

Durham E-Theses

*The early episcopal career of athanasius of
alexandria ad 328 - ad 335*

Duane Wade-Hampton Arnold

How to cite:

Arnold, Duane Wade-Hampton (1989) The early episcopal career of athanasius of alexandria ad 328 - ad 335. Doctoral thesis, Durham University.

Use policy

The full-text may be used and/or reproduced, and given to third parties in any format or medium, without prior permission or charge, for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes provided that:

- a full bibliographic reference is made to the original source
- a <https://etheses.durham.ac.uk/id/eprint/6738/> is made to the metadata record in Durham E-Theses
- the full-text is not changed in any way

The full-text must not be sold in any format or medium without the formal permission of the copyright holders.

Please consult the [full Durham E-Theses policy](#) for further details.

Duane Wade-Hampton Arnold

THE EARLY EPISCOPAL CAREER OF ATHANASIOS OF ALEXANDRIA
AD 328 - AD 335

Doctor of Philosophy
1989

This thesis presents an overview of the early episcopal career of Athanasios of Alexandria from the time of his election and consecration as bishop in AD 328 through to the time of his banishment by the emperor Constantine following the Synod of Tyre in AD 335. The purpose of the thesis is to examine the ancient and modern charges of misconduct which have been made against Athanasios and relate specifically to the early years of his episcopate. In order to facilitate such a study a thorough examination has been made of firstly, the modern historical and literary tradition which has arrived at a particularly negative assessment of Athanasios and, secondly those original documentary sources, both within and without, the Athanasian corpus, to evaluate their relative claims of veracity.

In the course of this study particular attention has been given to an identification of the issues and events within the early career of Athanasios which have been in dispute, including the reliability of the Philostorgian narratives, the controversy over Athanasios' consecration, and his reaction to the Meletian schism in Egypt especially as it relates to the material contained within London Papyrus 1914 and the Synod of Tyre. A brief study is also made of the festival oration of Gregory Nazianzen as it relates to the actions of Athanasios during this period of time.

The second section of the thesis carries this examination forward by a reconstruction of those events which led to the Synod of Tyre and the subsequent exile of Athanasios by Constantine. An evaluation of the charges made against Athanasios within this period, both at court and in ecclesiastical gatherings indicates that although the motives of his opponents may have been theological, the means used to remove Athanasios from Alexandria were essentially political with the Synod of Tyre functioning as essentially a 'show trial' with no real concern for either justice or equity.

THE EARLY EPISCOPAL CAREER
OF
ATHANASIUS OF ALEXANDRIA
AD 328 - AD 335

THE EARLY EPISCOPAL CAREER
OF
ATHANASIUS OF ALEXANDRIA
AD 328 - AD 335

by

Duane Wade-Hampton Arnold,
St. Chad's College

The copyright of this thesis rests with the author.
No quotation from it should be published without
his prior written consent and information derived
from it should be acknowledged.

Submitted in fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

The University of Durham
The Department of Theology

1989



2 AUG 1990

Dedicated to my father,
Herman Wade-Hampton Arnold
1923 - 1988

THE EARLY EPISCOPAL CAREER
OF
ATHANASIUS OF ALEXANDRIA
AD 328 - AD 335

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
DECLARATION	4
PREFACE	6
ABBREVIATIONS	
The Works of Athanasius of Alexandria	9
INTRODUCTION	12
NOTES TO INTRODUCTION	18

SECTION I

ATHANASIUS: QUESTIONS OF CHARACTER AND CONTEXT

1. INITIAL CONSIDERATIONS	22
2. INTERPRETERS OF ATHANASIUS	25
2.1 The Modern Critics	25
2.2 Nineteenth Century Comparisons	29
2.3 Current Views	36
3. ISSUES IN DISPUTE	38
3.1 An Identification of the Issues	38
3.2 Philostorgius and the Consecration Controversy	39
3.3 The Meletians and London Papyrus 1914	79
3.4 The Oration of Gregory Nazianzen	111
4. CONSIDERATIONS AND CONCLUSIONS	118
NOTES TO SECTION ONE	126

SECTION II
ATHANASIUS AND THE SYNOD OF TYRE

1. THE BACKGROUND OF THE SYNOD OF TYRE	166
1.1 Athanasius at Psamathia, AD 331/332	168
1.2 The Concern Over Libya, AD 332 - AD 333	186
1.3 The Arsenius Affair, AD 333 - AD 334	197
1.4 The Synod of Caesarea, March/April, AD 334	205
2. THE SYNOD OF TYRE	216
2.1 The Calling of the Synod of Tyre, AD 335	218
2.2 Procedure and Authority at the Synod of Tyre	224
2.3 The Proceedings at the Synod of Tyre, July, AD 335	230
2.4 The Mareotic Commission, August/September, AD 335	237
2.5 The Judgement at Tyre, October, AD 335	240
2.6 The Flight to Constantinople and Exile, November, AD 335	244
NOTES TO SECTION TWO	260
CONCLUSION	290
NOTES TO CONCLUSION	308
APPENDIX A: London Papyrus 1914	312

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Abbreviations of Bibliographic References	316
Dictionaries and Lexicons	319
Primary Sources, Editions and Translations	320
Secondary Sources	325
Addendum to Bibliography	371

DECLARATION

This thesis, entitled 'The Early Episcopal Career of Athanasius of Alexandria, AD 328 - AD 335', has been composed by myself and is a record of my own work. It has not been submitted or accepted in any previous application for a higher degree. All quotations are distinguished by quotation marks or, in certain instances, by their untranslated form when the source is in Greek or Latin. The sources of my information have been specifically acknowledged.

The copyright of this thesis rests with the author. No quotation from it should be published without his prior consent and information derived from it should be acknowledged.

Converti me ad Athanasium legendum, tantaque summi, et exii viri admiratio tenuit, ut ab eo divelli non possim. Legi duos eius libros adversus Gentiles; namque in primo Gentilem superstitionem arguit; in secundo Crucis, ac divinae e Incarnationis tuetur ignominiam tanta argumentorum vi, sententiarumque gravitate, ut agi quidem ea caussa, ut est a plerisque acta, et in primis a nostro Lactantio, dignius tamen, atque divinus non posse videatur. Legi ex ordine tres iam libros adversus Arium, nam quinque sunt, et magni quidem: tantaque fragrantia pietatis reffectus sum, ut nihil me legisse meminerim, quod huic operi conferri possit. Eminent eis literis incomparabilis, viri venustas quaedam tum sententiarum, tum verborum, digna profecto, quam omnes admirentur, venerentur, ament. Granditer enim eam caussam, ut dignum fuerat, agit cunctasque illius haeresis obiectiones ita aperit, arguit, refellit, tantaque Scripturarum sacramenta enodat, ut exsatiari eius lectione non possim. Quid plura? Statui apud me convertendo, igneo ac coelesti homini debitis meis me totum dedere; si quid otii suppeditare potuero; nihil enim illius doctrinae salubrius, nihil ignitius reperiri posse constanter adfirmaverim.

AMBROGIO TRAVERSARI
27 February 1424

PREFACE

This thesis has been written in an attempt to clarify the many complex events which took place during the first seven years of the episcopate of Athanasius of Alexandria and the impact of those events upon our current understanding of the bishop. The structure of the thesis, therefore, has been dictated by firstly, the concerns of historiography and secondly, by the chronological sequence which stretches from Athanasius' consecration as bishop of Alexandria in AD 328 to his banishment by Constantine in AD 335. Within this course of seven years many accusations arose in connection with Athanasius' conduct. Although every effort has been made to comment upon each of these charges within a particular period of time, it should be noted that many of the accusations were repeated within a wide variety of settings, spanning a number of years. Whenever possible, however, I have sought to place the charges within a proper chronological context.

Certain other stylistic features of this present study should be noted. The reader will find full publishing information for all of the sources used in the thesis in the bibliography along with those other materials which have been consulted in the course of this study and found useful. Abbreviations which are used for the works of Athanasius may be found in the preliminary pages of this thesis, while those for standard works of reference, journals, etc., may be found in the bibliographical section. I have sought to follow the Chicago Manual of Style in the presentation of endnotes and bibliographical



references. Owing to the complex nature of the arguments which surround both the actions and chronology of Athanasius' early episcopate, the material presented in the endnotes should be considered an integral part of this thesis.

I would like to thank those whose encouragement, advice and assistance aided the research and writing of this thesis. There have been many persons who have influenced my understanding of Athanasius of Alexandria; far too many to mention in this brief space. Some, however, have shared so generously of their time and expertise that I would be remiss not to name them. I owe a special debt of gratitude to many within the 'larger' academic community of the University of Durham who have assisted me along the way and provided helpful direction in the course of my research. These persons include the Revd. Prof. Stephen W. Sykes, Mr. Gerald Bonner, Dr. C.T.R. Hayward, Dr. Ann Loades and the late Rt. Revd. and Rt. Hon. A.M. Ramsey. My special thanks is also extended to Dr. David Thomas who guided my initiation into the realm of papyriological research and assisted me in my understanding of the Meletian archive materials. I would also wish to express my appreciation to my supervisor in this research project, the Very Revd. Dr. George D. Dragas, for his help and assistance.

In the academic community beyond the University of Durham there have been many others who have assisted my research by their advice and direction. The Revd. Dr. William C. Weinrich first directed me to the study of Athanasius and has continued to show interest in my research. Prof. Charles Kannengiesser, SJ, has provided helpful interaction and criticism. The late Rt. Revd. R.P.C. Hanson, while disagreeing with many of my

conclusions, nonetheless provided insightful comments on a number of critical points of interpretation within this present study.

I received courteous assistance from the librarians and staff of the Manuscript Room and Reading Room of the British Library, the libraries of the universities of Durham, Sheffield, Notre Dame and Detroit, and the Wayne State University Library.

In a special category is my wife Janet who assisted me in the typing and proofing of the text and helped to bring this work to its conclusion.

Finally, as I write these acknowledgements one person remains foremost in my heart and mind. Although his untimely death has denied me the opportunity of sharing this final result of my research with him, my father was an example of strength in the face of adversity and was a great encouragement to me in my work. It is to him that this thesis is dedicated.

27 January 1989
The Feast of St. John Chrysostom

D.W.H.A.

ABBREVIATIONS

THE WORKS OF ATHANASIUS OF ALEXANDRIA

<i>Ad Adolph.</i>	Epistola ad Adelphium episcopum
<i>Ad Afros</i>	Epistola ad Afros
<i>Ad Const.</i>	Apologia ad imperatorem Constantium
<i>Ad Dracont.</i>	Epistola ad Dracontium
<i>Ad ep. Aeg. et Lib.</i>	Epistola encyclica ad episcopos Aegypti et Libyae
<i>Ad Joan. et Ant.</i>	Epistola ad Joannem et Antiochum presbyteros
<i>Ad Lucif. I-II</i>	Epistolae duae ad Luciferum episcopum
<i>Ad monach.</i>	Epistola ad monachos
<i>Apol.</i>	Apologia contra Arianos
<i>C. Gentes</i>	Oratio contra Gentes
<i>De Decretis</i>	Epistola de decretis Nicaenae synodi
<i>De fuga</i>	Apologia de fuga sua
<i>De incarn.</i>	Oratio de incarnatione
<i>De morte Arii</i>	Epistola de morte Arii
<i>De sent. Dion.</i>	Epistola de sententia Dionysii episcopi
<i>De syn.</i>	Epistola de synodis Arimini Italia et Seleucia in Isauria celebratis
<i>De virgin.</i>	De virginitate
<i>Ep. encycl.</i>	Epistola ad episcopos encyclica
<i>Exp. in Pss.</i>	Expositiones in Psalmos
<i>Festal Letters</i>	Easter Letters
<i>Hist. Arian.</i>	Historia Arianorum ad monachos
<i>Or. c. Ar. I-III</i>	Orationes contra Arianos I-III
<i>Or. c. Ar. IV</i>	Oratio contra Arianos IV (Pseudo-Athanasius)

Serap. I-III

Epistolae ad Serapion I-III

Tom. ad. Ant.

Tomus ad Antiochenos

Vita Ant.

Vita Antonii

INTRODUCTION

INTRODUCTION

In a work published in the early winter of 1988, the late R.P.C. Hanson made the following observation concerning the state of the Church in the fourth decade of the fourth century:¹

The Greek-speaking Eastern and the Latin-speaking Western areas of the Christian Church were now heading for a major rift ... The cause of this was not primarily the doctrine of Arius. Theoretically at this point the Arian Controversy had been settled. ... The chief causes were the intrigue of Eusebius of Constantinople, the opportunism of Julius of Rome, and the misconduct of Athanasius of Alexandria, and among the three causes we must judge the last to be the most serious.

The misconduct of Athanasius which Hanson alludes to as the most serious cause of the breach between the East and the West in AD 341 consists of the accusations and rumours which surrounded the early episcopal career of Athanasius and culminated in the Synod of Tyre and the bishop's subsequent banishment by Constantine. It is the purpose of this present study to examine in detail the early episcopate of Athanasius from his consecration in AD 328 to his first exile in AD 335. The allegation of Hanson, cited above, has become, as will be seen in the course of this study, an increasingly common interpretation of the early career of Athanasius and has, therefore, created the need for a balanced and critical examination of those documentary sources which provide the basis for such a statement. It is the purpose of this study to attempt this examination.

Before the exploration of primary sources and the construction of an historical narrative centering upon the Synod of Tyre, however, it is important to note that the present opinions concerning the early career of Athanasius are also a part of an historical process which cannot be studied in isolation. It is for this reason that Section I of this thesis examines 'Athanasius: Questions of Character and Context'. Within this section the approaches to Athanasius by modern critics are compared to nineteenth century evaluations of the bishop in order to establish a basic historiography of contemporary and near contemporary Athanasian studies. Although it is almost impossible for such a study to be exhaustive (as may be observed by the bibliography attached to this thesis) it may be suggestive of the way in which the basic approach to Athanasius has been altered in the course of the last century. The remainder of the first section is devoted to particular disputed issues in the early career of Athanasius with an emphasis upon the various viewpoints of a large number of primary sources which stand behind the debated concerns of character and context. Of special importance in this regard are original interpretations of many of those primary sources which provide accounts of Athanasius' consecration as bishop of Alexandria and his subsequent treatment of the schismatic Meletian communities.

Having considered these important and hotly disputed questions of character and context, Section II of the thesis provides an historical narrative and examination of 'Athanasius and the Synod of Tyre'. Owing to the recent research of R. Lorenz which has resulted in the redating of a number of Athanasius' Festal Letters, it has been possible to prepare a more exact

reconstruction of those events which led to Athanasius' first exile.² Such a task has also been aided by the editing of the Syriac index of the Festal Letters which was undertaken by A. Martin and M. Albert, and has provided a somewhat revised chronology of those events preceding and surrounding the Synod of Tyre.³ Much of this work has, of course, required a reconsideration of the standard Athanasian chronology which was established by E. Schwartz.⁴ Moreover, the Synod of Tyre, as well as those events which both preceded and followed its meeting, has remained somewhat enigmatic. Questions concerning procedure and authority at Tyre have often been overlooked or dismissed as unimportant. The final judgement at Tyre, in regard to its nature as binding or advisory, has also remained unclear. It is hoped that this situation will be redressed within the course of this study and that an original contribution to Athanasian studies may be made thereby.

The principal difficulty which one has to overcome in writing a study of the early episcopal career of Athanasius - which is also perhaps the main reason why no complete modern critical biography of the bishop has yet appeared - lies with the nature and condition of the sources. Although Athanasius was a prolific writer on theological, polemical and pastoral themes, little biographical information emerges. As will be observed in this study, many historians, both early and contemporary, largely based their accounts upon those of Athanasius himself and may, therefore, present a rather narrow perspective. On the other hand, it must be recognized that the extant fragments of Philostorgius and the lost works of Sabinus of Heraclea, or the Arian reports included in the works of Sozomen and Epiphanius

are far from impartial and may present an equally constrained point of view.

In the present study, however, attention has been centered upon episodes within the early career of Athanasius which have numerous sources, not the least of these being the bishop's collection of documents presented in Apologia secunda.⁵ Beyond the sources cited above, however, a special effort has been made to collect even the smallest particles of information, either certain or merely probable, which might enable us to draw a more complete and accurate picture of the personality and actions of Athanasius in the early years of his episcopate. Also, particular attention has been given to some aspects of his consecration, the treatment of the Meletians, and the circumstances surrounding the Synod of Tyre which have not received sufficient consideration, and to some sources, the information of which has not yet been fully integrated into current Athanasian studies. Such are, to name a few: Alexandrine consecration practices after the Council of Nicaea; the large number of Meletians who gave their allegiance to Athanasius subsequent to his consecration; the similar sequence of events relative to the condemnation of Eustathius of Antioch; the effect of the Nicene canons upon Egyptian church order; the lack of Arian activities in Egypt between AD 328 and AD 335; and the possible alternate interpretations of London Papyrus 1914 in light of the confused religious situation in Egypt during Athanasius' early episcopate.

The need to clarify these particular points, especially the work of H.I. Bell on London Papyrus 1914, has been highlighted by the following comment of Hanson which was made in 1988:⁶

H.I. Bell has published the papyrus which throws such a lurid light on the behaviour of Athanasius in his see; though this was published nearly sixty years ago the significance of it has not yet sunk in everywhere. It is astonishing to read the article in TRE on the subject of 'Athanasius' by Martin Tetz written as recently as 1977 and find no mention of this document, so important for our estimation of Athanasius' character.

The correct interpretation of this document is vitally important to our estimation of the early Athanasius, that much is agreed. It will be observed, however, in the course of this study, that the standard interpretation which has been accepted by Hanson in concert with so many others, leaves much to be desired in terms of accuracy and clarity.⁷

It would be unrealistic not to accept that there remains much that is not known concerning these crucial years in the career of Athanasius. This study, however, is presented in the hope that by a reasoned approach to the primary sources a new appreciation of the context, character and actions of the early Athanasius will emerge.

INTRODUCTION

NOTES

- ¹R.P.C. Hanson, *The Search for the Christian Doctrine of God*, Edinburgh, 1988, pp. 272 - 273
- ²R. Lorenz, *Der Zehnte Osterfestbrief des Athanasius von Alexandrien. Text. Übersetzung. Erläuterungen*. Berlin/New York, 1986, pp. 30ff. The dating of the *Festal Letters* has been a developing area of study for over a century. Additional information concerning the dating of the letters, as well as textual information and comments may be found in the following studies and translations: W. Cureton, *The Festal Letters of Athanasius*. London, 1848 (the first completed editing of the Syriac letters); the Latin translation of the letters made by Cureton may be found in J.P. Migne, *PG* 26, cols. 1360-1444; H. Burgess, *The Festal Epistles of S. Athanasius*. Oxford, 1845, provides an English translation which also incorporates additional Syriac fragments for the tenth and eleventh letters; A. Mai, *S. Athanasii epistulae festales*, Nova Patrum Bibliotheca 6, Rome, 1853, contains another Syriac edition; a German translation is found in F. Larsow, *Die Fest-Briefe des heiligen Athanasius*, Leipzig, 1852; the translation of Burgess has been reprinted and annotated in A. Robertson, *Select Writings and Letters of Athanasius*, *LNPF* second series, vol. IV, Oxford, 1891 (reprinted Grand Rapids, Michigan, 1975, pp. 503 - 553; L. T. Lefort, *S. Athanase. Lettres Festales et Pastorales en Copte*. *CSCO* vols. 150 - 151 (*Scriptores Coptici* Tomus 19 - 20), Louvain, 1955; P. Merendino, *Osterfestbriefe des Apa Athanasius*, Düsseldorf, 1965, contains a German translation of the Coptic letters; a French translation of the important tenth letter is provided in M. Albert, 'La 10^e lettre festale d'Athanase d'Alexandrie. Traduction et interprétation', *Parole de l'Orient*, vols. 6 - 7 (1975, 1976) pp. 69 - 90; the Coptic text of the sixth letter along with a French translation is provided in R. Coquin and E. Lucchesi, 'Un complément au corpus copte des *Lettres Festales* d'Athanase (Paris, B.N., Copte 176) (Pl.III)', *Orientalia Lovaniensia Periodica* 15 (1984), pp. 137 - 142; and the Coptic text of letters 39, 40 and 41 with a French translation is provided in R. Coquin, 'Les *Lettres Festales* d'Athanase (CPG 2102). Un nouveau complément: le manuscrit IFAO, Copte 25 (Planche X)', *Orientalia Lovaniensia Periodica* 15 (1984), pp. 133 - 158.
- ³A. Martin and M. Albert, *Histoire "acéphale" et Index syriaque des Lettres Festales d'Athanase d'Alexandrie*. (SC 317), Paris, 1985
- ⁴The Athanasian chronology of Schwartz and the importance of the *Festal Letters*, as well as attendant problems are first addressed in *GS* III, Berlin, 1959, pp. 1 - 29 (*Zur Geschichte des Athanasius I*, *NGNG* 1904) and secondly in *GS* IV, Berlin, 1960, pp. 1 - 11 ('Zur Kirchengeschichte des 4. Jahnhunderts', *ZNW* 24 [1935], pp. 129 - 137). Although many questions concerning Athanasian chronology with respect to the *Festal Letters* were settled by Schwartz, other points have been

given attention in V. Peri, 'La cronologia delle lettere festali di Sant' Atanasio e la Quaresima', *Aevum* 34, (1961), pp. 28 - 86; Mgr. Lefort, 'Les lettres festales de saint Athanase', *Bulletin de l'Academie royale des sciences, des lettres et des beaux-arts de Belgique* 39 (1953), pp. 641 - 656; and T.D. Barnes has considered additional problems arising out of the Index in his review of A. Martin, *Histoire in Journal of Theological Studies*, NS 31 (1986), pp. 576 - 589.

