pre-existent and increate matter; and of the heretics, who said that the Creator was not the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, ³ Athanasius proceeds to deliver the Scriptural doctrine on the subject.—God, by His proper Word, our Lord Jesus Christ, made the universe out of things which were not: and seeing that man could not, agreeably to the condition of his proper nature, endure for ever, did not create men like the irrational animals, but created them according to His own image, making them partakers of the power of His proper Word; so that, having as it were some shadows (*σκιᾶς*) of the Word (or reason), and being made rational, they might remain in a state of blessedness in Paradise. As, however, men were to be endowed with the power of choice, God ⁴ made sure the grace imparted to them by the law which

¹ Compare Oration ii. cc. 14. 16. 53.

² c. 2. In replying to the Epicureans, Athanasius says that we understand from the marks of design, and the order discernible in the works of creation, that there is a God who designs and orders them. See c. 54.

³ c. 3.

⁴ ἡσφαλίστατο.

He gave, and by the place which He assigned them, He placed them in Paradise, and gave them a law. If they observed that law they would lead a life free from grief, and pain, and anxiety, with the promise of incorruption in heaven; but if they transgressed it, they would no longer live in Paradise; but, being cast out, would remain ¹ perpetually in the corruption of death. Men ² did transgress, and received the threatened condemnation of death. As men, when they by nature were not, by the presence and loving-kindness of the Word were called into being: so ³ being emptied of the innate idea of God, and turned back into ⁴ a state of non-existence, they would be emptied of eternal existence, and remain in death and corruption. Man is by nature mortal, as made out of things which were not; but if by constant contemplation he had preserved his likeness to the Self-Existent he would have ⁵ blunted the edge of the natural corruption in him, and remained incorruptible; and, being incorruptible, would have lived thenceforward ⁶ as God.

¹ ἐν τῇ τοῦ θανάτου φθορᾷ διαμένειν. So Athanasius interprets θανάτῳ ἀποθανεῖσθε, Gen. xi. 16.

² c. 4.

³ κενωθέντας τῆς περὶ Θεοῦ ἐγνοίας.

⁴ Athanasius thus explains his own meaning:—οὐκ ὄντα γὰρ ἐστὶ τὰ κακὰ, ὄντα δὲ τὰ καλὰ, ἐπειδήπερ ἀπὸ τοῦ ὄντος Θεοῦ γεγόνασιν. Goodness is existence, being likeness to the self-existent God: wickedness non-existence.

⁵ ἡμβλυνεν.

⁶ The reference is to Psalm lxxii. 6:—ἐγὼ εἶπα, θεοί ἐστε, καὶ υἱοὶ ὑψίστου πάντες.

¹ God not only created us out of things which were not, but conferred upon us by the grace of the Word, the power of living as God (κατὰ Θεόν). Through the Word co-existing with us, our natural corruption would not have touched us; but through the envy of the devil sin entered into the world; and the natural corruption acquired additional strength through the threat denounced against the transgression of the commandment. Man also, having once fallen, became continually more corrupt, till the whole earth was filled with wickedness. ² The natural man, created in the image of God, was ³ effaced, and the work made by God was destroyed. Such then was the strange and unseemly state of things. It was unfitting that God should fail in the fulfilment of His word, by not inflicting the punishment which He had denounced against transgression. On the other hand, it was derogatory from His power and goodness, that the rational creatures which had once been made and had partaken of His Word, should be destroyed, and be reduced into a state of non-existence by corruption. It would have been better never to have brought them into being. It was clearly, therefore, unworthy of the goodness of God to allow corruption to prevail against man, and death to have dominion over him. What ⁴ then

¹ c. 5. Athanasius appears here to make the *original righteousness* of men to consist in the indwelling of the Word.

² c. 6.

³ ἡφαιρίζετο.