⁵ For the purposes of this study, the author has accepted the conclusions of H.G. Opitz concerning the unity of the text's composition which are outlined in *Untersuchungen*, p. 158, footnote 3, and which refer to the ms. tradition of the *Apologia secunda*. O. Bardenhewer had earlier argued that the treatise had been the result of a gradual evolution and that the main body of the work, ch. 1 - 88, had been completed by AD 348 with ch. 89 - 90 being added later, about AD 357 (*Geschichte der altkirchlichen Litteratur*, Band II, Freiburg, second edition, 1914, p. 61). Similar arguments had been put forward by A. Robertson, *LNPF*, second series, Vol. IV, p. 97, who dated the main portion of the work to AD 351. R. Seiler rejected these attempts at dating and contended that the entire text was the result of almost twenty years of editing and reworking, the first instance of use being Athanasius' interview before the emperor following the Synod of Tyre in AD 335 (*Athanasius' Apologia contra Arianos. Ihre Entstehung und Datierung* [Diss., Tübingen] Düsseldorf, 1932, pp. 1 - 32). P. Peeters adopted the earlier opinion of Bardenhewer, again pointing to the probable addition of ch. 89 - 90 ('comment S. Athanase s'enfuit de Tyr en 335', *Académie royale de Belgique. Bulletin de la classe des lettres et des sciences morales et politiques*, Series 5, Vol. XXX, p. 174). Another recent return to the thesis of Bardenhewer has been suggested by T. Orlandi, with the contention that Athanasius began to collect documents for the work following his return from exile in AD 346 and completed the main body of the treatise around AD 352/353. The entire work was then made ready for distribution with the addition of ch. 90 in AD 355/356 ('Sull'Apologia secunda [contra Arianos] di Atanasio di Alessandria', *Augustinianum* 15 [1975], pp. 54 - 56). V. Twomey, following Opitz, also argues for the unity of the text, but making use of the repeated references to Valens and Ursacius, believes the work to have been essentially completed by AD 356 with minor alterations in ch. 89 being made by either Athanasius or another editor between AD 367 and AD 370 (*Apostolikos Thronos*, Münster, 1982, p. 304). Although outside of the main focus of this study, Opitz's evaluation of the text and the dating of AD 357/358 seems correct, although one must allow for a gradual process of collecting the large number of documents represented. The minor later revisions of the text suggested by A.H.M. Jones do little to alter the overall conclusions of Opitz ('The Date of the Apologia contra Arianos of Athanasius', *Journal of Theological Studies* NS 5 [1954] pp. 224 - 227).

⁶ Hanson, *op. cit.*, p. xx. Although Hanson's study appeared as this thesis was being completed and, therefore, is not treated in the main body of the text, I have sought to make some comments on this fine work in the conclusion. It may be noted, however, that Hanson regards an estimation of Athanasius' character and actions in the early years of his episcopate as being crucial to the understanding of the controversies of the time. In his section on 'The Behaviour of Athanasius' (*op. cit.*, pp. 239 - 273), Hanson makes it clear that he follows, to a lesser or greater extent, the basic propositions of the modern critics and the standard interpretation of LP 1914 (*op. cit.*, pp. 252 - 254) with very little critical analysis of the document. It is, therefore, all the more surprising that in another section on 'The Doctrine of Athanasius' (*op. cit.*, pp. 417 - 458) he takes issue with the Schwartzian presentation of the bishop, stating that although 'an unscrupulous politician, [he] was also a genuine theologian' (*op. cit.*, p. 422) and that 'it would be a great mistake to follow Schwartz's opinion' (*loc. cit.*). In this presentation of the bishop, Hanson has highlighted the ambiguity which seems to characterize the modern approach to Athanasius.

⁷ Hanson comments upon the initial stages of the thesis put forward in this study (*op. cit.*, p. 252, footnote 63), yet seems to contradict his remarks cited above (*op. cit.*, p. xx) by saying, 'these papyri are by no means the only evidence for the case against Athanasius' while castigating current studies for ignoring 'this document, so important for our estimation of Athanasius' character'.

SECTION I

ATHANASIUS: QUESTIONS OF CHARACTER AND CONTEXT

SECTION I

ATHANASIUS: QUESTIONS OF CHARACTER AND CONTEXT

1. INITIAL CONSIDERATIONS

In approaching a topic such as 'the Early Episcopal Career of Athanasius of Alexandria, AD 328 - AD 335', two disciplines are involved - that of the historian and that of the theologian. These two disciplines are not, of course, mutually exclusive and each serves to inform the other. This is especially true in regard to the person of Athanasius, for his entire life was shaped by the historical and theological forces of the first three quarters of the fourth century. During the first seven years of his episcopate these forces combined to bring forward a new understanding of imperial jurisdiction as it related to ecclesiastical assemblies and judgements. This combination has often served to obscure both the theological issues and the historical sequence of events which led to Athanasius' first exile in AD 335. Moreover, Athanasius himself was a driving force in the theological controversies of his age and it is in his writings that one can find many of the source materials which were later employed by fifth century church historians, such as Sozomen and Socrates. The line which divides historical integrity and theological polemic in the writings of the bishop

of Alexandria is very thin indeed. It is for this reason that the thoughtful observer must turn to corroborating materials in any attempt to reconstruct the theological and historical ethos of the early episcopate of Athanasius.

We must also, however, take note of the subjective elements which many have found to be present in the historico-apologetic works of Athanasius and compare them with similar subjective elements which may be found in the other writings which report the events under discussion.¹ This is especially true when we endeavour to understand and disentangle the complex sequence of events which led from Athanasius' consecration as bishop of Alexandria in AD 328 to his banishment by the emperor Constantine in AD 335. Such a process is made even more difficult owing to the fact that certain theologians and historians of more recent times have questioned the veracity of Athanasius' writings, basing their skepticism upon what they perceive as an unjustifiably large measure of blatant literary self interest on the part of the bishop of Alexandria.² Whether, in fact, this perception is correct must be examined on the basis of the documentary evidence available to us. In the course of such an examination, however, care must be taken not to impose upon fourth century personalities either our own presuppositions or the ethical standards current in our own time. In order truly to understand Athanasius, we must allow him to speak from his own age and situation. In that many modern writers have placed their own presuppositions upon the bishop of Alexandria, especially in regard to the early years of his episcopate, a certain amount of contemporary historiography must also be undertaken to discover how such views have developed in recent times.

In asserting this contextual view of Athanasius and the early years of his episcopate, it is of the utmost importance for any serious study to evaluate, in so far as is possible, all of the varied elements which made up and influenced the theological outlook and ecclesiastical activities of this particularly controversial bishop. One must, therefore, consider the character of the man, both as a churchman and as a writer. Furthermore, one must critically evaluate the image of Athanasius which has been created by current scholarship. Only then can one proceed to examine that tangled web of events which placed the banished bishop of Alexandria upon a boat bound for Trier in the early winter of AD 335.

2. INTERPRETERS OF ATHANASIUS

2.1 The Modern Critics

In the last one hundred years the character and, therefore, the reliability of Athanasius as a witness and recorder of the theological disputes and ecclesiastical events of the fourth century has come under considerable scrutiny and, often, a high degree of criticism. In the course of these critiques a number of charges of misconduct or blatant self-interest have been made against the admittedly powerful Bishop of Alexandria. In the first section of this present work we wish to examine those charges which are of special importance to our study.

These accusations ^{of} may be listed under three general categories:

- 1) The deliberate forging of documents, which Athanasius later included in his historical records as genuine;
- 2) The strong possibility that the consecration of Athanasius as Bishop of Alexandria was irregular, if not invalid; and
- 3) The use of intentional and often brutal violence by Athanasius in the suppression of the Meletian schism in Egypt.

Of these charges, which are very much inter-related, the last two deal directly with Athanasius' ecclesiology and specifically with his view of synods and canon law. The first charge of forgery, however, is also important as the writings of Athanasius provide us with a large portion of the primary source

materials used in the investigation of fourth century church controversies.

This charge of forgery, however, first made by Otto Seeck³ in 1896, is no longer considered credible having been well refuted by scholars such as S. Rogala, N.H. Baynes and R. Seiler.⁴ It now seems to be generally recognized that many of Seeck's charges arose out of his own basic, and often antagonistic, attitude toward what he perceived as the political expediency of the church. In the mind of Seeck, the church often sacrificed the pursuit of truth to the end of political conciliation or advantage.⁵ It is interesting to note that although Seeck's charges of forgery have now been set aside, his basic antagonism toward Athanasius was subsequently taken up by a number of other prominent scholars who succeeded him. Not the least among these was Eduard Schwartz.

The contribution of Schwartz to modern Athanasian studies has been enormous. Trained as a classical philologist, the 'papers contributed by Eduard Schwartz to the *Nachrichten* of the Gottingen Academy between 1904 and 1911 are admitted on all sides to mark the beginning of a new era' in Athanasian studies.⁶ It is important to note, however, that Schwartz, by his own admission, approached Athanasius with 'undisguised dislike' and distaste.⁷ The editors of Schwartz's *Gesammelte Schriften* sought to soften this position slightly by indicating that Schwartz's attacks were more directed against the halo or aureole of holiness surrounding Athanasius' image than against the greatness of his person.⁸ Nevertheless, it must be admitted, that Schwartz's depiction of Athanasius is that of an unscrupulous and power-hungry oriental prelate, motivated by *der Wille zur Macht*, who would make use of any means to insure his domination of the Church in Egypt and, if possible, the domination of the other ancient Sees as well.⁹ The attitude of

Schwartz concerning Athanasius has been well summarized by Norman H. Baynes as follows:¹⁰

To Schwartz Athanasius was always and in all circumstances the unbending hierarch; ambition, a ruthless will, and a passion for power are his constant characteristics.

Schwartz, therefore, although not inclined to accept the charges of forgery made against Athanasius, did, for instance, dismiss the whole of Athanasius' historical and apologetical works as 'mere propaganda'.¹¹ This negative view of these works has subsequently been taken up by scholars such as E. Caspar, K.M. Setton, and most importantly, by Hans-Georg Opitz, a student of Schwartz, who has provided us with the critical edition of most of Athanasius' historico-apologetical writings.¹²

Lecturing in 1944, F.L. Cross spoke of the contribution of Opitz to Athanasian studies. 'Arising out of the discussions which Schwartz stimulated, and perhaps hardly second in influence, has been the new edition of Athanasius entrusted by the Prussian Academy to Dr. Opitz and the researches to which it has given rise.'¹³ Even the events of the Second World War and the hostile state of relations between Great Britain and Germany could not prevent Professor Cross from paying 'tribute to the highly rewarding labour which Dr. Opitz has expended upon [the critical edition]', not to mention 'the indebtedness in which all future students of the text will stand to his comprehensive survey of the manuscript evidence'.¹⁴ It is important to note, however, that the attitude of Opitz concerning the personality, reliability and basic driving force of Athanasius differed very little from that of Seeck and Schwartz. According to Opitz, Athanasius was 'through and through a power-hungry personality'.¹⁵

Although Opitz's successor in the editing of the critical

edition, W. Schneemelcher, has deviated from the approach of his mentor in many areas, he has, nonetheless accepted and continued to expound the harsh judgement of Athanasius promoted by the predominantly German critical school. Schneemelcher also sees the Bishop of Alexandria as one primarily involved in a struggle for ecclesiastical and political power. Schneemelcher states, 'that the documents, even the Apologetic works, plainly present a picture of the driven nature of Athanasius, of his continual intrigues and his striving for power'.¹⁶ One must admit, however, that Schneemelcher gives Athanasius the 'benefit of the doubt' by ascribing his motivation not simply to blatant self-interest alone, but also to a basic misunderstanding on the part of the bishop concerning the true nature of the Church. According to Schneemelcher, Athanasius erred by setting aside the 'Pauline concept' of a community of faith in favour of a view which saw the Church as 'a refuge [or sanctuary] in which salvation is supervised, and is no longer the community of the justified, the Body of Christ raised up by the Spirit'.¹⁷

The assumptions of Schwartz, Opitz and Schneemelcher concerning the ruthlessness of Athanasius' character and his willingness to misrepresent persons and events have largely echoed those of Seck and have continued to exert a strong influence on current Athanasian studies. This is despite the fact that the so-called 'forgeries' of Seck have long since been recognized as genuine¹⁸ and that Schwartz himself has since been proven to have been in error on 'several important points'.¹⁹ These charges of 'propagandist', 'power at any cost', 'deceiver' and 'ruthlessness' have, it would appear, contributed and lent credence to very particular accusations of Athanasius in other specific areas.

Before moving on to such specific accusations, however, it

might be helpful to review the assessments of Athanasius' character and reliability which were made by certain nineteenth century theologians who wrote previous to the assertions of Seeck and the German critical school. There is a marked contrast.

2.2 Nineteenth Century Comparisons

Writing in 1844, J.A. Moehler, the Roman Catholic German biographer of Athanasius, could speak in glowing hagiographical terms of the bishop as 'an ascetic during the time of his youth',²⁰ accepting as historically factual Athanasius' own testimony of an early friendship with Saint Antony. Beyond this, Moehler, in marked contrast to later German scholarship, saw ardent loyalty and open compassion as the keystones of the character of Athanasius. Far from the picture of a ruthless, deceiving, or power-hungry prelate, Moehler states that,²¹

All those who had the occasion to know Athanasius well, loved him, and those to whom he was pastor had a touching attachment to him. He knew how to recognize the worth of others and he highly proclaimed that worth. He showed much indulgence for human weakness, even in the case of that weakness exercising an influence on faith; he preferred to highlight the truth which had been mixed in with falsehood and he knew very well how to discover true interior faith contained within an exterior of error. When he had completely understood a person's character, and recognized that they were inwardly sound, he defended that person against all slander. Each time that he was forced to write against men to whom he was loyal, he fought their false principles, but refused to give their names.

Having given this assessment of Athanasius' perceptiveness and collegial character, Moehler goes on to write that Athanasius was 'not a man who confused dead formulas with living faith'.²²

According to Moehler, Athanasius' anger was reserved primarily for those 'within the Church who had become infected by decay

and who served the Church with malevolent purposes'. Further, he was 'an angry saint toward those who were the enemies of souls, bought by the blood of Jesus Christ'.²³ Concerning the accusations made against Athanasius at Tyre in AD 335, Moehler merely states that in all the confused and sordid affairs of the synod, Athanasius was the real victim.²⁴

Moehler was joined in this positive appraisal of Athanasius by John Henry Cardinal Newman. F.L. Cross commented that 'There was perhaps no one in any country who, in the first half of the nineteenth century, had a greater knowledge of Athanasius than Newman.'²⁵ Newman, in fact, freely admitted that his own religious pilgrimage both started and finished with the study of Athanasius.²⁶

To Newman, the Bishop of Alexandria is 'the great theologian',²⁷ 'the courageous heart',²⁸ and 'the champion of truth'.²⁹ He is:

the royal hearted Athanase
with Paul's own mantle blessed.³⁰

In Newman's writings Athanasius is the Church Catholic's example *par excellence*. When describing the Bishop's talent as a writer, Newman states that, Athanasius is 'simple in diction, clear, unstudied, direct, vigorous, elastic, and above all, filled with character'.³¹ As a theologian, Newman describes the Bishop of Alexandria as being rooted firmly in both Scripture and Christian Tradition.³² According to Newman, Athanasius is the universal Christian, for when the persecuted Bishop is 'driven from his Church, [he] makes all Christendom his home, from Trèves to Ethiopia...'³³ Extravagant in his praise of Athanasius, perhaps Newman's early verse in honour of the Bishop of Alexandria from the *Lyra Apostolica* best sums up the impressions of a young and

somewhat infatuated Oxford don:³⁴

When shall our northern Church her champion see,
 raised by divine decree,
 to shield the ancient Truth at his own harm?...
 like him who stayed the arm,
 of tyrannous power, and learning's sophist-tone,
 keen-visioned Seer, alone.

The many crouched before an idol-priest,
 Lord of the world's rank feast.
 In the dark night, mid the saint's trial sore,
 He stood, then bowed before,
 the Holy Mysteries, - he their meetest sign,
 weak vessel, yet divine!

A close contemporary of Newman was John Mason Neale, hymnist and poet, yet of primary importance in the present context for his minutely documented history of the patriarchates of the Eastern Church which, tragically, was left uncompleted at his death. In writing his chronicle of the Patriarchate of Alexandria, Neale took account of, and had access to most of the standard fourth and fifth century Church historians (including the synopsis of Philostorgius) as well as the major Coptic and Syriac histories.³⁵ In fact, Neale was able to make use of almost all the sources available to the modern Church historian apart from the more recent critical editions and excepting H.I. Bell's *London Papyri 1913-1914* which was unavailable until the 1920s. As a result of working with such materials, Neale finds the various ancient and the emerging modern accusations against Athanasius to be without foundation in the available evidence. Instead, Athanasius is pictured as a 'holy confessor',³⁶ who has 'justly [claimed] the most illustrious place among the Confessors, and [is] known in his Church by the title of the Apostolic Patriarch'.³⁷ As regards to any negative critique of the Bishop of Alexandria, Neale is only willing to state in his chronicle of events that we 'may suspect that Athanasius was not a man of much physical courage'.

According to Neale, however, this should only lead us 'to admire the grace which enabled him to give so long and so arduous a proof of moral constancy'.³⁸

Almost a generation later Henry Melvill Gwatkin wrote what was to become the standard text for many years concerning the Arian controversy. Although it is not without its critics, as in the present work of Gregg and Groh,³⁹ *Studies of Arianism*, first published in 1882 (with a second revised edition in 1900), still remains a highly respected volume of late nineteenth century critical research into the events of the fourth century. Gwatkin, as can be seen by consulting the Preface of the second edition, took into account what must be considered as the best research of his day. Unlike Moehler, Gwatkin is unable to regard Athanasius 'as a genuine ascetic'.⁴⁰ But when it comes to an assessment of the overall character and reliability of the Bishop of Alexandria, Gwatkin, on the basis of his evaluation of the sources,⁴¹ arrives at the following conclusion:⁴²

...Athanasius was before all things a man whose whole life was consecrated to a single purpose. If it was spent in controversy, he was no mere controversialist. And if he listened too easily to the stories told him of the Arian misdeeds, his language is at worst excused by their atrocious treachery. As for the charge of persecution, we must in fairness set against the Meletians who speak through Epiphanius the explicit denial of the Egyptian bishops. And if we take into account his own pleas for toleration and the comprehensive charity of his *de Synodis* and of the council of Alexandria, we must pronounce the charge unproved. If we could forget the violence of his friends at Tyre, we might say more.

When considering the many contemporary accusations against Athanasius, Gwatkin simply states that, 'the pertinacious hatred of a few was balanced by the enthusiastic admiration of many.'⁴³

Yet another late nineteenth century estimate of the character of Athanasius was made by Archibald Robertson, Bishop of Exeter

and former Master of Hatfield College, Durham, in the introduction to the writings of the Bishop of Alexandria for the *Select Library of Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of The Christian Church*. First published in 1891, Robertson's comments stand in complete contradiction to those of Seeck published some five years later.⁴⁴

According to Robertson,⁴⁵

[Athanasius] had the not too common gift of seeing the proportions of things. A great crisis was fully appreciated by him; he always saw at once where principles separated or united men, where the bond or the divergence was merely accidental. With Arius and Arianism no compromise was to be thought of; but he did not fail to distinguish men really at one with him on essentials, even where their conduct toward himself had been indefensible. So long as the cause was advanced, personal questions were insignificant. So far Athanasius was a partisan. It may be admitted that he saw little good in his opponents; but unless the evidence is singularly misleading there was little good to see. The leaders of the Arian interest were unscrupulous men, either bitter and unreasoning fanatics like Secundus and Maris, or more often political theologians, like Eusebius of Nicomedia, Valens, Acacius, who lacked religious earnestness. It may be admitted that he refused to admit error in his friends. His long alliance with Marcellus, his unvarying refusal to utter a syllable of condemnation of him by name; his refusal to name even Photinus, while yet exposing the error associated with his name; his suppression of the name of Apollinarius, even when writing directly against him; all this was inconsistent with strict impartiality, and, no doubt, placed his adversaries partly in the right. But it was the partiality of a generous and loyal spirit, and he could be generous to personal enemies if he saw in them an approximation to himself in principle.

The Arian controversy was to [Athanasius] no battle for ecclesiastical power, nor for theological triumph. It was a religious crisis involving the reality of revelation and redemption.

Far from seeking the establishment of his own power in the Church, Robertson stated that 'In the whole of our minute knowledge of

his life there is a total lack of self-interest. The glory of God and the welfare of the Church absorbed him fully at all times'.⁴⁶ The portrait of Athanasius painted by Robertson bears little, if any, resemblance to that of his contemporary Seeck, although, again, both were making use of the same sources.⁴⁷

Similar views concerning the character of Athanasius and a dismissal of the many accusations made against him can be found in any number of other nineteenth century Athanasian scholars. One would only have to consult, in addition to those sources named above, the works of Neander, Kaye, Hort, Dorner, or Bright.⁴⁸ Or again, a similar outlook can be found in the biographical studies of Fialon, Reynolds, Bush, or the extensive monographs on the life of Athanasius by Stanley in the mid-nineteenth century or Farrar at the end of that century.⁴⁹ In the last decade of the nineteenth century even the often critical Harnack pays tribute to Athanasius by comparing him to the 'hero' of the Reformation, Martin Luther, stating that 'Athanasius joined hands with Luther across the centuries'.⁵⁰ Moreover, an amazing turn of argument is suggested in his *Lehrbuch der Dogmengeschichte* in which Harnack indicates that far from being a political opportunist, it was solely due to the integrity of Athanasius that the Church was saved from the snares of political power and became once again an institute of salvation, with the preaching of Christ as its primary purpose.⁵¹ Similar positive assessments of Athanasius were carried into the early part of the twentieth century in the biographical studies by Lauchert and Bardy.⁵²

Robertson's final comments on the character of Athanasius admirably sum up the attitude of the majority of scholars previous to the emergence of the German critical tradition following Seeck,

and the publication of *London Papyri 1913-1914* by H.I. Bell in 1924. Robertson says of the character of Athanasius that it,⁵³

has won the respect and admiration even of those who do not feel that they owe to him the vindication of all that is sacred and precious. Not only a Gregory or an Epiphanius, an Augustine or a Cyril, a Luther or a Hooker, not only Montfaucon and Tillemont, Newman and Stanley pay tribute to him as a Christian hero. Secular as well as Church historians fall under the spell of his personality, and even Gibbon lays aside his 'solemn sneer' to do homage to Athanasius the Great.

At this point, one may wonder what has caused, or actually stands behind, the change in attitude which has taken place as regards the character of Athanasius in the twentieth century. A simple explanation might be that just as the nineteenth century writers were captive to the somewhat romantic religious and literary tone of their day, those who have followed Seeck have been captive to the equally transitory critical spirit of theirs. Although this would explain the motivations behind the two sets of writers, it does not fully take into account the emergence of new historical sources and new methods used in the interpretation of extant or standard materials. Interpretations, however, by their very nature tend to be subjective rather than objective in their attempted perceptions. In the case of Athanasius, this has resulted in two assessments/interpretations which now stand side by side. One is the standard history of Athanasius which views him, in the main, as a hagiographical figure. The other is an almost hyper-critical view of Athanasius which tends to deprecate both his character and contribution. Both, however, claim certain source materials as evidence for their respective positions.

2.3 Current Views

In the last two decades these two opposing views of the character and reliability of Athanasius have been joined by a third, and somewhat more central stream of thought. Scholars such as Leslie W. Barnard, Frances Young, and G. Christopher Stead have come to a renewed appreciation of Athanasius in spite of what they see as his many faults and foibles as a theologian, bishop, and/or historian.⁵⁴ Another example of this 'centrist' school of Athanasian studies is the German scholar Martin Tetz. In his recent 'Zur Biographie des Athanasius von Alexandrien',⁵⁵ Tetz calls for a rather radical revision of the critical view of Athanasius which has been built up over the last century. He concludes that Athanasius was more deeply concerned with the *imitatio sanctorum* than many modern scholars have cared to admit, and that Scripture, not personal or political intrigues, must be seen as the one overall normative factor in Athanasius' career.⁵⁶

Even more conservative rehabilitations of Athanasius' career and writings have been taken up by others. In 1962 the American theologian Jaroslav Pelikan wrote of 'the great moral character of Athanasius' in his monograph *The Light of the World*, and stated that from the available evidence 'even historians and theologians unsympathetic to orthodox beliefs are really obliged to concede the same.'⁵⁷ Pelikan has been joined in this very positive assessment of Athanasius by a number of historians and theologians among whom one could cite G. Florovsky, T. Torrance, G.D. Dragas, E.D. Moutsoulas, V. Twomey and R. Person.⁵⁸

One must admit, however, that the critical tradition which started in Athanasian studies with Otto Seeck is still very much an active force, albeit with varying degrees of severity. Timothy Barnes, for example, accepts without question the 'violent' view

of Athanasius to the extent of portraying the bishop as 'a gangster';⁵⁹ while maintaining an otherwise high regard for the bishop of Alexandria and following the literary tradition of Bardy and Duchesne, Charles Kannengiesser has, nonetheless, recently called into question the Athanasian authorship of *Contra Arianos III*;⁶⁰ William Rusch has cited the somewhat suspect historical narratives of Philostorgius as preferable to parallel historical accounts in Athanasius;⁶¹ K.M. Girardet has expressed his suspicion concerning the so-called 'one-sided orthodox materials' of the fourth century;⁶² Jean-Marie Leroux has cast doubts upon the actual influence of Athanasius within the Eastern churches during his lifetime;⁶³ William Schneemelcher, although maintaining a cautious tone, continues to see political motivations and subsequent deceptions in many of the Athanasian writings;⁶⁴ and Annik Martin has reopened the issue of the Meletian schism and its possible strength and popularity as it affected Athanasius' authority (or lack of it) within the Egyptian church.⁶⁵

Much more could be said concerning all of the above authors, and several others as well, but as there will be frequent references to such recent scholarship throughout this presentation, it is perhaps best to turn our attention to those issues and main areas of contention regarding the character of Athanasius which have received such renewed interest.

3. ISSUES IN DISPUTE

3.1 An Identification of the Issues

A recent overview of the life and writings of Athanasius by Frances Young has outlined current attitudes towards the Bishop of Alexandria and has indicated those materials which stand behind certain of the the more negative assessments of his character. Young states that 'there seems to have been a pitiless streak in [Athanasius'] character - that he resorted to violence to achieve his own ends is implied by a good deal of evidence'.⁶⁶ It is further indicated that in his concern with the Meletian schism in Egypt, Athanasius 'did not scruple to use force in his dealings with this group'.⁶⁷ Finally, the assertion is made that Athanasius'⁶⁸

deposition at Tyre was based, not on doctrinal considerations, but upon his misconduct in Egypt. Rusch is certainly right in suggesting that the hostile reports of Philostorgius, the evidence of the papyri, and the criticisms that Gregory Nazianzen felt he had to answer in his panegyric, must be admitted in the search for the historical Athanasius.

Young here refers to a recent study by William Rusch in which he examines materials which he feels must be consulted in the construction of a true historical picture of Athanasius.⁶⁹ The three particular items which Rusch sees as being of importance, alongside the other narrative sources for such a history, are:

- 1) The reports of the fifth century church historian Philostorgius, of which we possess only fragments incorporated in the ninth century *Epitome* of Photius.⁷⁰

- 2) *London Papyrus 1914*, a fourth century Egyptian letter, came to light in the early twentieth century and was edited, annotated, and published by H.I. Bell in 1924.⁷¹
- 3) A festival oration of Gregory Nazianzen in which the life and theological activities of Athanasius are eulogized and defended.⁷²

Together, these three sources are those, which for the most part, have contributed to recent critical revisionist accounts of the life and character of Athanasius. When linked to the often hostile opinions of the German critical school and the accusations initiated by Seeck, it is well within the realm of possibility to see the Bishop of Alexandria as someone very different from the traditional hagiographical image of 'Athanasius the Great'. If, however, such a radical reversal in opinion is to be truly warranted, a careful and unprejudiced examination of each of these three sources must be made.

3.2 Philostorgius and the Consecration Controversy

It is claimed by Rusch that the *Ecclesiastical History* of Philostorgius, contained in the *Epitome* of Photius, ninth century patriarch of Constantinople, has preserved a genuine historical tradition concerning Athanasius, albeit of a non-orthodox kind.⁷³ He has been joined in this assessment by F. Young and L.W. Barnard, with tacit agreement to this proposition indicated by W.H.C. Frend.⁷⁴ In fact, owing in part to the influence of Seeck and Schwartz, many modern historians have tended to distrust the so-called 'orthodox' sources for the history of this period. K.M. Girardet has characterized such orthodox sources as promoting

a 'one-sided pro-Athanasian' point of view.⁷⁵ This has resulted in 'non-orthodox' sources receiving a greater deal of credence than they might possibly deserve on the basis of both internal and external evidence. L.W. Barnard goes so far as to suggest that the tradition that Philostorgius was essentially an Arian apologist is incorrect, although the passages cited from the *Ecclesiastical History* by Barnard to prove this point seem, in this author's opinion, more likely to have been the interpolations of Photius.⁷⁶

Philostorgius' history, written between AD 425 and AD 433, has long been recognized as 'a late apology for the extreme Arianism of Eunomius.'⁷⁷ Photius himself describes Philostorgius in the following terms:⁷⁸

Read the so-called *Ecclesiastical History* by Philostorgius the Arian, the spirit of which is different from that of nearly all other ecclesiastical historians. He extols all Arians, but abuses and insults all the orthodox, so that this work is not so much a history as a panegyric of the heretics, and nothing but a barefaced attack upon the orthodox. His style is elegant, his diction often poetical, though not to such an extent as to be tedious or disagreeable. His figurative use of words is very expressive and makes the work both pleasant and agreeable to read; sometimes, however, these figures are overbold and far-fetched, and create an impression of being frigid and ill-timed. The language is variously embellished even to excess, so that the reader imperceptibly finds himself involved in a disagreeable obscurity. In many instances the author introduces appropriate moral reflections of his own. He starts from the devotion of Arius to the heresy and its first beginnings, and ends with the recall of the impious Aetius. This Aetius was removed from his office by his brother heretics, since he outdid them in wickedness, as Philostorgius himself unwillingly confesses. He was recalled and welcomed by the impious Julian. The history, in one volume and six books, goes down to this period. The author is a liar and the narrative often fictitious.

Although Philostorgius may, in fact, have had access to some Arian

sources now lost to us, it must be admitted that the fragments which remain are not only biased, but, in many places, patently inaccurate as well.⁷⁹ This is especially true of those portions in Philostorgius which concern Athanasius.

In the fragments of Philostorgius' *Ecclesiastical History* preserved by Photius in the *Epitome*, only two passages make direct reference to Athanasius.⁸⁰ The first of these passages claims to be an account of the consecration of Athanasius following the death of Alexander. The second passage recounts the events which led to the return of Athanasius to Alexandria following his first exile. Of these two portions of Philostorgius, the former passage has received the greater attention in the search for the 'historical Athanasius', for it calls into question the events which surrounded the elevation of Athanasius to the throne of St. Mark. It also calls into question the veracity of Athanasius in his account both of his consecration and his later defence at Tyre in AD 335.⁸¹

Philostorgius' account of the events surrounding the consecration of Athanasius is epitomised by Photius as follows:⁸²

The impious contriver of lies [ie. Philostorgius] asserts, that after the death of Alexander, bishop of Alexandria, the votes of the prelates were not unanimous, and that there was a diversity of sentiment, and after a considerable amount of time had been spent in altercation, the divine Athanasius (τὸν θεῖον Ἀθανάσιον) suddenly appeared one evening in the church called after Dionysius, and finding there two Egyptian bishops, firmly closed the doors with the assistance of some of his followers, and so was ordained (χειροτονῶν) by them, though strongly against the will of the ordainers. For a power from above fell upon them, and so constrained their will and powers that what Athanasius wished was done at once. Philostorgius adds, that the remainder of the bishops then present anathematized Athanasius on account of this transaction; and that the latter, having first thoroughly strengthened his cause, addressed to the emperor certain letters relating to his

ordination, in the name of the entire state; and that the emperor, thinking that the letters in question were written by the assembly of the Alexandrians, ratified (κατοχῆν) the election with his approval. Afterwards, however, upon being informed of the details of the transaction, he sent Athanasius to Tyre, a city of Phoenicia, to give an account of the matter before a synod which was assembled there.

According to Photius, Philostorgius goes on to describe the events which took place at the Synod of Tyre, where, again according to Philostorgius, Athanasius is said to have been accused of fraud, immorality, illegal ordination, and the oft-reported violence against the so-called Meletian priest Ischyras. Philostorgius goes on to assert that,⁸³

Athanasius, who had hoped to escape trial altogether, went away after having been convicted of a double crime, not merely an illegal ordination (οὐκ εὐαγοῦ χειροτονίας), but also a foul calumny; and so, by the common consent of all, a sentence of deposition was passed against him.

Philostorgius further states that for these reasons Athanasius was excommunicated by a second sitting of the synod and that it was at this time (ie. AD 335) that Gregory the Cappadocian was consecrated and sent to Alexandria to take Athanasius' place.⁸⁴ The latter event did not, in fact, take place until AD 341, and then it was at the behest of the Synod of Antioch.⁸⁵

How then are we to evaluate the accusations of Philostorgius concerning the election and ordination of Athanasius? First we must note that the account of Philostorgius was written, along with the other histories of Socrates and Sozomen, a full hundred years after the events under discussion and was based upon uncertain and, we may assume, biased Arian sources.⁸⁶ Secondly, we must acknowledge that the consecration account of Philostorgius is only one among many such Arian, Eusebian, and Meletian accounts

which seem to have been widely circulated following the death of Athanasius and which called into question the validity of Athanasius' election and consecration as Bishop of Alexandria. As we shall see, however, none of these 'non-orthodox' accounts agree, either as concerning a general outline of events, or in their specific details.

The church historian Socrates, using, it would appear, mainly Athanasian materials as his source,⁸⁷ writes in his *Ecclesiastical History* that a short time after their return from exile (i.e. following Nicaea), the Eusebians,⁸⁸

...objected to the ordination of Athanasius, partly as a person unworthy (ἀνάξγου) of the prelacy, and partly because he had been elected by disqualified persons (μὴ ὡς ὑπὸ ἀξιωματικῶν). But when Athanasius had shown himself superior to this calumny (for having assumed control (ἐγκρατῆς) of the church of Alexandria, he ardently contended for the Nicene Creed), then Eusebius exerted himself to the utmost insidiously to cause the removal of Athanasius and to bring Arius back to Alexandria...

Yet another version of the election and ordination of Athanasius is found in Sozomen's *Ecclesiastical History*.⁸⁹ In his account of the events surrounding the elevation of Athanasius, Sozomen tells of how Athanasius sought to 'avoid this honour by flight, but that he, although being unwilling, was afterwards constrained by Alexander to accept the bishopric'.⁹⁰ After confirming the above statement with the testimony of one 'Apolinarius the Syrian', Sozomen provides us with an alternative Arian account of the election:⁹¹

The Arians assert that after the death of Alexander, the respective followers of that bishop and of Meletius held communion together, and fifty-four bishops from Thebes, and other parts of Egypt, assembled together, and agreed by oath to choose by a common vote, the man who could advantageously administer the Church

of Alexandria; but that seven of the bishops, in violation of their oath, and contrary to the opinion of all, secretly ordained Athanasius; and that on this account many of the people and many of the Egyptian clergy seceded from communion with him.

Sozomen, however, seems to dismiss the validity of this Arian account. He states that, 'For my part, I am convinced that it was by Divine appointment (οὐκ ἄθεεῖ παρελθεῖν) that Athanasius succeeded to the high-priesthood (ἀρχιερωσύνην),'⁹² and proceeds to extol the virtues of Athanasius. Sozomen ends his narrative of events by relating the apocryphal⁹³ story of Athanasius' 'boy baptism', his subsequent service in the household of Bishop Alexander and his friendship with St. Antony.⁹⁴

Two further accounts of the election of Athanasius as Bishop of Alexandria are provided by Epiphanius of Salamis in the *Panarion*.⁹⁵ Most likely completed in AD 377,⁹⁶ the *Panarion* gives two somewhat conflicting narratives concerning the elevation of Athanasius to the throne of St. Mark. The first of these is related in a discussion of the Meletian schism in Egypt and is concerned with what appears to have been an attempted Meletian usurpation of the See of Alexandria at the time of Alexander's death. The passage states that,⁹⁷

...Alexander of Alexandria drew near to death soon after the synod which had taken place in Nicaea. But Athanasius was not present at the death of Alexander, for at that time he was Alexander's deacon and had been sent to a meeting (κομητάριον). Alexander had ordered that no one should be appointed to succeed him but Athanasius alone; to this arrangement Alexander, many clergy, and the whole church had borne witness. Taking this opportunity [i.e. of Alexander's death], however, the Meletians installed a bishop of Egypt, owing to there now being no bishop of Alexandria (because Alexandria never had two bishops as other cities have); they, therefore, instead of obeying the will of Alexander, installed a bishop of Egypt named Theonas, who being in office three months

died. Athanasius then returned, not long after the death of Theonas, and from all the region round about a synod of the orthodox gathered which installed him [Athanasius] and gave him the throne as the one worthy (τῷ ἀξίῳ), who had already been prepared by God's will (τὴν θεοῦ βούλησιν) ... , and the witness and command of blessed Alexander.

The second account of the election found in the *Panarion*, seems, from all outward appearances and internal evidence, to be based upon Arian sources.⁹⁸ It is provided in connection with Epiphanius' history of the Arians in Egypt. That it is based on an historical account different from the passage cited above is evident from the contradictory nature of the two narratives. Further, the claim made in this second account of Epiphanius, that a certain 'Achillas' was elected as Bishop of Alexandria, either by the Arians alone or by the whole of the Egyptian clergy (excluding the Meletians),⁹⁹ is, according to L.W. Barnard, 'unsupported and is [also] open to the insuperable objection that Achillas was bishop of Alexandria before, and not after, Alexander'.¹⁰⁰ In any case, the account is as follows:¹⁰¹

As soon as Arius had been anathematized the following events took place in this manner. In the same year that Alexander went to his rest he was succeeded by Achillas (and Theonas was installed by the Meletians). Then Achillas, who became bishop for three months, was succeeded by the blessed Athanasius who had been Alexander's deacon and had, at that time, been sent by him to a meeting (κομητάριον); to whom, Alexander, when he was about to die, had ordered that the bishopric should be given. It was, however, the custom in Alexandria not to delay the installation of bishops after the death of the previous bishop, but to have this done immediately for the sake of peace and to avoid friction (παταρβασ) among the people, because some would want this one and others that one. So out of necessity, because of Athanasius' absence, they installed Achillas. But the throne and priesthood (ἱερωσύνη) had been prepared for the one [i.e. Athanasius] who had been called by God (τῷ ἐκ θεοῦ κεκλημένῳ) and had been appointed

by the blessed Alexander. Because Athanasius then came and was installed, and because he was zealous for the faith and in the defence of the church, many schismatic gatherings began to take place of the so-called Meletians (the reasonings of Meletius we have already stated); but Athanasius, for the reasons, stated above, desired the unity of the divided church.

Before turning to Athanasius' own account of his election and ordination as Bishop of Alexandria, there are yet two other sources describing this event which are of interest and importance.

The first of these two sources is Gregory Nasianzen's oration in honour of Athanasius. Commonly referred to as *Oration XXI*,¹⁰² this panegyric was delivered at Constantinople by Gregory at some point between AD 379 and 381.¹⁰³ Although *Oration XXI* contains a disputed passage concerning charges made against Athanasius at the Synod of Tyre (which charges will be examined in another context), it is of greater importance at this point in our study to examine that portion of the panegyric which describes the election and consecration of Athanasius as Bishop of Alexandria. Gregory first says of Athanasius' ordination to the priesthood (and to the episcopate) that he was,¹⁰⁴

...deemed worthy of the holy office and rank, and after passing through the entire series of orders (πᾶσαν τὴν τῶν βαθμῶν ἀκολουθήσαν διεξελεθῶν) he was (to make my story short) entrusted with the chief rule (προεδρίαν) over the people...

Gregory then goes on to speak specifically and directly of Athanasius' election to, and installation in, the throne of St. Mark. Possibly basing his account on the *Synodal Letter of the Egyptian Bishops of AD 338*,¹⁰⁵ Gregory states that,¹⁰⁶

...by the vote of the whole people (ψῆφῳ τοῦ λαοῦ παντός), not in the evil fashion which has since prevailed, nor by means of bloodshed and oppression (οὐδὲ φονικῶς τε καὶ τυραννικῶς) but in a apostolic and spiritual

manner, he is led up to the throne of Saint Mark, to succeed him in piety, no less than in office; in the latter indeed at a great distance from him, in the former, which is true of succession, following him closely. For unity in doctrine deserves unity in office; and a rival teacher sets up a rival throne (ἀντιθρόνον) the one is the successor in reality, the other but in name. For it is not the intruder, but he whose rights are intruded upon, who is the successor, not the law breaker, but the lawfully appointed (ὁ προβληθεὶς ἐνόμως) not the man of contrary opinions, but the man of the same faith; if this is not what we mean by successor, he succeeds in the same sense as disease to health, darkness to light, storm to calm, and frenzy to sound sense.