⁴ c. 7.

was necessary in order to save both the truth and the power of God? Could He have been satisfied with requiring repentance from man? No: the truth of God would not have been saved, because man could not have been brought under the dominion of death; nor could repentance have restored him to the original condition of his nature; it could only cause him to cease from sin. If there had been only the transgression and corruption had not followed, repentance might have sufficed; but the effect of the transgression was to bring the nature of man under the dominion of corruption, and to deprive him of the grace which he had received when he was created in the image of God. The Word of God, who had originally made all things out of things which were not, being above all things, was alone sufficient to renew all things, to suffer for all, and to intercede concerning all things with the Father.

¹ The incorporeal, incorruptible, and immaterial Word of God came down to our earth, ² condescend-

¹ c. 8. ὁ ἀσώματος ὢν τὴν φύσιν· καὶ δι' ἡμᾶς τῷ σώματι φανείς. c. 38. Athanasius here says, that the Word fills all things through His co-existence with the Father, *συνὼν τῷ ἑαυτοῦ πατρί.*

² *συγκαταβαίνων*, and shortly afterwards, *συγκαταβάς τῇ φθορᾷ ἡμῶν.* See c. 15: *διὰ τῶν εὐτελεστέρων συγκαταβαίνων.* Oratio i. c. 40: *διὰ τὸ ὑψωθῆναι καταβέβηκεν ὁ λόγος. διὰ τὴν τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἀσθένειαν συγκαταβάς.* c. 46. In all these passages the word expresses the condescension of Christ in taking upon Him human nature. See Suicer in v. *συγκαταβαίνω.*

ing (to us) by His loving-kindness towards us ; and by His manifestation, ἐπιφανεία, He took to Himself a body, not foreign to our body, but our body, and that from a pure and spotless Virgin who knew not man, the body itself being unmixed with sexual intercourse. Being powerful and the Creator of all things, He prepared for ¹ Himself in the Virgin a temple, the body, and appropriated it to Himself as

¹ So in c. 18, ἐκ παρθένου πλάττει ἑαυτῷ τὸ σῶμα, and in Oration iv. against the Arians, c. 34, ἐν τῇ ταύτης νηδύϊ ὁ λόγος ἑαυτῷ τὸν οἶκον διεπλάσατο, ὃν τρόπον ἐξ ἀρχῆς τὸν Ἀδὰμ ἐκ τῆς γῆς. Athanasius here refers to Proverbs ix. 1, ἡ σοφία ὠκοδόμησεν ἑαυτῇ οἶκον. Again, Oration ii. c. 7, οὕτως αὐτὸς ἔλαβε τὴν ἀπὸ γῆς σάρκα, Μαρίαν ἀντὶ τῆς ἀνεργάστου γῆς ἐσχηκώς μητέρα τοῦ σώματος, or as we find it stated in another place, Christ received from the Virgin all that God originally employed in the formation of man, sin only excepted ; contra Apollinarius, L. 2. c. 5. He made to Himself a body from the Virgin, not by way of operation (as a newly-made work), but by physical generation, that it might be by nature a body, and also by nature inseparable from the divinity of the Word ; L. 1. c. 6. In the first book against Apollinarius, c. 4, we find ἡ τῆς σαρκὸς ἔνωσις πρὸς τὴν τοῦ λόγου θεότητα ἐκ μήτρας γέγονεν. In the second book, c. 2, ἀοράτως μὲν Θεοῦ νοουμένου καὶ ὄντος ἀληθῶς· ὁρατῶς δὲ ἀνθρώπου ψηλαφουμένου καὶ ὑπάρχοντος ἀληθῶς· οὐκ ἐν διαιρέσει προσώπων ἢ ὀνομάτων, ἀλλὰ φυσικῇ γεννήσει καὶ ἀλύτῳ ἔνωσει : and c. 10, ἐγεννήθη ἐκ γυναικὸς, ἐκ τῆς πρώτης πλάσεως τὴν ἀνθρώπου μορφήν ἐν ἑαυτῷ ἀναστησάμενος, ἐν ἐπιτελείῃ σαρκὸς εἶχα σαρκικῶν θελημάτων καὶ λογισμῶν ἀνθρωπίνων ἐν εἰκόνι καινότητος· ἡ γὰρ θέλησις, θεότητος μόνης, ἐπειδὴ καὶ ἡ φύσις ὅλη τοῦ λόγου, κ. τ. ε. Here, at first sight, Athanasius appears to ascribe only one will, the Divine, to Christ. But see the note of the Benedictine editor, who refers to de Incarnatione et contra Arianos, c. 21, where the distinction between the divine and human wills is clearly expressed. See also Oratio iii. c. 57.