The second of these two sources has its basis in a Coptic oral tradition which has found its way into patristic literature in the *Apophthegmata Patrum* 78.¹⁰⁷ Although the exact origin and date of the narrative in question is more difficult to trace than certain of the other texts which have been cited above, both the context and subject matter point to it being a record of an incident which took place in Egypt during the episcopate of Athanasius. Some scholars, as V. Twomey, have sought to set a date slightly after the death of Athanasius (AD 373) for this text, although this is by no means certain.¹⁰⁸ This particular narrative was, however, placed in a more definitive textual tradition with its inclusion in the late fifth century compilation of the *Apophthegmata Patrum*. Two versions of the text are extant, the shorter recension is in Greek, the longer in Syriac.¹⁰⁹ A translation of the Greek text is as follows:¹¹⁰

At this time certain heretics came to Abba Poemen, and they began to speak against the Archbishop of Alexandria, for they claimed that he had received ordination from presbyters (πρεσβυτέρων ἔχει τὴν χειροτονίαν) ...

In E.A.W. Budge's translation of the same passage from the Syriac text, the point concerning presbyterial ordination is made in an even stronger way and seems, from the limited evidence of the

text, to be directed against the whole episcopal structure of Alexandria. Budge translates the passage in the following manner:¹¹¹

Certain heretics came on one occasion to Abba Poemen, and they began to calumniate the Archbishop of Alexandria, and to speak evil things concerning him, and they sought to prove that as they [the archbishops] had received consecration from the priests, they were consecrated like [other] priests...

Finally, in any assessment of the historical veracity of Philostorgius' account, as well as the accuracy of the other historians and writers cited above, we must turn to not only the earliest, but the most complete record of those events which surrounded the selection, ordination and consecration of Athanasius as Bishop of Alexandria. This is to be found in the aforementioned *Synodal Letter of the Egyptian Bishops of AD 338* which is included by Athanasius in the *Apologia secunda*.¹¹² That Athanasius himself speaks through the letter in defending himself against a number of charges is without doubt. One must also admit, however, that the *Synodal Letter of AD 338* claims to be the testimony of the entire 'holy synod assembled at Alexandria, out of Egypt, the Thebais, Libya, and Pentapolis'.¹¹³ Further, the synod sought to confirm the truthfulness of their account by stating that 'of all this [i.e. the election procedure] we are witnesses, and so is the whole city, and the province too'.¹¹⁴ We must also note that those gathered at this synod were well acquainted with the charges which had been made by the Eusebian-Meletian alliance against Athanasius concerning his election and ordination and were, therefore, very much prepared to give as full an account of the events as possible. Their statement is as follows:¹¹⁵

They [i.e. the Eusebians] prejudiced the Emperor against him [i.e. Athanasius]; they frequently threatened him with Councils; and at last assembled at Tyre; and to this day they cease not to write against him, and are so implacable that they even find fault with his appointment to the Episcopate, taking every means of shewing their enmity and hatred towards him, and spreading false reports for the sole purpose of thereby vilifying his character.

However, the very misrepresentations which they now are making do but convict their former statements of being falsehoods, and a mere conspiracy against him. For they say, that 'after the death of Bishop Alexander, a certain few having mentioned the name of Athanasius, six or seven Bishops elected him clandestinely in a secret place:' and this is what they wrote to the Emperors, having no scruple about asserting the greatest falsehoods. Now that the whole multitude and all the people of the Catholic Church (ὁ λαὸς τῆς καθολικῆς ἐκκλησίας) assembled together as with one mind and body and cried, shouted, that Athanasius should be Bishop of their Church, made this the subject of their public prayers to Christ, and conjured us to grant it for many days and nights, neither departing themselves from the Church, nor suffering us to do so; of all this we are witnesses, and so is the whole city, and the province too. Not a word did they speak against him, as these persons represented, but gave him the most excellent titles they could devise, calling him good, pious, Christian, an ascetic, a genuine Bishop. And that he was elected by a majority (πλεόονες) of our body in the sight and with acclamations of all the people, we who elected him also testify, who are surely more credible witnesses than those who were not present, and now spread these false accounts.

The only further reference we have concerning objections to the election and consecration of Athanasius as Bishop of Alexandria comes from the *Chronicon Athanasianum*¹¹⁶ and may well be supported by a remark in the letter of Constantine which is quoted by Athanasius in the *Apologia secunda*. In the *Chronicon* III the compiler of the festal letters states that in AD 330-331 Athanasius,¹¹⁷

... went to the Imperial Court to the Emperor Constantine the Great, having been summoned before him, on account of an accusation his enemies made, that he had been appointed when too young. He appeared [before Constantine], was thought worthy of favour and honour, and returned when the [quadragesimal] fast was half finished.

It is possible that it was this incident which Constantine had in mind when writing to the people of Alexandria in AD 331-332.¹¹⁸

Constantine states that Athanasius' enemies appeared before him complaining that:¹¹⁹

Such an one is too old; *such an one is a mere boy*; the office belongs to me; it is due to me, since it is taken away from him. I will gain over all men to my side, and then I will endeavour with my power to ruin him. [Emphasis added]

Constantine's response to these charges was one of scorn and derision and a dismissal of the accusers stating that, 'Theirs [Athanasius' enemies] is the mere force of envy, supported by those baneful influences which naturally belong to it'.¹²⁰

If we are to discover, with any degree of certainty, what actually took place in Alexandria concerning those events which surrounded the elevation of Athanasius to the throne of St. Mark in AD 328, a critical, careful and impartial evaluation of all of the above materials must be undertaken. This is of even greater importance, if, as we have stated before, we wish to call into question the use of Philostorgius as a reliable witness in the search for the 'historical Athanasius'. That the central portion of Philostorgius' account of Athanasius is concerned with a so-called 'contested' election and consecration is a matter which leads to yet further difficult questions. These particular concerns may be set out as follows:

1) The question of pre-Athanasian consecration practices in the Church of Alexandria.

That this issue impinges upon the so-called 'contested' election of Athanasius among recent scholars is clear. Writing in 1952, W. Telfer argued on the basis of texts from Jerome, Epiphanius, Ambrosiaster, and Eutychius,¹²¹ among others, that the system whereby the Bishop of Alexandria was elected and consecrated by the Alexandrine presbyters, was set aside only 'when Athanasius, deacon to Alexander, succeeded him in the throne [of St. Mark]'.¹²² According to Telfer it was only as a result of the fourth canon of the Council of Nicaea¹²³ that this change came about at all and that, therefore,¹²⁴

The probability is that the old custom was undisturbed until Nicaea, that Alexander was the last Alexandrine pope to take office without the imposition of living episcopal hands, and that a new order came in with Athanasius.

Writing in a similar context in 1955, Telfer again states that, 'until Nicaea, Egyptian ideas on episcopal succession were peculiar' and that, 'after Nicaea there is no reason to doubt that orthodox Egypt superimposed the requirements of the Nicene Canon upon the traditional Egyptian pattern in these matters'.¹²⁵

Telfer's view has been accepted and echoed by H. Nordberg, who, in a monograph published in 1963, stated that,¹²⁶

When Bishop Alexander died, he had already made arrangements in two respects for the election of his successor. Firstly, he had the election procedure changed, so that the Archbishop was no longer to be chosen by and within the presbyter's collegium in Alexandria, but jointly by the Bishops of all the ecclesiastical provinces.

Nordberg is of the opinion that this change was made 'mainly in view of the Meletians', whom he believes were set to assume a more powerful role in the affairs of the Egyptian Church.¹²⁷

Nordberg adds that secondly, 'Bishop Alexander had openly expressed the wish that Athanasius should be his successor'.¹²⁸ In considering the length of time between the death of Bishop Alexander (which he wrongly places as 'shortly before Easter')¹²⁹ and the election of Athanasius on 8 June 328, Nordberg states that, 'It is apparent that the election, besides the adoption of a new election procedure, took place under exceptional conditions'.¹³⁰ It is important to note that Nordberg rejects the early testimony of the synodal letter of the Egyptian bishops and, following the later Arian accounts contained in Sozomen¹³¹ and Philostorgius,¹³² states that 'the election itself [i.e. of Athanasius] was unobtrusively effected by an insignificant number of bishops - seven or two'.¹³³ According to Nordberg, it was for these reasons that Athanasius sought confirmation of his election from the Emperor Constantine and then made an extensive tour of his archepiscopal see in order to gain the approval of those bishops not present in Alexandria at the time of his consecration.¹³⁴

L.W. Barnard, writing in 1975, is more careful in his handling of the available evidence.¹³⁵ He rightly rejects the overburdened theory of Telfer that a Meletian bishop named John Arcaph had prospective rights to the See of Alexandria following the death of Alexander under the terms of an agreement made with Constantine about the time of Nicaea.¹³⁶ Barnard states that 'Telfer's ingenious reconstruction will not bear critical investigation resting, as it does, mainly on conjecture rather than contemporary evidence'.¹³⁷ Barnard does, however, seem to follow Telfer and Nordberg on a number of other points, including that of the so-called 'new election' procedure which was supposed to have come into effect at the death of Alexander. Barnard contends that 'Alexander, before he died, made arrangements for Athanasius'

election and for the changing of the [election] procedure'.¹³⁸ Making use of arguments similar to those of Nordberg, Barnard, although more cautious in his overall evaluation of the Alexandrine context, does comment *a priori* that, 'It seems certain that the election [i.e. of Athanasius] was disputed'.¹³⁹

Both Barnard and Nordberg seem to have been either unaware of, or to have set aside, the important critique of Telfer's position concerning the pre-Athanasian consecration practices of the Church of Alexandria made by E.W. Kemp in 1955.¹⁴⁰ Following an examination of the way in which Telfer makes use of various texts, with special attention being given to a disputed passage from Jerome on the Alexandrine method of consecration,¹⁴¹ Kemp rightly points to the fact that Telfer 'places more weight on the evidence than it will properly bear'.¹⁴² Furthermore, commenting on the use of Epiphanius as an independent witness of the ancient practices of the Church of Alexandria viz-a-viz episcopal consecration in general, and that of Athanasius in particular, Kemp remarks that,¹⁴³

as a general historian [Epiphanius] is not very reliable and this particular statement [i.e. concerning Athanasius' election and Alexandrine consecration customs] is not strengthened by the context in which it appears.

After showing the many inaccuracies contained in Epiphanius' 'second Arian' account¹⁴⁴ of the election of Athanasius and the supposed custom of immediate succession,¹⁴⁵ Kemp rightly argues that this passage 'cannot be accepted without independent support'.¹⁴⁶

In Telfer's argument that a change in consecration practices took place at the time of Alexander's death, he seeks to confirm disputed passages, such as those in Epiphanius, by the use of much later writers.¹⁴⁷ Special reference is made to the work of Eutychius, the Melkite patriarch of Alexandria (AD 933-943), also

known as Sa'id ibn Batrik. In his *Annals* Euty chius made the following claim:¹⁴⁸

... this custom of the twelve presbyters of Alexandria appointing the patriarch out of themselves continued till the time of the patriarch Alexander, who was of the three hundred and eighteen; he forbade the presbyters henceforth to appoint the patriarch, and ordered that when the patriarch was dead the bishops should assemble and ordain a patriarch. He ordained, moreover, that at a vacancy they should elect some outstanding and upright man from any part of the land, whether he were one of the twelve city presbyters or not and make him patriarch. Thus ceased the ancient custom of the presbyters appointing the patriarch, and there took its place the rule of the patriarch being made by the bishops.

Kemp, however, has pointed out that, 'It is generally agreed that Euty chius was an ignorant and blundering writer, and evidence which appears for the first time in his annals cannot be relied upon with any degree of certainty'.¹⁴⁹

Kemp makes similar statements in regard to Telfer's handling of other material as well, such as the *Vita Petri*,¹⁵⁰ and the writings of Severus of El Eschmouein¹⁵² and Severus of Antioch.¹⁵² Many of Telfer's arguments are considered by Kemp to be 'pure conjecture'.¹⁵³ None of the constructions presented by Telfer appear to justify his conclusion that,¹⁵⁴

... there is no longer room for doubt that early popes of Alexandria took office without the intervention of bishops of other sees.

Telfer's insistence on the historicity of a macabre ceremony in which it is implied that consecration actually took place through the imposition of the hands of the dead bishop upon the person of his successor is, as Telfer himself admits, 'conjectural'.¹⁵⁵ Telfer, however, builds upon this assumption and maintains that both this ceremony, and the practice of presbyterial consecration, were retained until the time of Alexander.¹⁵⁶

The probability is that the old custom was undisturbed until Nicaea, that Alexander was the last Alexandrine pope to take office without the imposition of living episcopal hands, and that a new order came in with Athanasius.

In reply to such an extraordinary claim based upon such dubious sources, Kemp merely comments that, 'The reader will, perhaps, consider that here conjecture has run far beyond the limits of reliable evidence...'.¹⁵⁷ Kemp, on the weight of the available evidence, rightly rejects Telfer's theory and indicates that if such unusual customs had actually been in force, they had most likely ceased following the episcopate of Heraclas of Alexandria (AD 233-49).¹⁵⁸ Further, Kemp comments that,¹⁵⁹

In view of the place which Alexandria occupies in the fourth century it is very remarkable that no contemporary or near contemporary reference should have survived if the change was made as late as the time of Nicaea and with the election of Athanasius.

It is clear that apart from one disputed passage in Jerome, the only other clear statement we have on the exact time and circumstances of such a change is 'to be found in an inaccurate writer of the tenth century', i.e. in the *Annals* of Eutychius.¹⁶⁰ Although Kemp allows the possibility that there is 'evidence of the survival at Alexandria to a later date than elsewhere of a presbyterial college with episcopal powers', the overall thrust of his argument is that such a collegium was no longer empowered to consecrate a bishop in the early decades of the fourth century.¹⁶¹ It would, in fact, be reasonable to state that the use of such a collegium had probably ceased to perform this function by the middle of the third century.^{161a} Kemp, considering the citations from Jerome, Eutychius, and Severus of Antioch, concludes that,¹⁶²

It is possible to argue with some plausibility as do Gore and Turner that we have in these writers merely traces of what was originally an Arian calumny about Athanasius.

Kemp is followed in this particular judgement by J. Lecuyer¹⁶³ who applies this argument to the Alexandrine consecration calumny found in the *Apophthegmata Patrum* 78 and cited in the text above.¹⁶⁴ In examining this Arian accusation, we must reject C.H. Turner's theory that the Archbishop being accused is Theophilus,¹⁶⁵ and follow the argument of Gore that Poemen was already a well established anchorite by about AD 375.¹⁶⁶ The subject of the accusation would, therefore, most likely be either Athanasius or his immediate successor, Peter. From the silence of Poemen in answering the accusation, Telfer assumes some degree of truth in the statement that the Archbishop 'had received ordination from presbyters'.¹⁶⁷ This view, however, does not take into account the Syriac version of the story which speaks of the archbishops of Alexandria in the plural¹⁶⁸ and clearly characterizes the entire exchange as an heretical exercise in slander.¹⁶⁹ If we accept Gore's date of AD 375 for this story, it seems even more likely that the purpose of the slander was two-fold. Firstly, it may have been meant to cast aspersions on the memory of Athanasius, who had only recently died in AD 373, and secondly, it may have sought to call into question the validity of orders conferred by Athanasius which were still operative in orthodox Egypt. Although the story may have had its origins in the more distant past concerning the ancient method of appointing bishops of Alexandria, it appears from the evidence that there was no basis in fact to apply such a slur to the memory of Athanasius.

From all the above we may come to certain reasonable

conclusions concerning the question of the pre-Athanasian consecration practices of the Church of Alexandria. The first conclusion is that Telfer's ingenious reconstructions are unable to be maintained under Kemp's careful scrutiny, being based upon either unreliable writers far removed in time from the events being considered or upon very selective and highly disputed passages from more contemporary sources. Secondly, we may find fault with the statements of both Nordberg and Barnard that a new method of consecration came about only after the death of Alexander and during the subsequent election of Athanasius.

Finally, comment needs to be made concerning two of the texts mentioned above, which seem to give support to Philostorgius' narrative concerning the so-called 'disputed election' of Athanasius. Firstly, we note that the 'second Arian' account of Athanasius' election given by Epiphanius finds no support in the evidence examined.¹⁷⁰ His remarks are not only confused historically (e.g. the fact of Achillas having been bishop before, and not after, Alexander), but it is also apparent from his twisting of the facts to fit his own preconceptions that Epiphanius, in reality, had no first hand knowledge of either the actual customs of the Alexandrine Church or the sequence of events surrounding the election of Athanasius. Similarly, we may set the accusation found in the *Apophthegmata Patrum* 78 in its proper context - that of a late Arian slander which perhaps drew upon ancient folklore but had as its motive a calling into question of the validity of orthodox Alexandrine orders which had their source in the episcopacy of Athanasius. We may, therefore, conclude that any dispute which may have surrounded the elevation of Athanasius to the throne of St. Mark had nothing whatsoever to do with a change in Alexandrian consecration practices, if, in fact, such

a dispute took place at all.

2) The question of proper and improper methods of consecration and canonical revision and clarification at the Council of Nicaea.

This issue follows, and is connected with, the question of the pre-Athanasian consecration practices of the Church of Alexandria set out above. This point is also directly related to the account of Athanasius' election and ordination provided by Philostorgius in his *Ecclesiastical History*.¹⁷¹

In the letters of Severus of Antioch, a sixth-century Monophysite bishop of that see, a passage has come to light which infers that presbyterial consecration continued in Alexandria until the time of the Council of Nicaea. In the course of an argument that old customs may not be retained following later synodal decrees, Severus says,¹⁷²

The bishop also of the city, renowned for its orthodox faith, of the Alexandrines was in old times appointed by presbyters: but in modern times in accordance with the canon which has prevailed everywhere, the solemn institution of their bishop is performed by bishops, and no one makes light of the accurate practice that prevails in the holy churches and recurs to the earlier condition of things, which has given way to the later clear and accurate, deliberate and spiritual injunctions.

Telfer makes use of this passage to reinforce his argument concerning the late date of a change in Alexandrine consecration practices.¹⁷³ Kemp, however, points out that 'the Syriac version of Severus may very well be rendering the Greek $\chi\epsilon\lambda\rho\tau\omicron\upsilon\upsilon\epsilon\iota\upsilon$ which is itself an ambiguous word and can mean either appoint or consecrate or both'.¹⁷⁴ In any case, the force of Severus' statement 'implies that such a change was made as a result of the fourth canon of Nicaea'.¹⁷⁵ Kemp finds this use of the fourth canon

unusual, as 'the wording of the canon shows that it was framed for quite another purpose than to bring such a change as is suggested to have happened at Alexandria'.¹⁷⁶ Apart from this suggested use of the canon, Severus tells us little else of interest concerning the election of Athanasius to the See of Alexandria. It is, nevertheless, Severus' use of the fourth canon which is taken up by Telfer as support for his general thesis. He goes so far as to say that 'orthodox Egypt superimposed the requirements of the Nicene canon upon the traditional Egyptian pattern',¹⁷⁷ in matters of episcopal consecration. Elsewhere, Telfer states that the fourth canon 'appears as something new' in the Egyptian Church.¹⁷⁸ One would perhaps be wise, however, to regard these last statements more as expressions of Telfer's own theological outlook, rather than as a statements of fact.¹⁷⁹

It is clear that a closer examination of both the content and the intent of the fourth canon is required. The fourth canon of Nicaea is as follows:¹⁸⁰

A bishop should most certainly be chosen(καθίστασθαι) by all the other [bishops] of the province (ἐπαρχία). But if this poses a difficulty, because of an urgent need, or because of the length of the journey, then at least three [bishops] shall meet in one place, and with the votes of those absent having been communicated in writing, they shall proceed to the consecration(χειροτονίαν). The confirmation of what has been done, however, belongs in each province to the metropolitan (μητροπολίτη).

That this canon is not concerned primarily with either the future or present procedures for the election of a bishop of Alexandria as of AD 325, is evident in its very form and language. Had it wished to intimate a change in a well known custom of an ancient see, we may safely assume that the canon would have been framed by the council in a way similar to canons six and seven, in which such sees are specifically named.¹⁸¹ As to Telfer's assumption

that this canon has introduced an innovation, it might be more accurate to say that the council, by the use of this canon, sought to clarify and codify a widespread practice which had already been in effect for sometime.¹⁸²

In terms of early church law, the fourth canon of Nicaea had a precedent in the twentieth canon of the Synod of Arles (AD 314), *Ut sine tribus episcopis nullus episcopus ordinetur*,¹⁸³ which may well have drawn on yet earlier collections of canonical prescriptions.¹⁸⁴ As Hefele recounts, this fourth canon of Nicaea 'was afterwards in its turn reproduced and renewed by many councils - by that of Laodicea (c.12), of Antioch (c.19), by the fourth Synod of Toledo (c.19), the second of Nicaea (c.13): it is also reproduced in the *Codex Ecclesiae Afric.* (c.13)'.¹⁸⁵ That there may have been fourth century exceptions to this rule, as claimed by Telfer, only serves to prove that the provisions of this canon were, for the most part, observed with great regularity both immediately before and following Nicaea.¹⁸⁶

At this point in our discussion, it would be prudent to look again at the so-called 'historical' account of the election and ordination of Athanasius provided by Philostorgius.¹⁸⁷ In our present context, one item in the narrative is of particular interest. Philostorgius reports that there was a lack of unanimity among the assembled bishops as to who should succeed Alexander and that following 'a considerable amount of time' spent in argument, Athanasius took matters into his own hands. According to Philostorgius, Athanasius,¹⁸⁸

... suddenly appeared one evening in the church called after Dionysius, and finding there *two Egyptian bishops*, firmly closed the doors with the assistance of some of his followers, and so was ordained by them, though strongly against the will of the ordainers. [Emphasis added]

It is interesting to note, that although both Telfer and Barnard hold to a 'disputed consecration' interpretation of the events of AD 328 in Alexandria, they both indicate that this particular portion of Philostorgius' narrative seems to be little more than an exercise in slander, made in light of the provisions of the fourth canon of Nicaea.¹⁸⁹ Barnard, however, suggests that Philostorgius was, nonetheless, attempting to emphasize 'the uncanonical nature of the election' of Athanasius.¹⁹⁰ If we follow the argument of A. Martin that Athanasius would have been scrupulous in his observance of the synodal decrees of Nicaea concerning the qualifications of episcopal electors,¹⁹¹ it seems incredible to imagine that he would knowingly violate the fourth canon.¹⁹²

Although this singular report of the 'two bishops' represents a central problem of credibility in the narrative of Philostorgius, it is by no means the only difficulty one finds in this confused and interpolated text. Even his citing of the Church of Dionysius as the location for Athanasius' ordination, for example, may not be accepted without reservation. It is, in fact, possible that the name of this church was taken by Philostorgius from the listing of the churches of Alexandria by Epiphanius.¹⁹³ The Church of Dionysius seems to have only later been definitely used as an episcopal residence, and then it was in AD 357 when it was occupied by George, the Arian intruder.¹⁹⁴ Furthermore, Philostorgius' assertion that 'the remainder of the bishops then present anathematized Athanasius on account of this transaction [i.e. the forced ordination]'¹⁹⁵ finds no support in any other account and makes Athanasius' subsequent tour of Egypt seem very unlikely, if not impossible.¹⁹⁶ The further claim that the election was later confirmed by Constantine, an opinion followed, to various degrees by Barnard, Girardet, and Nordberg on the strength of

Philostorgius, seems to have its basis in a very unreliable and possibly forged Arian document of a somewhat later date.¹⁹⁷ The entire account is further complicated by Philostorgius' complete lack of historical accuracy in recounting the events surrounding the Synod of Tyre and his confusion concerning the subsequent intrusion of George the Cappadocian into the See of Alexandria.¹⁹⁸

We may, therefore, conclude with some degree of certainty that if the election and ordination of Athanasius was in any way influenced by the fourth canon of Nicaea, it would have been to cause even greater care and attention in the following of the instructions contained in the pronouncement. It is important to note that, apart from Philostorgius, no other extant writer either intimates or outrightly accuses Athanasius of violating this particular canon. We may be sure that had there been a basis in fact for such an accusation, there would have been many of those opposed to Athanasius who would not have been hesitant in the least to make such a charge.

In dealing with the disciplinary purpose of the fourth canon of Nicaea, it would seem reasonable to follow the judgement of Hefele that 'Meletius was probably the occasion of this canon'.¹⁹⁹ It is to this Meletian involvement in the so called 'contested' election of Athanasius that we must now turn our attention as a third difficulty in an interpretation of the events of the summer of AD 328.

3) The question of Meletian involvement in the Alexandrian episcopal election of AD 328.

The Meletian Schism in Egypt arose out of a dispute which broke upon the scene during the Diocletian^{ic} persecution. This most lengthy and serious persecution which the Christian Church had endured was initiated by Diocletian in February, AD 303. It was most severe in Africa and the eastern portion of the empire. In the western portion of the empire, under Maximian and Constantius (the father of Constantine), very little was done to promulgate the persecution or, indeed, other decrees issued by Diocletian.^{199a} In Egypt, however, the persecution was intense and martyrdom was common. Upon Diocletian's retirement in AD 305 the situation became markedly worse with the accession of Galerius and his appointment of Maximin as Caesar over the civil diocese of Oriens which included Egypt and the Palestinian and Syrian littoral. The severity of the persecution in Egypt continued unabated under Maximin apart from a brief interruption in the spring of AD 311 as Galerius himself was dying. Maximin, however, resumed his efforts against the churches in the east by the autumn of that same year.^{199b} The persecution in Egypt finally came to an end in AD 313 after Licinius seized control of the empire in the east.

In the course of these events, most likely during the latter portion of AD 305 or early in AD 306, certain of the bishops who were being held as prisoners wrote a letter to complain about the actions of Meletius of Lycopolis, a newly appointed bishop who had replaced Apollonius of Lycopolis who had apostasised.^{199c} The four

prisoner bishops, Hesychius, Pachomius, Theodorus and Phileas, directed this letter to Meletius himself and argued that he had taken liberties in ordaining priests in their dioceses during their absence contrary to the canons and customs.^{199d} They further stated that they had made adequate provision for the people of their dioceses during their time of imprisonment through a system of 'visitors'.^{199e}

Although the language of the letter was strong, the bishops did address Meletius as '*dilecto et comministro in Domino*' and it does not appear that they had any intention of breaking relations with him.^{199f} The letter would seem to be better understood as a warning which had arisen out of troubled times.

During this period we are uncertain as to the exact location of Peter, the bishop of Alexandria. Rowan Williams is inclined to place the bishop somewhere within Egypt on the basis of Codex Verona LX and further argues that Meletius continued his schismatic ordination of presbyters, including one named Isidore and another named Arius, not during imprisonment (the consensus view), but during a 'visitation' of Alexandria where he also excommunicated certain presbyters loyal to Peter who were in hiding.^{199g} When Peter was informed of this action, he wrote a letter to his flock instructing them to hold Meletius excommunicate. For Williams, therefore, the cause of the schism has to do with a struggle over pastoral care and administration of the church in lower Egypt during the time in which a void had been created owing to the arrest of a large number of bishops and the tentative hold of Peter upon Alexandria. In such an interpretation of events, Meletius could be seen as simply one who responded to a need arising out of persecution and whose motives were ultimately misunderstood.

Williams' reconstruction does seem plausible given the evidence which is presented, although it directly contradicts the sequence of events and circumstances given by Epiphanius who most likely derived his material directly from Meletian sources.^{199h} According to Epiphanius, the initial relationship between Peter and Meletius was much closer, more like a bishop and coadjutor, and the schism arose over Peter's canons concerning those who had lapsed under persecution. In this scenario the quarrel between Peter and Meletius on the question of the lapsed began while both were in prison, or at least, during a time when neither was at liberty. When they were both released, late in AD 305 or early in AD 306, Meletius entered the dioceses of the four Egyptian bishops (who were still in prison) and attempted to secure a following by undertaking the ordination of those who agreed with his more rigorist stance in regard to the lapsed. Meletius' subsequent foray into Alexandria and ultimate excommunication followed within the year. Still later, according to this account, Meletius and a number of his followers were arrested and banished to the mines where the schism remained and even grew among the Christian prisoners until the ultimate release of Meletius under the temporary edict of toleration promulgated by Galerius in AD 311.¹⁹⁹ⁱ

There are, without doubt, a number of difficulties with the circumstantial account of Epiphanius, which Williams has pointed out with great clarity. It is questionable, however, that we have sufficient documentation to support Williams' contention that, 'we can be confident that [the issue of the lapsed] was not the main cause of the schism, since it is perfectly clear that Meletius was active before the spring of 306'.^{199j} The location of Peter during this time, the exact meaning of certain portions of the letter of the four bishops to Meletius, the later designation of Meletians as

'the Church of the Martyrs' and the notorious inaccuracies of Epiphanius would seem to prevent such a dogmatic assertion, although it seems clear that Williams has developed another way in which we might view this turbulent period in Egyptian church history.

In any case, following the renewal of the persecution by Maximin and the martyrdom of Bishop Peter on 25 November, AD 311, disorder reigned in lower Egypt and there appears to have been a vacancy, of disputed length, before the accession of Achillas as bishop of Alexandria.^{199k} If we give weight to the later reports of Athanasius, the Meletians maintained an active opposition to Achillas during his short episcopate and continued to develop a separate organization throughout Egypt.^{199l} Their subsequent relations with Alexander after his accession to the see of Alexandria are also problematic as we have only the accounts of Epiphanius and Athanasius to depend upon for information relative to this period.^{199m} The actions of the Council of Nicaea concerning the Meletians and the death of Alexander shortly following the Council leads us to the question of Meletian involvement in the Alexandrian election of Athanasius in AD 328.

It is, however, difficult to establish an exact chronology of events or even a general outline of circumstances for the period between the Council of Nicaea in AD 325 and the election of Athanasius as bishop of Alexandria in AD 328 with any certainty, as the documents and records which might be of assistance are unclear and often contradictory. This difficulty is especially evident as we attempt to discover the exact extent of Meletian involvement in the election itself. In discussing this particular difficulty two points must be discussed. The first point, mentioned in passing above, is the contention of W. Telfer that after the death of bishop

Alexander, Meletius himself had an effective claim to become bishop of Alexandria, a claim which was later taken up by John Archaph, once the Meletian bishop of Memphis.²⁰⁰ A second point, also previously touched upon, is the thesis of A. Martin that the so called 'contested election' of Athanasius arose owing to Meletian anger over being disenfranchised as to their part in the Alexandrine election procedures of AD 328.²⁰¹ Although the two arguments are based upon different assumptions, their conclusion is the same - the Meletians, in reaction to the election of Athanasius, again went into schism and formed an important opposition party in Egypt during his early episcopate.

A large part of Telfer's argument is based upon his insistence that Athanasius' elevation to the throne of St. Mark was an innovative affair, as regards the traditions of the Church of Alexandria. This is a claim, which from the evidence cited above, appears suspect. Telfer states that,²⁰²

The succession of Athanasius to the bishopric of Alexandria involved ... a breach alike of tradition and of existing agreements. Athanasius was not an Alexandrine presbyter, he did not as pope bury his predecessor, and his elevation set aside the consideration of any claims a Meletian candidate might have.

According to Telfer, there were 'such claims awaiting consideration', for Constantine had contrived to assure the Meletians that, following the death of Alexander, one John of Memphis, 'acknowledged leader of the Meletian interest after Meletius himself', would have 'perspective rights not in regard to the see of Memphis but to that of Alexandria' itself.²⁰³

Telfer partially bases this reconstruction of events upon the enigmatic phrase found in Athanasius' transcription of the schedule of Meletian bishops presented to Alexander sometime after Nicaea, that John of Memphis was the one 'whom the emperor ordered

to be with the archbishop'.²⁰⁴ This John of Memphis is considered by Telfer to be, in all probability, the same person who reappears during the period of the Synod of Tyre as John Archaph, the added name being an allusion to his role in the Meletian church as 'Arch-apa', or 'supreme father'.²⁰⁵ Finally, Telfer suggests that Constantine in his later letter to John Archaph hinted 'at some great reward to follow upon his reconciliation with Athanasius'.²⁰⁶ Such an interpretation, however, does not entirely fit the pattern of his argument that this would have involved an elevation within the Alexandrine church, for Athanasius was already in possession of the see at this time and would have had to agree to any such proposal.

Once again, we must agree with L.W. Barnard that Telfer's 'ingenious reconstruction will not bear critical investigation resting, as it does, mainly on conjecture rather than contemporary evidence'.²⁰⁷ For Telfer, the 'rights' of John of Memphis are inextricably linked with those of Meletius. When, therefore, the first argument fails under the pressure of evidence, so likewise does the second. It may also be noted that the phrase which follows the name of John of Memphis in the *Breviarium Melitii* is by no means conclusive. To be designated 'κελευσθεὶς παρὰ τοῦ βασιλέως εἶναι μετὰ τοῦ ἀρχιεπισκόπου' is very ambiguous at best.²⁰⁸ Robertson's comment, following Newman, is that the 'archbishop' referred to here is Meletius (in the sense that he was the 'first' in preeminence among the Meletian bishops) and that as this 'is the first occurrence of the word' ἀρχιεπισκόπου, it does not carry its later 'fixed sense'.²⁰⁹ He further states that, 'the historical allusion is obscure'.²¹⁰ Although Nordberg understands the 'archbishop' in the above passage to refer to Alexander, he confesses that it was a 'vague stipulation' which would have been

variously interpreted by the two parties in the dispute.²¹¹ The ultimate and certain fate of John of Memphis is also obscure. John of Memphis, so called, disappears from the documents of the day and John Archaph is indicated as the leader of the Meletians by AD 333/34. Barnard states that Archaph 'is probably to be identified with the John, Bishop of Memphis' listed in schedule.²¹² He cites Nordberg and Telfer, but indicates that Telfer's understanding of the name Archaph as a party title, and which, therefore, links him to John of Memphis, is 'uncertain as it is bound up with Telfer's theory that this John had prospective rights to the see of Alexandria'.²¹³ As to the role of Constantine in this affair, Barnard rightly argues against Telfer that,²¹⁴

... there is no evidence that he wished to give John Archaph prospective rights to the Alexandrine see. His one concern was to reconcile Catholics and Meletians so that peace might reign in the Empire. The Emperor was little concerned with the ecclesiastical rights of John or the Meletians, although he was concerned that they should not be subject to oppression.

It is impossible, on the basis of the extant evidence, to give full credence to the theories of Telfer as to the prospective rights of the Meletians to episcopal leadership in the see of Alexandria. A more plausible explanation for the re-entry into schism of the Meletians following the election of Athanasius has been put forward by Annik Martin.

Martin contends that the reason for Meletian anger and accusations following the election of Athanasius was owing to their disenfranchisement and inability to participate in the process. After a brief review of the evidence for the 'contested election' of Athanasius, Martin puts forward a key question, 'Did the Meletian bishops, under the terms of the accords of Nicaea,

have the right to participate in this election?'.²¹⁵ From the evidence of Sozomen, who according to Martin, 'knew very well the content of the [later Meletian] accusations', there is little doubt that the 'Meletians wanted to participate in the election' and most likely went into schism once again when they were excluded.²¹⁶ Again, however, Martin asks the question, 'Did they have the right?'.²¹⁷ Martin states,²¹⁸

The synod of Nicaea specified that they did not have the power to elect or to propose the name of a candidate in their diocese, the catholic bishop of the place retaining the sole perogative. One can easily assume that when two bishops occupied the same see, the Meletian would be excluded as well from the right to participate in the election of the bishop of Alexandria; when he was the sole title holder he held it against contrary forces. Would not the Meletians have looked for the recognition by their catholic colleagues of the totality of their ancient episcopal rights, especially at the occasion of the succession to Alexander? This is what is signified in the allusion cited by Sozomen above. The catholic bishops who had a Meletian for a colleague would have, without doubt, shown themselves hostile to such a solution.

Martin further comments that Athanasius 'could scarcely have accepted the participation at his election of disputing bishops and he, therefore, would have held to the strict application of the agreements made at Nicaea'.²¹⁹ According to Martin, it was this inability to stand and participate as equals with the catholic bishops which drove the Meletians back into schism.

Martin has correctly singled out the crucial issue. Did the Meletians have any right to participate in the election of the successor to Alexander? Furthermore, would they have been allowed to participate in the election by the catholic bishops? To answer the former query, we must turn our attention to the synodal letter sent from Nicaea to the Egyptian and neighbouring churches concerning the admission of the Meletians into the fellowship of the catholic community in Egypt which was under

the episcopal rule of Alexander. The letter is as follows:²²⁰

Since the synod was disposed to act kindly, for in strict justice he was not worthy of leniency, it was decreed that Meletius should remain in his own city and that he would have no authority to make appointments (προχειρίζεσθαι) or to lay on hands (χειροθετεῖν) or to appear in any city or village for such a purpose, but should possess only the title of his rank, bishop. Those who have already been appointed by him, after they have been confirmed by a more sacred ordination (μυστικώτερα χειροτονία) may on meeting this condition be admitted to fellowship and have their rank and the ability to officiate, but they shall be under the rule of those enrolled in each parish and church who have been appointed by our most honourable colleague Alexander. These have no authority to make appointments (προχειρίζεσθαι) of persons pleasing to them or to propose names or to do anything without the permission of the bishop of the catholic and apostolic church serving under Alexander ... If it should come to pass that any at that time in the church die, then those who have been recently received are to succeed to the office of the deceased, but only if they appear worthy, and the people choose them, with the catholic bishop of Alexandria concurring in the election and ratifying it.

I have followed Everett Ferguson in rendering the word προχειρίζεσθαι - 'make appointments'.²²¹ The clear intent of the letter is two-fold. Firstly, it seems clear that Ferguson is correct in stating that the 'passage must mean that the Meletian clergy are to receive a new ordination'.²²² We may also note that any further elevations to the episcopate among the Meletians are not a prescribed right, for the candidate must receive the approval of the bishop of Alexandria, the assent of the people, and be considered 'worthy' (ἄξιος). In other words, they would be involved in the same pattern of events which would hold true for any episcopal candidate. Secondly, the Meletians are restrained from making lower appointments within their own spheres of influence, or even making nominations, without the explicit permission of the catholic bishop of the place.

In light of such restrictions on a local basis, it seems almost incomprehensible to suggest that the Meletians had a 'prospective right' to the throne of St. Mark or even the expectation of being allowed to participate in the election of Alexander's successor. Martin is certainly ^{in maintaining} correct, ~~contrary~~ to Telfer and Girardet, that the accords reached at Nicaea would have been interpreted by Athanasius and his followers in the most literal sense.²²³ We may conclude, therefore, that it is extremely unlikely that the Meletians were considered to have the right to be involved in any substantial manner in the Alexandrine episcopal election of AD 328. It is altogether possible, however, that it was their exclusion from that process which may have then prompted them to enter into schism once again and eventually to seek an alliance with the Arians against Athanasius. When considered against such a background of events, the later accusations of the Meletians and the Arians against Athanasius as regards the 'irregular' nature of his election and consecration take on a somewhat different meaning.

There is one further scenario which some have suggested might have influenced the Meletian involvement (or non-involvement) in the election of the successor to Alexander. This is the possibility that there was a 'second session' of the Council of Nicaea which dealt with the continuing problems of schisms and theological divisions which were confronting the church, with special attention being given to the Egyptian situation. Many, on the basis of the evidence presented by Schwartz, Seeck, and Opitz, regard this second session as an historical fact.²²⁴ Others, however, such as Robertson, Telfer, and more recently, Jan-M. Szymusiak, have followed the more traditional understanding of Montfaucon that the time between Nicaea and the final presentation of the *Breviarium*

Melitii to Alexander was protracted by the Meletians and did not take place until AD 327 with no other substantial synodal sessions in the intervening period.²²⁵ Much of the speculation concerning a second session of Nicaea has arisen owing to the remark by Athanasius that when his predecessor Alexander died, five months had not passed from the time of the Meletian reconciliation.²²⁶ Although Athanasius does not indicate that Alexander died five months after the Council of Nicaea, some, as Theodoret, placed that meaning upon the statement.²²⁷ Gelasius suggested that the Council of Nicaea actually lasted three years (strengthening Theodoret's misunderstanding of the statement by Athanasius), but it is known that the main sessions of the council were held and completed in a relatively short time in the summer of AD 325.²²⁸

In all probability the reconciliation of the Meletians which prompted the final presentation of the *Breviarium* took place at a special gathering which had been summoned by Constantine to deal exclusively with the schism within the Egyptian Church. This argument has been advanced as a distinct possibility by Colm Luibheid. Such a scenario does appear to reconcile the remarks of Eusebius of Caesarea, concerning a second meeting which took place following Nicaea, with the brief period of peace between the catholic and Meletian parties in Egypt which occurred immediately before the time of Alexander's death in April of AD 328.²²⁹ The need for further mediation by Constantine may well have been occasioned by a Meletian refusal to accept the accords which had been decided upon at Nicaea and which effectively limited their power in the 'newly constituted' episcopate of Alexandria. Given the tone of Athanasius' later remarks concerning the admission of Meletius into communion ('would that he would never have been

admitted') it seems to have been a disagreeable proposition for both sides from the beginning and was certainly made worse by Athanasius' subsequent election and the Meletians' non-participation in the process.²³⁰

By making use of the wide variety of sources which are at our disposal, a plausible reconstruction of the pivotal events under discussion could be as follows. At the Council of Nicaea several decisions were reached which would have a profound impact upon the ecclesiastical structure of the Egyptian church quite apart from the theological pronouncements which had been set forth concerning Arius. Firstly, the council sought to give legislative approval to the traditional territorial authority of the bishop of Alexandria, which under canon six was understood to include 'Egypt, ... Libya, and ... Pentapolis', that is, the whole of the Nile valley and all of that region which stretched across Pentapolis.²³¹ Although the exact extent of his control over the four civil provinces of Egypt, Libya, Pentapolis, and Thebais would be debated in the years to come, the Nicene fathers sought to indicate the special position and prestige of the bishop of Alexandria by means of this canon. This unique range of authority was further emphasized by a comparison with the similar status of the bishops of Rome.²³² Secondly, the fourth and fifth canons determined and regularized the proper procedure for the election and ordination of bishops as well as the initial authority of a provincial synod.²³³ As Hefele indicates, 'Meletius was the probable occasion' of the fourth canon and not a particular concern on the part of the council with the Alexandrine model of episcopal consecration.²³⁴ Finally, the council dispatched a synodal letter to the Egyptian and neighbouring churches which indicated the exact provisions for the reinstatement of the Meletian clergy.²³⁵

It may be easily appreciated that these provisions, taken together, gave Alexander a very strong hand with which to deal with the question of the Meletian difficulties in Egypt upon his return from the council during the latter portion of AD 325.²³⁶

The majority of the Meletian party in Egypt would not have been overly pleased with the results of the council concerning their particular position. Telfer well describes the post-Nicene situation of the Meletians as follows:²³⁷

It is evident that Meletius was himself willing to be reconciled. But that being so, it fell to him to communicate the terms of the Synodal letter to each of his suffragans and persuade them to accept. We need not be surprised that it was into the third year before he was able to present to Alexander the whole company of persons to be reconciled and to benefit under the terms of the Synodal letter.