an instrument, being made known and dwelling in it. Thus, having taken to Himself a body like to our body, because we were all liable to the corruption of death, He delivered it to death in the place of all, and ¹ offered it to the Father in His loving-kindness to us all: to the end that, all dying in Him, the law of corruption might be annulled, its power having been fulfilled ² in the Lord's body, and it no longer having any place against man: to the end also that He might turn again to incorruption men who had turned to corruption; and might quicken them from death by the appropriation to Himself of the body, and by the gratuitous gift of the resurrection; thus destroying death in them as straw is destroyed by the fire.

³ The corruption of man could not be destroyed unless all died. The Word being immortal, the Son of God could not die: He therefore took unto Himself a body which could die, in order that this body, partaking of His Word which is over all, might

¹ ἵνα ἔχων τὸ προσφερόμενον αὐτός, ὡς ἀρχιερεύς, ἑαυτὸν προσενέγκῃ τῷ πατρί. Oratio ii. c. 7. See De Sent. Dionys. c. 11.

² ἐν τῷ κυριακῷ σώματι. See also cc. 20. 22. 26. 30. We find ὁ κυριακὸς ἄνθρωπος, Expositio Fidei, c. 1; ἄνευ συνουσίας κυριακὸν σῶμα, c. 3; ὁ ἐκ Μαρίας Θεοῦ ἄνθρωπος, Oratio iv. c. 36.

³ c. 9. εἰ μὴ διὰ τοῦ πάντως ἀποθανεῖν. It appears to me that we should read πάντας.

be a sufficient satisfaction, *ἵκανόν*, to death for all, and yet, through the indwelling Word, might remain incorruptible, and corruption might thenceforth cease from all, through the gift of the resurrection. Thus He paid the debt of man in His death, and He, the incorruptible Son of God, being united to all in the likeness (of the body), clothed all with incorruption in the promise of the resurrection. Athanasius here introduces a not very apposite illustration: As a great monarch, when he takes up his abode in one house of a city imparts protection to all the houses in it; so the Word, having taken to Himself one body like that of man, imparts His own incorruptibility to all mankind, and the corruption of death hath no longer any power against them.

¹ Having shown by a reference to Hebrews ii. 10 that it was fitting that He, by whom man was created, should also be the restorer of man from corruption, and that, in order to effect that restoration, He should offer a body like to that of man, Athanasius goes on to say, that God, ² in order to render men capable of attaining to the comprehension of the Divine nature, made them partakers of His proper Image, our Lord Jesus Christ, and created them in His own image and after His likeness, to the end that, comprehending the image, they might

¹ c. 10. See Oration ii. c. 53.

² c. 11.

through it acquire some ¹ notion of the Father, and know their Creator. ² They might also, through the contemplation of the works of creation, have attained to that knowledge; but they corrupted themselves, and gave themselves up to the worship of idols and to every kind of impiety. God, therefore, in consideration of their weakness, gave them a law, and sent to them prophets to instruct them in His knowledge and in His worship, and in the regulation of their life and conversation. The law was not given, nor were the prophets sent to the Israelites alone, but to the whole human race. They proved, however, ineffectual to reclaim man from the error of his ways; both the Jews and the Gentiles became continually more corrupt. ³ Still it was not fitting that man, who had once partaken of the image of God, should perish. In order, therefore, to renew that image within him, and to enable him again to attain to the knowledge of God, it was necessary that the very image of God, our Saviour Jesus Christ, should come on earth. He alone could renew the image in man: and He took a mortal body that death might be destroyed in Him; and that man, originally made in the image, might be renewed in it. ⁴ He alone could fulfil this office, could ⁵ regenerate the soul, and renew it after the image; could

¹ ἐννοίαν.² c. 12.³ c. 13.⁴ c. 14.⁵ ἀναγεννώμεν.

effectually ¹ teach mankind, and ² by the works which He did in the body bring them to the knowledge of the Word of God dwelling in the body, and through Him to the knowledge of the Father.