It would appear that this process created so many difficulties and such a disturbance that the issue once again threatened the peace of the Egyptian church. Eusebius is very clear that the difficulties which attracted the attention of Constantine after the end of the Council of Nicaea were specifically Egyptian in their origin.²³⁸ The hypothesis that this involved a full 'second session' of the Council of Nicaea, as Luibheid has pointed out, presents many more problems than it solves.²³⁹ On the other hand, to view Eusebius' 'synod' simply as a meeting of the Egyptian clergy, along with perhaps other church leaders, at which Constantine brought his influence to bear upon the participants and 'gave his sanction to the decrees of the council' would help to explain the somewhat tardy and strained admission of the Meletians into the ranks of the Egyptian clergy.²⁴⁰ This meeting and final submission does appear to have taken place in the context of, or immediately after, some large meeting of the clergy, for Athanasius states that those persons listed in the *Breviarium*

Melitii - twenty-eight bishops, four presbyters, and three deacons - were actually presented in person to Alexander by Meletius.²⁴¹ Although each side may have been persuaded by Constantine to accept the accords reached at Nicaea, neither party seems to have been pleased with the arrangement which appears to have been concluded during the last few months of AD 327.²⁴² Within less than five months of the conclusion of this settlement, Alexander was dead and Meletius had also disappeared from the scene, probably dying within a short time as well.²⁴³

Alexander of Alexandria died on 17 April AD 328, just three days after Easter.²⁴⁴ Ehiphanius informs us that Alexander had chosen Athanasius as his successor, a report which would be congruous with Alexandrine tradition in such matters.²⁴⁵ Athanasius was not in Alexandria at the time of Alexander's death. Some accounts place him at court on church business, while others indicate that he was attempting to flee the honour.²⁴⁶ In either case, there appears to have been an attempt at usurpation in his absence. While inaccurate as regards detail, Epiphanius does appear to preserve a Meletian tradition concerning an attempt to place one of their own on the throne of St. Mark.²⁴⁷ Such an attempt, however, would have been regarded by the catholic clergy as completely irregular according to the synodal letter of Nicaea and the recent submission of the Meletian clergy to Alexander and, therefore, immediately rejected. Perhaps the Meletians hoped to take advantage of what Barnard calls, 'Egyptian psychology ... for there was a long tradition in Egypt that the King's successor had to be enthroned immediately on his death in order to avert cosmic and political chaos'.²⁴⁸ Epiphanius does indicate that it was an Alexandrine custom for a bishop's successor

to be immediately appointed to ensure the peace and stability of the church.²⁴⁹ Within a short time, however, Athanasius returned to Alexandria where a good number of bishops had already assembled and, we are told, were being entreated by the people to elect Athanasius, calling him 'good, pious, Christian, an ascetic, a genuine bishop'.²⁵⁰ Either owing to their failed (or short-lived) attempt to elect their own candidate, or because of the strict interpretation of the decisions contained within the synodal letter (and possibly its subsequent enforcement by Constantine), the Meletian bishops were apparently completely excluded from any further part in the election. By the week following the Feast of Pentecost (1 June AD 328) all of the bishops who were competent to take part in the election could have made their way to Alexandria, having completed the full cycle of Easter celebrations in their own churches where they would have been presiding. During that week Athanasius was elected by a majority (πλείονες) of the bishops present (indicating that there may have been some dissent), received the acclamation of the *plebs*, and on 8 June AD 328, seven and one-half weeks after the death of Alexander, 'having passed through the entire series of orders', he was ordained by the gathered bishops in accordance with the fourth canon of Nicaea.²⁵¹ It is, however, possible that as he mounted the throne of St. Mark in the sight of the people, he had yet to attain the full canonical age of thirty years.²⁵² Not surprisingly, as Nordberg has pointed out, the first challenge that awaited the new bishop was a renewed schism on the part of the Meletians which threatened the unity and stability of the Egyptian church.²⁵³

When compared and contrasted with other contemporary sources, it seems clear that the account of the consecration and election

of Athanasius given by Philostorgius is undoubtedly defective both in the details which are offered and in its general reporting of events and personalities. When placed alongside the other accounts, it appears very probable that Philostorgius only repeated a random assortment of fraudulent Arian and Meletian calumnies against Athanasius which have been compressed into a single narrative that has little basis in fact. That there was a separate tradition concerning Athanasius preserved by Philostorgius, there can be little doubt. That it was, in the words of Rusch, a 'genuine historical tradition' seems to be an unacceptable evaluation of the evidence presented. Of all the sources available which purport to give an account of the election of Athanasius, the one presented by Philostorgius appears to to be the most contrived and the most removed from other documentary evidence, whether Arian, Meletian, or orthodox.

By way of contrast, the material contained within the synodal letter of the Egyptian bishops, written in AD 338/39, only a decade after the event, while admittedly defending an orthodox position, does appear to be a more reliable report of what actually took place.²⁵⁴ The other accounts which are contained in Epiphanius, Sozomen, Socrates, and Gregory Nazianzus, do acknowledge the circulation of Arian and Meletian versions of the election, but they are, for the most part, discounted and the general outline of events can be reconciled with the report and witness of the Egyptian bishops. For this reason we cannot agree with the contention of Rusch that Philostorgius is a vital help to the modern researcher who is involved in the task of constructing a true historical picture of Athanasius. On the contrary, Philostorgius appears to so distort the image of Athanasius that

it is difficult to find any kind of true historical representation of the Bishop of Alexandria in his entire account, unless one is seeking the variety and manner with which Athanasius was assailed by those who opposed him.

3.3 The Meletians and London Papyrus 1914

Following his enthronement in the summer of AD 328, there is little doubt that Athanasius faced an unenviable situation in Egypt. Although, as stated above, it appears that Athanasius was elected with the support of the majority of the clergy and people gathered in Alexandria, the church in Egypt as a whole seems to have been beset by continuing divisions. As John Griffiths has stated,²⁵⁵

The lack of unity in the earlier years of the rule of Athanasius is plain enough. The Meletians, the Arians, and the Manichees were all attracting support in a divisive sense; and there was always the danger that the monastic movement ... would fail to support the spiritual leadership of Alexandria.

The pattern of schisms and divided loyalties within the Egyptian church at this time is difficult either to trace or fully comprehend. It is obvious, from both the extant materials and subsequent events, that a large number of Meletians entered into schism once again following the election of Athanasius. There were, however, a number of Meletian bishops, presbyters, and deacons who appear to have transferred their full support to Athanasius in the very early years of his episcopate. For example, the presbyter Macarius, who is later implicated in the Ischyras incident, appears to be the same individual (of that name) who

is listed in the *Breviarium Melitii*.²⁵⁶ A Meletian bishop, Theon of Nilopolis, also listed in the schedule, is later mentioned by Athanasius as having died in possession of an orthodox bishopric.²⁵⁷ Henric Nordberg argues convincingly that Athanasius brought several former Meletian bishops and presbyters with him to Tyre, stating that, 'out of 47 Egyptian clericals at Tyre [accompanying Athanasius] probably at least 17 had been earlier supporters of the Meletian church'.²⁵⁸ From the evidence presented, it seems clear that Nordberg is fully justified in claiming that in Athanasius' first few years as bishop he 'succeeded in winning for his cause a number of schismatic leaders'.²⁵⁹

During the time between Athanasius' election in AD 328 and the synod of Tyre in AD 335, similar attempts to win over the disaffected Meletians were being conducted by the Arian party headed by Eusebius of Nicomedia. With the reinstatement of the exiled Eusebius and Theognis of Nicaea in AD 328, the Arian controversy entered upon a new chapter.^{259a} Eusebius, soon after his own restoration, began to forge a political alliance with many of those Meletians who had rejected the leadership of Athanasius. Thomas Kopecek has described the ends toward which the Eusebians were moving at this time as follows:²⁶⁰

Those bishops who had supported Arian theology turned their attention to realizing two practical goals, namely, the reinstatement of Arius to the Alexandrian priesthood and the deposition - on non-theological grounds - of Nicaea's defenders.

The origin of this tactical alliance between the Eusebians and the Meletians is shrouded in mystery. The claim by Sozomen that Arius had once been a follower of Meletius has been accepted by many scholars, reinforced as it is by a note contained within

the *Codex Veronensis LX*.²⁶¹ Rowan Williams, however, has put forward the view that the Arius mentioned in these two sources as a companion of Meletius is most likely not to be identified with the heresiarch.²⁶² For, in the controversy which followed, not only did Alexander fail to mention the background of Arius in this regard, but, as Williams has pointed out, Athanasius also refrained from making any reference to such information. This portion of Williams' argument is stated as follows:²⁶³

Even stranger [than the silence of Alexander] is the silence of Athanasius - never an overscrupulous controversialist (as we have seen, he had no qualms about accusing Meletius of apostasy). If anyone was in a position to know what was recorded of the younger Arius in the chancery files of Alexandria, he was. Yet he can describe the Meletian origins, and the later tactical alliance of Arians and Meletians, without ever exploiting what would surely have been a heaven-sent opportunity for blackening the names of both groups of adversaries at once. He uses - predictably - the familiar trope of the dog returning to its vomit against the Meletians: why not against Arius reverting to his past mode of disruptive behaviour?

In any case, it seems unlikely that an Arian-Meletian alliance would have grown out of Arius' earlier association with Meletius; for those same sources which invite such speculation also indicate that this was but a brief episode in the life of the heresiarch which ended in an atmosphere of mutual antagonism.²⁶⁴

It seems clear, therefore, that the Arian-Meletian alliance post-dates Athanasius' election and the subsequent elevation of John Archaph to the leadership of the Meletians. Yet, a vexing question remains, 'When did Athanasius become aware of the conspiracy which was being formulated against him?'. From his own testimony in *Apol.* 59, Athanasius indicates that in the early stages of the alliance the Meletians had Eusebius as their 'secret friend' (κρύφα φίλος).²⁶⁵ This might suggest Athanasius' own lack of awareness concerning the situation at this time.

In his *Festal Letters* we may witness his progress in perception as to the reality of the alliance. In his *Festal Letter* for AD 332, Athanasius states that he is at court, having been summoned by Constantine, at the instigation of "the Meletians, who were present there", seeking his 'ruin before the Emperor'.²⁶⁶ In his *Festal Letter* for AD 333, Athanasius makes several references to the 'schismatics' (i.e., the Meletians), but it is not until the *Festal Letter* for AD 338 that he speaks of all 'those who dispute with Christ [i.e., the Arians], but also ...the schismatics; for they are united together, as men of kindred feelings.'²⁶⁷ Athanasius' conviction that the Meletians had made common cause against him with Eusebius of Nicomedia appears to have been the result of a gradual process which found its final culmination near to the time of the calling of the synod of Caesarea in AD 334. By the time of the synod of Tyre in July AD 335, any reservations he might have had concerning the reality or the predatory nature of the alliance would have been completely dispelled.²⁶⁸ After this time, Athanasius is consistent in his identification of the Meletians in Egypt as an extension of the Arian party under Eusebius.²⁶⁹

We may conclude that by AD 335 the Meletians in Egypt had fragmented. A sizeable segment had given their loyalty to Athanasius - according to Nordberg, almost half of those listed in the *Breviarium Melitii*.²⁷⁰ Another large party, under the leadership of John Archaph, entered into an alliance of convenience with Eusebius of Nicomedia. Yet another group, similar to those described by Barnard as 'semi-Coptic Meletian monks' who 'in a rural milieu, would have retained something of the indigenous, puritanical outlook of the "Church of the Martyrs"', seem not to have given their allegiance either to Athanasius or John Archaph,

but only to their own cenobitic ἄπλοα.^{270a} On the basis of the available evidence it is difficult, if not impossible, to envision the Meletian community in Egypt by the year AD 335 as a single, well-ordered, or homogeneous movement.

In addition to the fragmented Meletian party in Egypt, there also seem to have been a number of other smaller schismatic and/or heretical groups who were involved in the ecclesiastical politics of the Alexandrine see during this period of time. Unlike the Meletians, however, it is difficult to fully determine the political or popular influence which any of these parties exercised. W.H.C. Frend contends that there were, at the time of Athanasius' election, only 'three problems besetting the Church in Egypt - Arius' supporters, the Manichees, and the Meletians', but that Athanasius considered the Meletians to be 'the most pressing problem' of the three.²⁷¹ Nordberg asserts that during this period 'the Arians were a diminishing minority within the church; the Meletians a rather important one'.²⁷² Charles W. Griggs agrees with Nordberg, yet indicates that it was the Meletian intrusion into the Egyptian monastic communities which most concerned Athanasius.²⁷³

There was, however, an additional break-away group in Egypt. It seems clear from the case of Ischyras that a number of those who had been involved in the Colluthian schism had chosen not to make peace with either Alexander or his successor, Athanasius. Some of these, as Ischyras himself, eventually ended up allied with the Eusebians and the Meletians.²⁷⁴ The petition of Athanasius' supporters at the synod of Tyre confirms that part of the evidence against Athanasius had resulted from the fact that 'Eusebius and his fellows contrived that a letter be presented, as coming from the Colluthians, the Meletians, and Arians, and

directed against us'.²⁷⁵ Although the original Colluthian schism had been confined to Alexandria itself, and Colluthus himself appears to have been reconciled to Alexander at a synod of Egyptian bishops held in AD 324 (with Ossius of Cordova in attendance) some, as Ischyras, remained separated from the main body of the church in Egypt.²⁷⁶ Although we cannot ascertain from the available materials how large a group the post-Nicene Colluthians constituted, the Egyptian bishops at Tyre considered them enough of a threat to list them alongside the Meletians and Arians.

We are also uncertain as to the exact strength of the Arian party (or parties) in Egypt during the period before the synod of Tyre in AD 335. Edward R. Hardy states that, 'in the first stage, the forces against Athanasius were a combination of the crypto-Arians, headed by Eusebius of Nicomedia, outside Egypt, and the Meletians inside'.²⁷⁷ Kopecek claims that, following Nicaea, Theognis and Eusebius had been 'conspiring with Alexandrian Arians', but he gives no indication or evidence as to who these persons were or what positions they held.²⁷⁸ We have no reason to believe that Arius ever returned to Alexandria following Nicaea, as most sources indicate that he remained in exile until his death in AD 336.²⁷⁹ Further, some scholars, such as Rowan Williams, have speculated that Arius' theological position may have resulted in 'the relative isolation of Arius himself within a movement called by his name'.²⁸⁰ In Egypt, it seems probable that the movement was less than monolithic and included in it both those who strictly adhered to Arius' views (disciples) as well as those who only sympathized with Arius' ecclesiastical/political situation (allies).²⁸¹ Although we are uncertain as to the danger which this group initially posed to the power of Athanasius, it appears,

from subsequent and repeated references in the *Festal Letters*, that the threat increased with each passing year from the time of his election through to the synod of Tyre.²⁸²

Apart from those parties and movements which had their genesis within the church, consideration must also be given to others which existed on the fringes of the Egyptian ecclesiastical community. Griffiths has suggested the following scenario:²⁸³

Intellectually, of course, Alexandria itself represented an amalgam, the fused elements being Greek, Egyptian, Jewish, Iranian, and Babylonian - to mention only the most prominent.

P.M. Fraser has commented on the fact that Persian influences became much more pervasive in Alexandrine society throughout the Roman era, especially through Manichaeism and Mithraism.²⁸⁴ Further afield, the more native Coptic communities were also affected. The appeal of the Manichaeans to the widely spread monastic communities in Egypt was real enough that when Athanasius wrote his *Life of Antony* a special point was made to include the Manichaeans with the Arians and the Meletians as follows:²⁸⁵

In things having to do with faith, he [Antony] was truly wonderful and orthodox. Perceiving their wickedness and apostasy from the beginning, he never had communion with the Meletian schismatics. And neither toward the Manichaeans nor toward any other heretics did he profess friendship ... So in the same manner did he abhor the heresy of the Arians ...

Even if we accept the judgement of Schwartz that Athanasius 'used' Antony for his own political and theological purposes, his grouping of the Manichaeans with those other parties which had threatened the Alexandrine see is suggestive of their relative influence.²⁸⁶

We may safely indicate, therefore, that the state of affairs in Egypt during the first years of Athanasius' episcopate appears to have been somewhat unstable in regard to the life of the church.

The Meletian community had fragmented. Remnants of the Colluthian schism continued to create difficulties, with some of its adherents entering into the Eusebian-Meletian alliance. The Arians in Egypt and Alexandria proper consisted of individuals of varying theological perceptions without, it would appear, a single guiding force. The Egyptian monastic community had yet to become a cohesive movement loyal to the bishop of Alexandria and was also subject to various influences.²⁸⁷ In addition to the difficulties he faced in Egypt, Athanasius, by AD 335 had also been stripped of many of his allies elsewhere, such as Eustathius of Antioch, Asclepas of Gaza, and a host of the other main defenders of Nicaea.²⁸⁸ This then was the context in which Athanasius began his episcopate and attempted to unify the Egyptian church, facing the double challenge of external distrust and internal dissension.²⁸⁹ The question facing the modern researcher is, 'How did Athanasius respond to these circumstances?'

In 1924, Sir Harold Idris Bell announced the acquisition by the British Museum of a group of ten papyri which promised to be 'new lights on Saint Athanasius'.²⁹⁰ In describing this collection of papyri, Bell made the following initial evaluation:²⁹¹

These letters (for all but one are letters) despite their Byzantine fluffiness, which veils a little meaning in a monstrous jumble of words, are of exceptional interest for the light they throw on the life of a Christian community in the reign of Constantine the Great. But it is by virtue of two only of the papyri that the collection boasts its special importance. One of these, the only contract in the series, fixes at last the disputed date of the Synod of Caesarea ... the other and more interesting, a long letter from an Alexandrian Meletian, gives a vivid picture of the sufferings to which the sectaries were exposed at the hands of Athanasius and his adherents.

After a brief description of the content of the letter, which Bell claimed exposed Athanasius' 'official persecution' of the

Meletians during the period before the synod of Tyre, he concluded by making this comment:²⁹²

The new letter places the proceeding at Tyre in a new light. It is, of course, like Athanasius' own narrative, a partisan statement, but it shows, what was suspected before, that there was more justification for the attack on Athanasius than the Catholic tradition allows to appear, and it may rank among the most precious documents of fourth-century ecclesiastical history. (emphasis added)

The publication later that year of the ten papyri as part of a volume entitled *Jews and Christians in Egypt* provided the opportunity for a more detailed examination of the document referred to above which was catalogued as London Papyrus 1914 (hereafter LP 1914).²⁹³ (The full text of LP 1914 is contained in **Appendix A**. References to particular lines of LP 1914 correspond to the numbers at the left of the text.)

From internal evidence, Bell dates LP 1914 as having been written sometime in May-June AD 335.²⁹⁴ His argument for this particular dating of the letter may be summarized as follows:

1) It was written during the time that Athanasius was in actual possession of the see of Alexandria, that is, after June AD 328.

2) It describes the actions of Athanasius during a time when, although he was able to instigate measures against the Meletians, he was far from secure himself. Bell asserts that, 'there is no trace in our tradition of such insecurity during the early years of his episcopate, and indeed it is very unlikely that till their alliance with the Eusebian party the Meletians were strong enough to constitute a real menace'.²⁹⁵ Furthermore, Bell states that, 'this alliance was probably not formed till late in 330'.²⁹⁶ The extreme limits

according to Bell are, therefore, late AD 330 and Easter AD 340 (the beginning of the second exile of Athanasius).