³The Word humbled Himself to appear in the body, that He might, as man, draw men to Himself, and turn their senses to Himself; and, by the works which He did, persuade those who saw Him as a man that He was not a mere man, but God, and the Word and Wisdom of the true God. He ⁴expanded Himself, as it were, above, below, in the deep, and ⁵in breadth: above in the creation, below in His incarnation, in the deep by descending ⁶to the place of departed spirits, in breadth in the world: so that all things were filled with the knowledge of God. Himself invisible, He manifested Himself as the Word of God, and the Ruler and King of the universe by His works. ⁷He was not so enclosed in the body as not to be elsewhere; nor while He set it in motion was the universe ⁸emptied of His energy

¹ In c. 10, Athanasius had said that Christ came, not only to offer Himself as a sacrifice for sin, but also to correct the careless conversation of man by His teaching.

² Athanasius shows in the following chapter how this was effected.

³ c. 16.

⁴ ἀπλώσαντος. So in c. 17, ἐφαπλῶν; in c. 19, ἐφαπλώσας; in c. 44, ἡπλώσεν; in c. 45, ἐπὶ γῆς ἡπλωμένην τὴν τοῦ λόγου βλῆπων θεϊότητα.

⁵ εἰς τὸ πλάτος.

⁶ εἰς τὸν ἄδην.

⁷ c. 17.

⁸ κεκένωτο.

and providence ; and, strange to say, being the Word, He was not contained by any thing, but Himself ¹ contained (held together) all things. Being in the whole creation, He is external to the whole as to His essence, but is in all things by His power, administering all things and expanding His providence in and to all ; quickening each thing singly and all things collectively ; comprehending all things, Himself not comprehended, but entire in all respects in His Father alone. The soul of man may contemplate in thought things external ² to its own body and distinct from it, but it cannot act upon them or set them in motion. This was not so with the Word of God when in man. He was not bound to the body, but had it under His dominion ; so that while He was in it and in all things, He was external to all existing things, and ³ reposed in the Father alone. When the Virgin bore Him, He suffered nothing ; nor, though in the body, was He polluted by it, but, on the contrary, ⁴ sanctified it ; and, being incorruptible, quickened and purified that which is mortal.

⁵ When, therefore, we read of Him as eating, and drinking, and being born, we must understand that His body, as a body, was born, and nourished

¹ συνείχε.

² ἔξω τοῦ ἰδίου σώματος.

³ ἀνεπαύετο.

⁴ See c. 43. Oration i. c. 60. Oration ii. c. 10.

⁵ c. 18.

with suitable food; but that God the Word, who administers all things, being united to the body, by the works which He did in the body manifested Himself, not as man, but as God the Word. These things are said of Him, to show that the body, which ate, and drank, and was born, was the body of the Lord, and not of another, and that He had a body in reality, not in appearance. By these acts the Word was known to be present bodily; and by the works which He did through the body, He made Himself known to be the Son of God. Being invisible, He is known from the works of creation: having been made man and not ¹ being seen (as the Word) in the body, He was known from His works to be, not a man, but the Power and Word of God. Having ² remarked that the divinity of our Lord was seen and conspicuously manifested by the convulsions which took place in the natural world at the time of His crucifixion, Athanasius goes on to speak of the manner of His death.

³ It has been shown that no one but the Saviour, who made all things in the beginning out of things which were not, could make that which is corruptible, incorruptible; that no one but the Image of the Father could renew men after the Image; that no

¹ *μὴ ὁρώμενος*. The Benedictine editor adopts this reading in preference to *μὴ χωροούμενος*, which is found in other editions.

² c. 19. See c. 26.

³ c. 20.

one ¹ but the very Life, our Lord Jesus Christ, could render that which is mortal, immortal; that no one but the Word who administers all things, the only-begotten and true Son of the Father, could instruct men concerning the Father, and overthrow the worship of idols. But it is further necessary to show that He alone could deliver mankind from the sentence of death under which they all lay, by paying the penalty for them. After, therefore, that He had manifested His divinity by the works which He did, He gave up His own temple as an offering to death, in order to deliver mankind from the penalty due to their ancient transgression; and He showed Himself superior to death, by manifesting His own incorruptible body as the first-fruits of the resurrection of all. His body was of the same essence as all human bodies; and being mortal, would, like them, have died: but by the ²access of the Word to it, it was no longer corrupted according to its proper nature, but through the indwelling Word of God was placed out of the reach of corruption; so that, strange to say, the death of all was fulfilled in the Lord's body, and death and corruption were destroyed by the Word who was united to it.

¹ τῆς αὐτοζωῆς οὐσης.

² τῇ δὲ τοῦ λόγου εἰς αὐτὸ ἐπιβάσει. Athanasius says elsewhere, that the body being capable of death naturally, the Word of His own will allowed it to die: so that it suffered naturally, and was raised by divine power for our sakes. *Contra Apollinarius*, L. 1. c. 7. So in this tract, c. 31, ὅθεν ἀπέθανε μὲν ὡς θνητὸν, ἀνέζησε δὲ ἰὰ τὴν αὐτῶ ζώην. See *Oration* i. c. 44.

¹ Athanasius thus states the conclusion to be drawn from the foregoing reasoning: "The common Saviour of all having died for us, we, the faithful in Christ, no longer as before, according to the denunciation of the law, ² remain in the corruption of death, since that condemnation has been annulled; but the corruption being annulled and destroyed ³ in the gratuitous gift of the resurrection, we are dissolved as to our mortal body, at the time which God has appointed to each of us, only that we may obtain a better resurrection." He then proceeds to answer objections. It was objected, that if it was necessary for Christ to deliver His body to death for all, it would have been more seemly that He should put it off ⁴ privately, in the ordinary course of nature, in some honourable manner, than that He should submit to an ignominious death on the cross. Athanasius replies that the death which comes to all men comes on account of the weakness of their nature: being unable to endure long, they are dissolved by time, through disease and infirmity. But the Lord is not infirm: He is the Power and Word of God and very Life. If, therefore, He had put off the body in His bed after the ordinary fashion of men, He would have been supposed to

¹ c. 21.

² So, as we have seen, Athanasius interprets *θανάτῳ ἀπο θνήσκουμεν*.

³ *ἐν τῇ τῆς ἀναστάσεως χάριτι*.

⁴ *ὡς ἄνθρωπος, ἰδίῳς—ἐντίμως*.

die through the infirmity of nature, and to be in no respect superior to other men. But since He was Life and the Word of God, and yet it was necessary that the debt of death should be paid for all, on this account, as being Life and Power, He imparted strength in Himself to the body; but in paying the penalty of death, He did not take from Himself, but made others, the occasion of perfecting the sacrifice. For it was not fitting that the Lord, who healed the diseases of others, should ¹ Himself suffer from disease; nor that the body, in which He imparted strength to others, should ² itself be infirm. But why did He not prevent death, as well as disease, from touching Him? He took the body in order that He might die: if He had not died, the resurrection could not have taken place. But it was not fitting that disease should precede death, lest the infirmity should be ascribed to Him who was in the body. But He suffered hunger? Yes, that was proper to the body; but He did not perish through

¹ Athanasius here seems to say that the body of Christ was not subject to disease: and we do not read in Scripture that it ever was actually so subject. As man, He wept, and was weary, and hungry, and thirsty. De Sent. Dionysii, c. 9. Ad Ep. Ægypt. et Lib. c. 17. De Fugâ, cc. 12, 13. Oration iii. cc. 31, 32. 34. 46. 53.