3) Within the limits of this decade, Bell has then eliminated those periods of time during which Athanasius was absent from Egypt. Athanasius was at court facing the accusations of the Meletians in late AD 331, not returning to Alexandria until Easter of AD 332.²⁹⁷ He left Alexandria again on 11 July AD 335 to attend the synod at Tyre and was subsequently banished, not returning to Alexandria until 23 November AD 337. Bell, moreover, discounts any possibility that the letter may date from after the first exile of Athanasius, leaving the possible years of authorship as AD 331 - AD 335, with those certain exceptions named above.

4) The Egyptian month of Pachon is mentioned three times in LP 1914 (ll. 6, 45, 47). As the letter appears to have been written soon after the events described, Bell places it within May-June of one of the four years cited above.

5) Although the text is not exact as to the identity of the personages reported upon, Bell considers the ἄνα Ἰωάννην of the letter to be the Meletian leader John Archaph, who is either at, or going to, Antioch (l. 34). The letter states that as Athanasius was preparing to go on a journey (l. 39ff), a certain Archelaus (whom Bell identifies as a confederate of Athanasius) was arrested at the orders of Apa John (l. 35ff.). This follows the earlier arrest of Macarius (l. 30,31). With the actions against the Meletians

and the events above in mind, Bell states that 'the situation strongly suggests the time immediately preceding the Synod of Tyre in 335'.²⁹⁸

6) Setting aside the year AD 332 as being a time during which Athanasius 'cannot have contemplated going abroad' so soon after his return from court, Bell also excludes AD 331, as Athanasius' departure would have been too late in the year to allow for a May-June dating.²⁹⁹ It would seem that AD 334 is another possibility in view of calling of the synod of Caesarea, but Bell points out that the summons from the Emperor came in February or early March, and, in any case, Athanasius finally, refused to attend. Although such hesitation on Athanasius' part is seen in LP 1914 (l. 38ff.), Bell considers the subsequent period of two months (until May-June) to be 'rather a long time after the summons' to still be undecided and, therefore, disallows AD 334.³⁰⁰

7) Finally, Bell cites the use of names in LP 1914 which may be related to personalities who are known to have been involved with those events which surrounded the synod of Tyre. He admits, however, that the only persons mentioned in the letter who can be identified with any degree of certainty are Athanasius himself; Isaac, Bishop of Letopolis; and Athanasius, son of Capito.³⁰¹ The further identification of Apa John as John Archaph, as well as that of Archelaus and Macarius as those known supporters of Athanasius involved with the synod of Tyre, is less certain. The use of this information, however, as concerns the dating of LP 1914,

is, as Bell says, 'no doubt, extremely dubious' and without weight or substance in such a determination.³⁰²

It is then, the result of this process of elimination which allows Bell to state his conviction that, it is 'highly probable that 1914 is to be dated May-June, 335'.³⁰³

From the text of the letter itself we know its author to be a person named Callistus (ll. 1, 63). Bell identifies him as 'doubtless a Meletian monk or cleric' and, from the style of the letter, as 'a Copt' who was 'not wholly at home in Greek'.³⁰⁴ The letter was being sent to Apa Paiéou and Patabeit who were priests (l. 1). Bell states that the purpose of the letter is to give a 'circumstantial account of the sufferings of his fellow Meletians at the hands of Athanasius' adherents and of Athanasius himself'.³⁰⁵ The standard interpretation of LP 1914, first presented by Bell in 1924, may be summarized as follows:

On the evening of 24 Pachon (19 May) AD 335, slightly less than two months before Athanasius' departure for Tyre, an attack took place at Nicopolis, a suburb of Alexandria known as a stronghold of the Meletians, and continued in the military camp which adjoined the community.³⁰⁶ The attack had begun at the house of Heraclius the recorder the previous day (ll. 3, 4). On the day in question, however, Isaac of Letopolis after seeing Heraiscus at Alexandria had come to dine with his host or another unknown bishop 'in the camp' (ll. 6-8). According to Bell's translation, 'the adherents of Athanasius' heard about the visit and with the assistance of the soldiers of the camp, attempted to kidnap Isaac (ll. 8, 9).

Callistus informed his readers that the attackers were in an intoxicated state as the attack began, but still managed to break into the military camp in pursuit of Isaac (l. 10). By this time, however, Isaac and the other bishop had been hidden by some sympathetic soldiers. Their quarry having escaped, the attackers turned on four other 'brethren' who were coming into the camp and beat them (l. 14). Finally, the attackers made their way to a hostel near the west gate of the city of Alexandria (some distance outside the camp) and seized the keeper asking him, 'Why do you admit Meletian monks to the hostel?' (ll. 20, 21). Others who had entertained the visitors received similar rough treatment. The following day the *praepositus* of the soldiers is described as being ashamed of his drunken behaviour the night before and, 'although a Gentile', he presented an offering (ἀγάπην) as a sign of penance (l. 28).

According to Bell, the remainder of the letter describes the concurrent attitudes and actions of Athanasius and his followers immediately before the synod of Tyre. Athanasius is described as being 'very despondent' and 'causing distress' owing to events which involved the Emperor and the possible arrest of Macarius (ll. 30, 31). The following lines are mutilated (l. 31ff.) and are, therefore, of little help in further explaining the circumstances which follow. Athanasius, according to Bell, sent Archelaus and Athanasius, the son of Capito, to attempt to ἀποσπάσαι Macarius, but were themselves detained by 'Apa John at (in) Antioch'

(ll. 35-36). Owing to this apparent reversal, Athanasius is reported as being hesitant to leave the country (ll. 38, 39).

A further break in the text occurs at line 41, but Bell assumes that the subject of the remainder of the letter continues to be Athanasius.³⁰⁷ The letter tells of his 'carrying off a bishop of the Lower Country' who was then confined in a meat market (l. 42) and of a priest and deacon who were also imprisoned (ll. 43, 44). Heraiscus, who appears to have been taken in the original attack, remained in the camp and was, according to Callistus, scourged through the course of four days (ll. 45,46). On 27 Pachon (22 May) a further seven bishops were exiled, including Emês and Peter (ll. 47, 48). Bell identifies this Peter with the person of the same name in the *Breviarium Militii*.³⁰⁸

The final portion of the letter is taken up with the distribution of bread within the community and assorted greetings to those who lived in the same area as the recipients.

As a result of the information contained within this letter, Bell came to several conclusions which have gained wide acceptance. It must be stated, however, that the central thrust of these conclusions is the result of Bell's particular interpretation of the text; his insistence on dating the letter to just prior to the synod of Tyre; and his preferred translation of certain questionable passages. This being said, it must be admitted that Bell does attempt to present a careful and balanced view of

Athanasius within the limits imposed by his understanding of LP 1914. Bell asserts that Athanasius, while answering the charges made against him at Tyre concerning the chalice incident and the murder of Arsenius said nothing about the other accusations made against him in regard to charges of violence and oppression towards the Meletians.³⁰⁹

According to Bell,³¹⁰

The reason is now clear: these charges were in part true. That he was himself responsible for the violence of the soldiery on the evening of Pachon 24 Callistus does not state, *and it is not probable*; but we may doubt whether he took much trouble to prevent such outrages, and he is definitely charged with imprisoning the schismatics and with other high-handed measures. Very important too is what Callistus tells us of the attempt to carry off Macarius. He does not indeed allege that the three would-be kidnappers were commissioned by Athanasius, but he does state that Athanasius was very despondent when he heard of Archelaus' arrest, and it is hardly conceivable that the confederates can have acted without at least his tacit consent. We must conclude that there was a germ of truth in the picture given of Athanasius by his enemies as a self-willed, unruly man, apt to treat even the Imperial authority with contempt. (emphasis added)

In his final comments concerning Athanasius and the charges made against him, which appear to have been confirmed in LP 1914, Bell is cautious in his judgement of the Bishop of Alexandria. His evaluation is as follows:³¹¹

Yet it must not be forgotten that the letter of Callistus also is an *ex parte* statement. The facts he relates can hardly be doubted, but they may have had a justification which he does not allow to appear. And in any case it would be unfair to found on these and similar facts a general condemnation of Athanasius, though we admit faults in his character and errors in his conduct.

Bell further states that the leaders of both sides in this conflict were lacking in Christian charity towards their opponents, and while each complained of persecution, each was more than willing

to make use of forceful methods of persuasion against the other.³¹²

Yet, according to Bell,³¹³

A fair and critical judgement between Athanasius and his opponents must rest on a consideration, not of such details, but of total personality and of the main issue at stake.

Writing one year later in 1925, Bell indicates, however, that LP 1914 only assisted in proving what could already be assumed was the case - that is, that Athanasius was actively involved in the persecution of the Meletians. Bell comments that the 'young Athanasius' who had succeeded Alexander in the episcopal throne of St. Mark,³¹⁴

... was of a masterful temperament, with all the intolerance and all the impatience of youth *and even without* the evidence of the document [i.e. LP 1914] to be quoted presently, one need feel little hesitation in accepting as at least partially true the accusation of his enemies that he persecuted the Meletians. (emphasis added)

The question must then be asked, 'What evidence, apart from LP 1914, gave rise to this prior assumption of the guilt of Athanasius by Bell?'

In his introduction to the Meletian papyri collection, Bell cites only two other sources which deal with Athanasius' 'violent conduct' towards the Meletians. The first of these is the reference of Sozomen to earlier charges of violence and oppression towards the Meletian party, along with similar, but more detailed accusations which were supposedly found by the Church historian in the minutes of the synod of Tyre, which, unfortunately, are no longer extant.³¹⁵ The second source is the material contained within the letter of the Oriental Council of Sardica which was written in AD 343. The narrative in the letter is both graphic and specific in describing the charges which were made against

Athanasius: 316

Accusatus praeterea est de iniuriis, violentia, caeda, atque ipsa episcoporum internicione [Arsenius]. Quique etiam diebus sacratissimis paschae tyrannico more saeviens ducibus atque comitibus iunctus, quique propter ipsum aliquos in custodiam recludebant, aliquos vero verberibus flagellisque vexabant, ceteros diversis tormentis ad communionem eius sacrilegam adigebant.

We may note that although Bell appears to accept the general meaning of the letter, he is less than committed to all the particular details to which it alludes. For example, he comments that the stories concerning Macarius and the chalice incident, 'grew in the course of time. In the letter of the Oriental Council of Sardica Athanasius is accused of having *personally* broken the chalice, smashed the altar, overturned the priest's chair, and demolished the church!'.³¹⁷ That the stories of Athanasius' supposed misdeeds had been greatly embellished by his enemies in a relatively short period of time there can be little doubt. Furthermore, we must acknowledge that both the synod of Tyre and the Oriental Council of Sardica, from which the records of such misdeeds are drawn, were actively hostile towards Athanasius and were filled with those who sought his destruction.

The impact of LP 1914 upon subsequent evaluations of Athanasius and his character has been profound. Although Bell did not agree with the opinions of Athanasius which had been expressed by Seck and Schwartz, the interpretation of LP 1914 which was presented in *Jews and Christians in Egypt* did seem to lend support to their view of Athanasius as an unscrupulous and ruthless man who would make use of any means to achieve his own ends.³¹⁸ Bell, however, was only willing to admit that Athanasius often showed, 'perhaps more of the wisdom of a serpent than the harmlessness of the dove'

and that, 'altogether one discerns in his career the hard, somewhat unamiable outline of the ecclesiastical statesman rather than the figure of the saint or scholar'.³¹⁹

That the standard interpretation of LP 1914, first offered by Bell in 1924, has been accepted and expanded upon by a large number of Athanasian scholars is clearly evident. In recent studies, LP 1914 is often the only source which is cited when reference is made to the 'violence of Athanasius'. For example, Nordberg makes use of LP 1914 in describing the political and religious situation in Egypt which led Athanasius to 'take drastic measures against the most extreme Meletians'.³²⁰ The letter is also the basis for A.H.M. Jones' comment concerning 'Athanasius' bullies', and L.W. Barnard's claim that, 'the charges that Athanasius had engaged in violence, oppression, and reprisals against the Meletians were not without foundation'.³²¹ Barnard does, however, in another place, qualify this statement by making the observation that Athanasius had adopted such methods against the Meletians 'who themselves had shown much violence and persecution towards the orthodox'.³²² Timothy Barnes accepts the entire contents and interpretation of LP 1914 without reservation as an indication of the state of the church in Egypt immediately before the synod of Tyre.³²³ Although W.H.C. Frend is more cautious than many and does not charge Athanasius himself with direct persecution of the Meletians, he nonetheless accepts the report of the papyrus as proof of a violent extension of Athanasius' 'propaganda' campaign.³²⁴ Gregg and Groh speak of LP 1914 as evidence of 'how military officials could be pressed into service against the Meletians (and innocent villagers who had dealings with them) by the partisans of Athanasius'.³²⁵ Many

more examples could be given of the influence of LP 1914 on current Athanasian studies. It is perhaps sufficient to say that this one document has provided great support for the negative evaluation of the character of Athanasius first put forward by Seeck and Schwartz.

A good deal of attention has also been given to the letter of Callistus by those who have been mainly interested, as was Bell, in papyrological evidence of life and letters in Ptolemaic and Roman Egypt. As a result, LP 1914 has figured prominently in many such studies which have been undertaken in the course of time since 1924.³²⁶ Certain scholars, such as E.A. Judge, have attempted to place LP 1914 within the wider context of other papyri finds of the same period.³²⁷ As a result, questions have been raised concerning LP 1914 which were left unanswered by Bell. Some of these concerns will be considered in our discussion below. Yet, apart from these more specialized interests, most of these studies have, in an *a priori* manner, accepted the general interpretation of LP 1914 which Bell first put forward.

There are, however, a number of difficulties with Bell's standard interpretation of those events which are described in LP 1914. The first of these is that Bell's interpretation is based upon a somewhat simplistic concept of the religious situation which existed in Egypt during the decade following Athanasius' consecration as bishop of Alexandria in AD 328. Bell appears to assume that there were only two predominant parties involved in the ecclesiastical politics of Alexandria during this period - the Athanasian party and the Meletian party. In the Gregynog Lectures for 1946, which two years later were published under the title, *Egypt From Alexander the Great to the Arab Conquest, A Study in the Diffusion and Decay of Hellenism*, Bell could

write a history of the entire period with no reference to the Manichaeans and only a passing mention of Mithras.³²⁸ In the Forwood Lectures for 1952, published one year later as *Cults and Creeds in Graeco-Roman Egypt*, Bell again appears to disregard the importance of these groups which existed on the fringes of the Christian community, although he at least mentions the influence of the Manichaeans upon monastic communities in Middle Egypt and the Nile Valley.³²⁹

Perhaps even more important than these outright omissions is Bell's insistence upon viewing the Meletian schism and the emerging factions within the Alexandrine church in a manner which disregards the obvious confusion and intricacies of the period in question. For example, while Bell comments in several places on the importance of the Meletian-Eusebian alliance which caused the Meletians to be 'strong enough to constitute a real menace' to Athanasius, only a passing reference is made to those many Meletians who allied themselves with Athanasius - and Bell indicates that this only took place in the period *after* Tyre!³³⁰ Bell also makes no differentiation between the Meletians who had allied themselves with the Eusebians and those in the monastic communities (as in LP 1917) who appear to have had little to do with either the Eusebians or Athanasius.³³¹ In fact, Bell consistently indicates that the Meletians presented a somewhat solid party of opposition against Athanasius, disallowing even the suggestion that an individual listed in the *Breviarium Melitii* such as Πέτρος ἐν Ἡρακλεοῦς, could possibly have sided with Athanasius by the time of Tyre.³³² For Bell, there is only the one Meletian party under the leadership of John Archaph which, owing to defections and exiles after the synod of Tyre, receded into obscurity. From the arguments which have been presented above,

however, this does not appear to have been the probable situation in Egypt during this time. Moreover, apart from the mention of Arius as an original adherent of Meletius, Bell makes no further mention of the Arian party in Egypt or their activities within this period, only commenting (following Sozomen) that, 'in course of time the Arians were popularly called Meletians in Egypt'.³³³ Furthermore, the adherents of Colluthus are not referred to at all in any of Bell's written work concerning this era.³³⁴

Certainly there is very little evidence to support such a simplistic view of the situation in Egypt in the ten years which followed the elevation of Athanasius to the throne of St. Mark and there is much evidence against it. As has been discussed above, Athanasius himself was concerned in his writings with the Manichaeans, the Meletians, the Arians, and the Colluthians. Nordberg's research has indicated that it is highly probable that a large number of Meletians had given their support to Athanasius *before* the synod of Tyre, and were actively engaged in opposing and discrediting their former brethren. Certain papyri, such as LP 1917, point to other, largely independent, communities of Meletians who, while certainly not Arian (or Eusebian) in their theological outlook, also expressed little or no loyalty towards the ecclesiastical establishment in Alexandria. Finally, the Meletian-Eusebian alliance which existed both inside and outside of Egypt during the time under consideration and attracted many supporters, is well attested to in a wide variety of sources.

In addition to the mere fact that these various groups actually existed and exerted influence during this turbulent period in Egypt, there is every reason to imagine that all of these parties, and the individuals within them, formed a pattern of shifting alliances and mixed loyalties. In the case of Ischyras, for

example, we apparently see a man 'ordained' by Colluthus, who chose to remain in a schismatic state after his leader's reinstatement in the Alexandrine church.³³⁵ After some years in isolation, serving only his family as a priest, it appears that he joined himself to the Meletians (probably after the submission of Meletius, for his name does not appear on the schedule which was submitted to Alexander).³³⁶ Still later, he is brought to the synod of Tyre as an accuser of Athanasius, under the protection of Eusebius of Nicomedia and John Archaph.³³⁷ Ischyras was eventually persuaded by his relatives to retract his charges against Athanasius and was reconciled to the bishop, although placed under censure.³³⁸ This situation, however, was soon reversed when Ischyras again broke with Athanasius, renewed his charges, and was 'given the name of a bishop' by the Eusebians with the apparent consent of John Archaph.³³⁹ Although the case of Ischyras is far from typical, it does illustrate the point that the ecclesiastical situation in Egypt was far from stable and cannot be reduced to the somewhat simplistic scenario which is assumed by Bell.³⁴⁰ As Bell himself has said, 'the historian, however eminent, is a bold man who seeks to interpret the history of the fourth century on the lines of modern rationalism'.³⁴¹ While his reference in this quotation is to Constantine, it could well apply to any attempted interpretation of the ecclesiastical politics of post-Nicene Egypt.

The religious and political situation described above takes on even greater importance when an attempt is made to understand and evaluate the events which are described in LP 1914. As Bell himself admits, the circumstances in which the letter was written provide a key to its interpretation:³⁴²

The style of the letter is unfortunately awkward and at times obscure; and moreover a private letter, the writer of which, referring to matters familiar to his correspondent, does not need to be as definite as an historian, is always apt to be a little difficult of comprehension. Hence it is not surprising that parts of our letter are by no means clear and admit of more than one interpretation.

A clear example of the need to understand the circumstances under which this letter was written is provided in lines 8-9 of the text of LP 1914. Those who attempted, with the aid of the soldiers, to kidnap Issac of Letopolis and his host are referred to in the text as οἱ διαφέροντες Ἀθανασίου (ll. 8,9). This has been translated by Bell as 'the adherents of Athanasius.'³⁴³ Yet, is this the actual meaning which the writer intended? In an essay on 'The Problem of Translation', Bell made the following observation:³⁴⁴

Only a minority of words, chiefly substantives expressing some concrete object of specific notion, have but one definite meaning. Most have various senses, passing one into another by almost imperceptible gradations; and it is only rarely that the corresponding word in another language will show that particular range of meanings. Thus a single word may in translation have to be rendered, on various occasions, by any one of several different words.

It might be suggested that this is especially true when dealing with a phrase such as that given above, for there are, in its root and use as a participle, two possible translations which carry opposite meanings. Is the text speaking of 'those who are kinsfolk or adherents of Athanasius', or is it informing us of the actions of 'those who differ from Athanasius'?



It is possible, given the meaning of the root *διαφέρω* to even speak of 'those who are in competition with Athanasius', although this may be to stretch the meaning of the phrase beyond that which was intended by the writer. We must note that Lampe, in assigning the concept of adherence to this phrase is only able to provide this solitary example out of LP 1914, while the milder meaning of 'kinsfolk' and the root meaning of 'difference' is attested to in a wide variety of sources.³⁴⁵

In considering such questions we must return to certain initial observations and impressions concerning LP 1914. From a detailed examination of the papyrus itself, there can be no doubt at all that the reading of the words *οἱ διαφέροντες* is absolutely correct. It is clear, however, that Callistus, the writer of the letter, has difficulty writing in Greek and that the intricacies of the language and the shades of meaning which the syntax and structure of language provided were beyond his literary abilities. Although there are a good many features of his grammar and style which are familiar within his period and geographical setting, we must still note that his repetitious use of words and phrases without connecting particles or conjunctions (ll. 9, 10), his omission of connecting words (l. 38), and his use of supplementary clauses without conjunctions (ll. 24, 48) all show a basic difficulty with the language (see Appendix A). The exact meaning, therefore, of the phrase which Bell has translated as 'the adherents of Athanasius' could very possibly carry another meaning. Certainly, it is possible to suggest from contemporary usage of the root word *διαφέρω*, that

the translation rendered by Bell may not, in fact, be wholly satisfactory. This particular phrase illustrates Bell's comment that, 'a translator is an interpreter, and unless he is faithful to his original his interpretation may be entirely misleading'.³⁴⁶ This, of course, is not to suggest that Bell was intending to render anything other than a faithful translation of the text. It is possible, however, that his translation of this particular phrase was overly influenced by his understanding of the letter's context and, therefore, reflected his own bias. For Bell there were only two parties involved - the Athanasians and the Meletians. The translation, therefore, had to fit within this scheme of things. As some of those who were being attacked are identified as Meletians, the attackers had to be Athanasians.