² So in Oratio ii. c. 55: ὡς περ γὰρ τὰς ἡμῶν ἀσθενείας δεχόμενος λέγεται αὐτὸς ἀσθενεῖν, καίτοι μὴ ἀσθενῶν αὐτός, δύναμις γὰρ ἐστὶ τοῦ Θεοῦ. In c. 43 it is said, that the Word used the body as an instrument, but partook of none of its affections, but rather sanctified it.

hunger, on account of the Lord who bore the body. On this account also, if He died as a ransom for all, He did not see corruption, but rose in His integrity: since the body belonged to no other, but to the Life itself.

¹ Again, it was said that Christ might, by concealing Himself, have avoided the plots of the Jews, and preserved His body ² altogether immortal. Athanasius answers, that as it was not fitting that the Word of God, being Life, should Himself inflict death on His own body, so neither was it fitting that He should avoid the death inflicted upon Him by others. He awaited death in order to destroy it, and hastened to finish the death inflicted for the salvation of all. The Saviour came to finish, not His own death, but the death of mankind; wherefore, He put off the body, not by His own proper death, inasmuch, as being Life, He could not so die; but He received death from mankind, that He might entirely destroy it in His own body. ³ It was necessary, moreover, that the end of the body of the Lord should be thus public, in order that, by showing that He preserved His own body incorruptible, He might give mankind a pledge that their bodies would rise again free from corruption. It was

¹ c. 22.

² καθόλου, without submitting it at all to death.

³ c. 23.

further necessary that His death should be public, in order that He might satisfy men of the truth of His resurrection. If He had died privately in a corner, they would have said that His death and resurrection were alike fictions. The proof of His death must precede that of His resurrection.

¹ But if He was to die a public, why was it necessary that He should die an ignominious death? Athanasius answers, that this was one proof of His complete triumph over the power of death, that He did not choose the mode of His death, but submitted to that inflicted by His enemies. ² There was a peculiar fitness in His death upon the cross. He came to bear the curse denounced against us: but how could He bear it, unless He became a curse for us by submitting ³ to the death which is declared to be accursed? He was, by His death, to break down the middle wall of partition, and to call the Gentiles. This He did, when, His arms extended on the cross, with the one ⁴ He drew to Himself the Jews, with the other the Gentiles, uniting both in Himself.

¹ c. 24.

² c. 25. Athanasius mentions another point in which the death upon the cross was appropriate:—the body was preserved entire, from which we should learn that the Church, His body, ought to be preserved free from schism. c. 24.

³ “Cursed is every one that hangeth on a tree.” Gal. iii. 13.

⁴ Athanasius refers to John xii. 31: “And I, if I be lifted up from the earth, will draw all men unto me.”

He was to destroy the power of the ¹ prince of the air, who deceives men by His illusions, and impedes them in their ascent to heaven. To this end, therefore, Christ was suspended on the cross in the air, that He might purify it from all the mischievous effects of the agency of dæmons, and ² bearing us upwards by His own body, which He offered to death for all, He might open to us the way to heaven.

³ Christ did not rise immediately from the tomb; but allowed an interval of three days to elapse between His death and His resurrection, in order to prove the reality of His death, and yet that His body did not suffer corruption. He did not allow a longer interval to elapse, in order that He might show Himself alive while the remembrance of His death was yet fresh in the minds of men, and they who put Him to death still on the spot.

⁴ In proof that Christ had on the cross triumphed

¹ Ephes. ii. 2.

² He ascended as man, and carried up to heaven the flesh which He bore. Oration iii. c. 48.

³ c. 26. The human body lay in the tomb, but was raised as the body of God by the Word Himself. De Sent. Dionysii, c. 9. The soul of Christ was separated from His body at His death, but the Word remained united to it, to preserve it from corruption. Contra Apollinarium, L. 2. cc. 16, 17.

⁴ cc. 27, 28, 29. Athanasius says, that both men and women prepared themselves to encounter death, by submitting to voluntary hardships and voluntary discipline. c. 27.

over death, Athanasius appeals to the readiness shown by Christians to encounter it in attestation of the sincerity of their faith. Before Christ came, death was formidable even to holy men ; now, even women and youths disregard it. ¹ In like manner, the daily conversions of the Gentiles to the truth of Christ ; the influence exerted over the thoughts and consciences of men, so that the adulterer, the murderer, the unjust, the blasphemer forsake their evil courses, and submit to the teaching of Christ ; ² the expulsion of evil spirits by His very name ; these all prove that He is not dead, but that He has risen from the dead, and lives, or, rather, is the Life. He cannot be dead, who daily performs so many acts ; drawing men to piety, persuading them to virtue, teaching them concerning immortality, leading them to the desire of heavenly things, inspiring them with power against death, showing Himself to every one, and destroying the impiety of idolatry. The works which the Son of God daily works for the salvation of men are the proof of His resurrection.

³ Athanasius now turns to the confutation of the Jews, to whom the cross of Christ was a stumbling-block. They ought to have learned from their own

¹ cc. 30, 31, 32. See c. 37.

² Athanasius enlarges on this point in c. 52. It is worthy of remark, that he makes no other appeal to the exercise of supernatural powers.

³ cc. 34, 35, 36, 37.

Scriptures that the Messiah ¹ was to be born of a Virgin, and to assume the nature of man, and to be Lord of all; that His birth was to be announced by the appearance of a star; that He would be called out of Ægypt; that He would suffer every kind of indignity, and would not only die, but die ² upon the Cross; that ³ He would rule over the Gentiles; ⁴ that He would restore sight to the blind, and cause the lame to walk. All these predictions were fulfilled in Jesus of Nazareth, and in none other. ⁵ The Jews appear to have admitted that these prophecies applied to the Messiah, but to have denied that they were fulfilled in Jesus, and to have said that they still looked for the promised Saviour. In confutation of this objection, Athanasius alleges Daniel's prophecy of the seventy weeks, and the prediction of Jacob, from both of which it was clear that the time appointed for the appearance of the Messiah had passed.

¹ Athanasius refers to Isaiah vii. 14. Numbers xxiv. 5. 17. Isaiah viii. 4; xix. 1. Hosea xi. 1. Isaiah liii. 3. Athanasius refers Isaiah liii. 7, "Who shall declare His generation?" to the birth of Christ from the Virgin, οὐκ ὄντος τοῦ σώματος αὐτοῦ ἐξ ἀνδρός, ἀλλ' ἐκ παρθένου μόνης. c. 37. He had no Father after the flesh; His generation, therefore, could not be declared.

² In proof of this Athanasius refers to Deut. xxviii. 66. Jer. xi. 19. Psalm xxii. 16.

³ Isaiah xi. 10.

⁴ c. 38. Isaiah xxxv. 3.

⁵ cc. 39, 40. In the latter chapter Athanasius refers to Psalm cvii. 20: ἐξαπέστειλε τὸν λόγον αὐτοῦ καὶ ἰδσατο αὐτούς, and interprets τὸν λόγον of the Word; an interpretation to which the Hebrew lends no countenance.

¹ In refuting the Gentiles, Athanasius has recourse to the argument *ad hominem*. They called the universe a body, and said that the Word or Reason is in the whole and in every part: why, then, should they hesitate to admit that the Word may inhabit a human body, and make use of it as an instrument to convey to man the knowledge of God and himself.

² But it would have been more fitting that the Word should take up His abode in some of the more beautiful parts of the universe, in the sun, or moon, than in man. Athanasius replies, that man alone had departed from the law given him by God, while the heavenly bodies and the other parts of the universe still pursued their appointed course. The Word, therefore, took up His abode in man, because man alone needed instruction and salvation. As men could not discern God in His providential administration of the universe, in order to accommodate Himself to their weakness the Word united Himself to a part of the universe,—the human body; and by the divine works which He performed in it led them to the knowledge of God.

³ But God might have saved, as He created, man

¹ cc. 41, 42.

² c. 43. Athanasius alleges the authority of Plato in his favour, ex Politico.

³ c. 44.

by a mere word or command. Athanasius answers that, as the universe was created out of things which were not, the mere will of God sufficed for their creation; but that, as things which were, not things which were not, were to be healed and saved, it was necessary that the Saviour should come to the things which He was to save; He used, therefore, the human body as His instrument in the salvation of man. The corruption of man also was not external to His body, but cleaved to it; it was necessary, therefore, that life should be attached to it in the place of corruption; the body which had once put on corruption could not have put on immortality, unless the Word had assumed it. If death had been prevented from touching the body only by a command, it would still have remained mortal and corruptible, according to the condition of bodies. But now it has put on the incorporeal Word of God: it, therefore, no longer fears either death or corruption; being clothed in life, and corruption being destroyed in it.

¹ Athanasius appeals to the visible effect which Christianity had produced, in order to prove that He who came on earth to proclaim it was the Divine Word; to the conversion of the Gentiles, to their renunciation of the heathen temples and worship, to the silence of the oracles, above all to the change

¹ cc. 45—54.

wrought in the life and conversation of those who embraced the Gospel. They were seen to be ¹continent even in their youth, patient in the endurance of temptations and hardships, forbearing under insults, unmoved amidst the loss of their earthly possessions, despising death when required to bear testimony to Christ.

² The Word was made man, in order that we may be ³deified; He manifested Himself through the body, in order that we may attain to the ⁴idea of the Invisible Father: He suffered contumely from man, in order that we may inherit immortality. He sustained no injury, it is true, being ⁵impassible, incorruptible, the very Word, and God; but He keeps and preserves suffering mankind, for whom He

¹ Athanasius particularly notices the fact, that many young persons, both male and female, professed chastity: he appeals also to the expulsion of devils, by naming the name of Christ and making the sign of the cross, cc. 48. 51.

² c. 54.

³ ἵνα ἡμεῖς θεοποιηθῶμεν. Compare c. 4. Oration i. cc. 39. 42. Oratio iii. c. 23. The Word made us capable of receiving the Godhead, Oration ii. c. 59. Through our kindred to His body we are made the temple of God, and the sons of God, so that the Lord is worshipped in us, and they who see us proclaim, in the words of the Apostle, "Truly God is among them" (1 Cor. xiv. 25). Oration i. c. 45. See de Dec. Syn. Nic. c. 31.

⁴ ἵνα ἡμεῖς τοῦ ἀοράτου πατρὸς ἔννοιαν λάβωμεν. So εἰς τὰς περὶ Θεοῦ ἐννοίας, c. 43. κεινωθέντας τῆς περὶ Θεοῦ ἐννοίας, c. 4.

⁵ Compare Oration iii. cc. 34. 55, 56. Ad Epictetum, cc. 5, 6. Contra Apollinarium, L. 1. c. 11.

underwent these sufferings, by His own impassibility.

¹ Having again referred to the continually increasing influence of Christianity and to the corresponding diminution of the power of idolatry, as affording conclusive evidence that the Word and Son of God had come in the flesh to be the Saviour of mankind, Athanasius ² goes on to exhort us carefully to study the divinely-inspired Scriptures, in which is clearly foretold the second appearance of Christ; when He shall come, not in meanness, but in His proper glory; not in humiliation, but in His proper greatness; not to suffer on the cross, but to impart to all the fruit of His crucifixion, immortality, and incorruption; not to be judged, but to be Judge of all, according to the deeds done by them in the body, whether good or bad; to admit the good into His kingdom in Heaven, and to consign the wicked to everlasting fire and outer darkness.

³ But in order that our reading of the Scriptures may profit us, we must purify our hearts and lives according to the doctrine of Christ, so that our understanding, always ⁴ walking after that doctrine, may attain what it desires, and learn all that it is possible for human nature to learn respecting the Word of God. For no one can attain to the compre-

¹ c. 55.² c. 56.³ c. 57.⁴ ὁδεύσας.

hension of the writings of the saints, who does not purify his thoughts and imitate the life and conversation of the saints. When we have washed and purged the soul, and have become assimilated to the saints in our practice, then, having our conversation with them, we shall comprehend what has been revealed to them by God, and, being united to them, shall receive the things which eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, nor have entered into the heart of man, the things reserved for the saints in the kingdom of Heaven.

THE END.