Given our present understanding of the numerous groups who were competing for power in the Egyptian church during this period, it is possible to see things differently. The attackers may have indeed been the 'adherents of Athanasius', but more in the literal sense of those who were 'close kinsfolk' - such as those Meletians who had given him their allegiance. This seems very likely. Conversely, the attackers might have been those who were actually 'in competition' with Athanasius and the events recorded in LP 1914 could be the result of some inter-nicene struggle of which we are unaware. Although we may only speculate at this point, there were a large number of groups active in Egypt who could very aptly be described as being 'in competition with Athanasius'. Were the attackers Meletians who had gone over to Athanasius? Were they Colluthians, who had no great love for the Meletians before the time of Nicaea and may have re-emerged in this turbulent period? The text is unclear, but both the context and the language used permit the consideration of a number of possibilities.

Clearly, there is much contained within this letter which remains unexplained, both in terms of context and personalities. E.A. Judge has commented concerning the question as to exactly what sort of monks in this period, Meletian or otherwise, had their centre of activity located between an army camp and the largest city in Egypt. As Judge writes, we may 'wonder what kind of "solitaries" they were - certainly not ones in full retreat from society'.³⁴⁷ We are also left with the mystery of the exact role of πάντων Ἡραεῦσκον (l. 25) within this community. He was as Bell says, 'apparently a person of some importance' and his title of πάπας would indicate that he was a priest or bishop or, perhaps, the leader of a monastic community.³⁴⁸ There has even been speculation that he was 'a sort of antipope, set up by the Meletians in opposition to Athanasius'.³⁴⁹ Yet, as Bell says, 'it is a serious objection to this view that neither Athanasius nor any of the ecclesiastical historians should refer to him'.³⁵⁰

Yet another difficulty in the text of LP 1914 occurs owing to a blemish in the papyrus following the first portion of line 41. Bell would later comment that, 'here a sacrilegious worm has eaten away much of the papyrus'.³⁵¹ It is a most unfortunate difficulty, for the portion eaten away most likely indicates the subject of the remaining lines. Although Bell states that, 'evidently Athanasius is the subject', there is nothing which positively indicates that this is so.³⁵² Athanasius is clearly the subject of that portion of the text which comes before the break (ll. 29-41), but the context and change of scene indicated by Callistus following line 41 makes it possible that another person or party has been introduced into the account. Athanasius himself is not mentioned again by name after line 41. When the

actual physical state of the papyrus itself is examined, it becomes clear that even the scant information provided in lines 41 and 42 must be viewed with a very critical eye. We cannot, therefore, automatically assume that Athanasius is the individual who 'carried off a bishop of the Lower Country and shut him up in a meat market' (ll. 42, 43), imprisoned the deacon (l. 44), ordered Heraiscus scourged (l. 46), or exiled the seven bishops (l. 47). Those bishops who were exiled could, in fact, belong to any of those parties named above, including the Athanasian.³⁵³

Further doubts may be expressed concerning the manner in which Bell has dated LP 1914. As we have seen, the date of May-June AD 335, immediately before the synod of Tyre, was arrived at largely through a process of elimination. There are, however, several difficulties in the pattern of events which has been suggested by Bell. Although, it may be agreed that LP 1914 was written after Athanasius became the bishop of Alexandria, that is, after AD 328, more recent scholarship would strongly disagree with Bell's contention that Athanasius spent his first years as bishop of Alexandria in relative security.³⁵⁴ The Meletians were a menace in Egypt even before their alliance with the Eusebians and Bell seems incorrect in his contrary suggestion.³⁵⁵ Further, although we may eliminate those periods which Athanasius spent away from Egypt (at court, synods, or in exile) it does not seem improbable to suggest that the events in the Alexandrine see were such that there was continued instability even after Athanasius' return from his first exile on 23 November AD 337. These two concerns alone open up the possibilities for the dating of the letter from the middle portion of AD 328 (Athanasius' election) to Easter AD 340 (the beginning of Athanasius' second exile) with those certain exceptions which have been noted. The personages whom

Bell notes within the text, especially Isaac of Letopolis (apart from Athanasius, the only positively identified person), were all active throughout the entire span of this twelve year period.³⁵⁶ Finally, the hesitation which is experienced by Athanasius within the text (l. 38ff.) could have taken place at many times during this period, most especially in early AD 334 when he refused the summons of Constantine to attend the synod of Caesarea. If the summons had been received in late March, as suggested in LP 1913, and Callistus' letter reporting his hesitation was written in mid-May, this would not appear to be the terribly protracted period which concerned Bell.³⁵⁷ Given, therefore, the possibilities of a different context than that envisioned by Bell and a different approach to dating, the entire thrust of LP 1914 and its subsequent interpretation is radically changed. As an item of evidence, we must admit that LP 1914 is unable to uphold its own intrinsic set of described circumstances and self-proclaimed message of persecution.

Much more could be said concerning LP 1914 and other, perhaps, novel interpretations of the letter could be put forward, but this would take us beyond the scope of our present study. Bell often admitted that he was 'not a theologian' and only interested in the history which his study of papyri revealed.³⁵⁸ The intricate questions which made the Meletian schism a fascinating area of historical research obviously intrigued Bell. It is also clear that he had an 'attachment' to the study of Athanasius which went beyond the study of papyri. For example, Bell's desire to identify LP 1929 as a genuine autograph letter of Athanasius is indicative of his fascination with the bishop of Alexandria.³⁵⁹ Bell's work is to be much commended for its attention to detail and his careful and, usually, balanced considerations, but clearly any single

papyrus or collection of papyri is unable to reveal all the facts of a given situation. They are merely indicators and guides within a wider circle of historical investigation. As Bell himself wrote,³⁶⁰

... there is a danger of exaggerating the darker side. Such evidence as that of the papyri may easily mislead; for it is abuses, difficulties and irregularities, rather than the normal working of the system which such documents record.

It is enough to say that, although all of the above does not eliminate the possibility that Bell's initial interpretation and translation of LP 1914 is absolutely correct, it must at least insert a note of doubt and caution in the use of the document as 'proof-positive' of the violent nature of Athanasius' character. As with any piece of written historical evidence we must continue to ask certain questions: Is this piece of writing genuine? Is its message trustworthy? How are we to be certain? What is the relationship between the author and the event (or events) recorded? How does it compare with other contemporary statements? In other words, we must make use of an informed 'historical common sense' and not be distracted or led astray by our own preconceptions or prejudices.

In considering the evidence of LP 1914 which, whatever its ecclesiastical or political source, is clearly an *ex parte* record of events, we should also consider Athanasius' own remarks on the subject of the use of violence to further a religious cause. Clearly, there are those who would accuse Athanasius of duplicity, but his writings need to be considered as at least a 'public' expression of his own concerns. Although it is not impossible, we may question whether Athanasius would employ a method of systematic persecution against opponents which he would later

describe at length as 'an instrument of the devil'.³⁶¹ He further commented that,³⁶²

... the truth is not preached with swords or with darts nor by means of soldiers; but by persuasion and counsel ...what counsel is there when he who withstands them receives at the end banishment and death?

In Athanasius' later written work, he would 'condemn those who 'turn to violence, and in the place of fair reasoning seek to injure' their opponents.³⁶³ This view was part of his conviction that, 'it is not the part of true godliness to compel, but to persuade'.³⁶⁴ Moreover, Athanasius saw violent intimidation in the following terms:³⁶⁵

It is in this manner that the devil, when he has no truth on his side, attacks and breaks down the doors of them that admit him with axes and hammers. But our Saviour is so gentle that he teaches in this way, 'if any man wills to come after me', and 'whoever wills to be my disciple'; and coming to each person he does not force them, but knocks at the door...

It must be admitted that in these passages Athanasius was writing against those who had persecuted *his* followers. We must ask ourselves, however, 'would he be willing to expose himself to the charge of duplicity in such an open manner if he was known to be guilty of such crimes?'. Some, such as Bell, have claimed that there must have been some measure of truth in the accusations of violence towards the Meletians which were made against Athanasius, owing to his silence in answering such charges at Tyre.³⁶⁶ Yet the silence of Athanasius at Tyre on this smaller question (when compared to the cases of Ischyras and Arsenius) should be viewed in context. He may not have answered in that the absurdity of the charges did not call for a refutation in the same manner as the more serious accusations. It is important to note that this is basically the position which was taken by

the Alexandrine synod in AD 338 as they categorically rejected the charges made against Athanasius at Tyre.³⁶⁷

A more immediate and contemporary impression of Athanasius' view of persecution may be gained from an examination of his 10th *Festal Letter* which was composed in AD 338 either while enroute from his exile in Trier or in Alexandria.³⁶⁸ Here Athanasius encourages his church to look upon their persecutors as friends, to imitate the 'forgiveness of David', the 'meekness of Jacob' and the 'pity of Joseph' towards those who have 'inflicted evil' upon them.³⁶⁹ Above all, they are exhorted to 'imitate the example of our Saviour, who grieved for those who did such things'.³⁷⁰ Again, Athanasius may have been guilty of duplicity; but would he have done so in a letter to the very persons who would have witnessed his earlier excesses? For one who is acknowledged by all to have been a master politician, it would seem a very imprudent course to have followed.

Exiled five times, with friends and colleagues subjected to persecution, torture and death, when it comes to the question of violence, it would appear that Athanasius was more often 'sinned against, than sinning'. We must, of course, give proper regard to the other interpretations of LP 1914 and, indeed, to the other charges which have been made against Athanasius. Yet, on the whole, it is possible that Hermann-Josef Vogt was correct when he commented that,³⁷¹

Athanasius never gave way to a blind party spirit, and never lost sight of the issues which lay behind and beyond the disputed formulations.

If this is true concerning the great theological issues of his time, can we imagine that Athanasius was any less concerned with the unity of the Egyptian church, and the ways in which that unity

might be achieved. Clearly, the employment of persecution by Athanasius against his opponents would have been counter-productive in the long term. Moreover, it is difficult to imagine that he would have had such success in attracting Meletian 'converts' had he personally directed a campaign of violence and intimidation against them in the early years of his episcopate. We must also keep in mind that it was during these early years in particular that a number of Meletians appear to have become ardent supporters of the young bishop of Alexandria.

In the final analysis, we must consider that which is probable to have taken place in this troubled situation given all of the available information. Although many possible scenarios may be constructed, most do not, in fact, appear probable. Some build only upon an argument of silence, preferring to view Athanasius as a shadowy figure whose true actions are unknown owing to the secret nature of the conspiracies in which he was involved. Yet, what of the evidence? Athanasius vindication by the synod of Egyptian bishops, his support by large numbers of former Meletians, his acceptance by the rigorous monastic communities of the Egyptian desert, his own written legacy concerning persecution, and his later vast popularity in Egypt all argue against the standard interpretation of LP 1914 as *prima facie* evidence of Athanasius' violent conduct towards his theological and political opponents. The internal questions, therefore, which have been raised in LP 1914 are by no means completely settled and have yet to be fully reconciled with external evidence and placed within their proper historical setting.

3.4 The Oration of Gregory Nazianzen

The final, and most surprising, source which is listed by Frances Young and William Rusch in their reassessments of the character of Athanasius is the festival oration (*Oration 21*) of Gregory Nazianzen in which the life and theological activities of Athanasius are eulogized and remembered.³⁷² Their recourse to this document as an aid in the reassessment of Athanasius is, of course, an unusual use of a panegyric which has as its avowed intention the exaltation of the memory of the bishop of Alexandria; for as Gregory says, 'In praising Athanasius, I shall be praising virtue. To speak of him and to praise virtue are one in the same, because he had, or to speak more correctly, has embraced virtue in its entirety in himself.'³⁷³ Young and Rusch, however, perceive in Gregory's overt and intense praise a more subtle motivation and object - the defense of the memory of Athanasius against the critical, and often hostile, non-orthodox reports concerning his actions and character which were still in circulation when Gregory delivered this address sometime between AD 379 and AD 381.³⁷⁴ Young, drawing upon the research of Rusch, simply states that, there were 'criticisms that Gregory Nazianzen felt he had to answer in his panegyric'.³⁷⁵

The argument of Rusch which seems to give substance to this statement builds upon the premise that the accounts of Philostorgius and the traditional interpretation of LP 1914 must be included in the construction of a true historical picture of Athanasius. For Rusch, the festival oration of Gregory confirms that these critical non-orthodox accounts concerning the bishop of Alexandria, especially those recorded by Philostorgius, were

still prevalent enough to cause concern and, therefore, shaped the address of Gregory who was attempting to preserve the orthodox memory of Athanasius. Rusch states his case in the following manner:³⁷⁶

...*Oration* 21 of Gregory Nazianzen [is] a sermon probably given in 380 at the feast of St. Athanasius, seventy [sic] years after his death. As we have said above, this sermon of Gregory presents Athanasius as a saint and pillar of the Church who defended her against the Arian menace. But certain passages of the text may tentatively be taken as an attempt to deny allegations from the non-orthodox tradition. The end of section 15 is a denial of the truth of the history of Arsenius which casts it aside as though it were common gossip and without substance as an established deed. Sections 8 and 9 relate to the election and general conduct of Athanasius. One finds no explicit mention of the kind of information provided by Philostorgius, but it is clear that these chapters tend to refute the Philostorgian presentation of Athanasius. The election of the latter is presented as unanimous. He [Athanasius] appeared sublime in action, humble in spirit, amiable, sweet, reproving with the tenderness of a father, etc. (see section 9). Cannot the listing of these traits be seen as a record set against the other recollections of Athanasius which were still alive and more in accord with the non-orthodox tradition? In that case, Gregory's *Oration* 21 gives witness at the end of the fourth century to those elements of a non-orthodox tradition which continued to slur the memory of a canonized patriarch.

While it seems certain, as has been stated earlier in this section, that there were a number of variant traditions concerning Athanasius still extant in the late fourth and early fifth centuries, the argument of Rusch concerning *Oration* 21 is less than satisfactory for a number of reasons. Firstly, it does not seem to take into account the literary *genre* to which *Oration* 21 belongs.³⁷⁷ The listing of Athanasius' virtues by Gregory in section 9, which Rusch refers to above, continues in section 10 with reference to the Pauline 'model for future bishops'.³⁷⁸ These listings, however, need not be seen as an answer to

contrary opinions, but merely as a rhetorical device. Commenting on sections 9 and 10 in *Oration 21*, Rosemary Reuther has written that,³⁷⁹

In the panegyric this [approach to the listeners] could also be given a hyperbolic turn by pretending that the virtues of the person being praised were so great that the orator was exhausted in trying adequately to describe them all, and he called upon his audience to help him out. Thus, after describing the early career of Athanasius, Gregory makes a fresh start with the words: 'Come then to aid me in my panegyric; for I am labouring heavily, and though I desire to pass by point after point, they seize upon me one after the other, and I can find no surpassing excellence in a form which is in all respects well proportioned and beautiful, for each as it occurs to me seems fairer than the rest and so takes by storm my speech'.

Another common figure used by an orator such as Gregory was *paraleipsis*, in which the speaker 'recounts some facts or events while declaring his intention to pass over them in silence'. Again commenting on *Oration 21*, Reuther states,³⁸⁰

Thus in the passage following the one quoted above, Gregory declares that he must pass over most of Athanasius' virtues in silence, since they could fill myriad discourses (having, of course, already enumerated all these virtues in considerable detail), and confine his account only to the most important points.

Far from designing his discourse to answer the particular charges of critics from outside the orthodox tradition, it seems much more reasonable to regard this address by Gregory as merely following the literary form which he deemed appropriate for such an occasion. We need not, therefore, attach any special significance to Rusch's selected sections of this address beyond making allowance for Gregory's concern with a particular oratorical style.

Secondly, Rusch places great emphasis on what he perceives to be Gregory's singular intention in formulating this oration

concerning Athanasius. Rusch suggests that Gregory is attempting to 'deny allegations from the non-orthodox tradition' and is concerned with those 'elements of a non-orthodox tradition which continued to slur the memory of a canonized patriarch'.³⁸¹ For Young, there are 'the criticisms that Gregory ... felt he had to answer'.³⁸²

Both of these views are contrary to the opinion of Justin Mossay, who, in his introduction to the critical text of *Oration 21*, considers the intent of Gregory to be three-fold:³⁸³

1. To show Athanasius as a model of what it means to be a bishop.
2. To explain the manner in which Athanasius was able to cooperate with the monastic communities in Egypt and reconcile active participation in the Church with the ideal of solitude.
3. To present Athanasius as a preeminent defender of Trinitarian faith.

Furthermore, Mossay considers the oration to go beyond simply an address in praise of Athanasius at that point in sections 34 and 35 at which Gregory relates the particular issues which the bishop of Alexandria faced to the pressing issues of the universal Church of his own day.³⁸⁴ Certainly, it is not difficult to see *Oration 21*, with the themes set out above, as having a particular message for the Gregory's Constantinopolitan congregation during the period surrounding Theodosius' reforms. It is, perhaps, not without significance that Gregory in section 35 portrays Athanasius primarily as a reconciler who 'bound together' differing parties 'in a unity of action'.³⁸⁵

In Reuther's analysis of *Oration 21* similar themes emerge, albeit with a greater emphasis on the use of particular rhetorical forms.³⁸⁶ She notes that, following the introductory sections 1-9, 'Gregory then uses the same technique that he used in the oration on Cyprian'.³⁸⁷ Following a recitation of Athanasius' virtues, however, Reuther indicates that Gregory passes on 'to what is most important:³⁸⁸

In this case what is most important turns out to be the story of Athanasius' expulsion from Alexandria by the Arian bishop George of Cappadocia. In the process, Gregory gives us a specimen of his best invective style: 'There was a monster from Cappadocia, born on our furthest confines, of low birth and lower mind...'

Considering the events in Constantinople from AD 379 - AD 381, including the expulsion of the Arian bishop Demophilus and Gregory's move, with his orthodox congregation, from the Church of the Anastasis to the Church of the Apostles in AD 380, it is possible to view *Oration 21* as having a very particular intention, but probably not the one suggested by Young and Rusch.³⁸⁹

It is, perhaps, better to consider *Oration 21* in the light of Gregory's stated intention 'to speak of and fully admire' Athanasius. In performing this service Gregory may have been drawing upon his own encounter with the bishop while a student in Alexandria in AD 350, although this is by no means certain.³⁹⁰ It is apparent, however, that Gregory was very much alive to the orthodox tradition concerning the life and career of Athanasius and presents it in a manner that is suited to his own particular purpose. If, in fact, the case of Arsenius is treated as 'common gossip', Gregory's condemnation of Arius is no less succinct in section 13. His description of Nicaea likewise lacks a degree of historical accuracy, but succeeds,

rightly or wrongly, in placing Athanasius 'in the first rank among the members of the Council, for preference was given to virtue equally with that of office'.³⁹¹ In such a context, Gregory's slight reference to the Arsenius affair as, 'the hand which was produced by fraud against the saint, and the corpse of the living man', is neither out of place nor, more importantly, out of character considering the nature of the address.³⁹² There is little reason to see either in this comment, or in the mention of Athanasius' election in section 8, veiled references to the Philostorgian accounts, or, indeed, that any other sections of the oration are in response to similar 'slurs' on the memory of the bishop from outside the orthodox tradition.

The contention of Rusch, and by inference, Young, is essentially an argument which is based upon silence. We have no certain way in which we can ascertain the true and absolute intention of Gregory in *Oration 21*. Upon considered reflection, however, the purposes outlined by Mossay and the rhetorical format for the oration which has been elucidated by Reuther appear to be somewhat more persuasive as indications of Gregory's intention in the writing of the panegyric. Moreover, there would appear to be some degree of justification in relating *Oration 21* to the immediate context of the controversy in Constantinople, rather than an entry into an historical debate concerning the character of Athanasius with sources which, not only were suspect, but are also mixed accounts of which we have little certain knowledge. Although it is within the realm of possibility that another interpretation of Gregory's oration may, in fact, be correct, there is little, if any, evidence

available to support the more speculative assertions of Rusch and Young.

4. CONSIDERATIONS AND CONCLUSIONS

Within this first section, an attempt has been made to examine once again those sources which have contributed to more recent critical revisionist accounts of the life and character of Athanasius. In the examination of these sources special attention has been given to those particular reports which might give weight to the opinion of Frances Young that, 'there seems to have been a pitiless streak in [Athanasius'] character - that he resorted to violence to achieve his own ends is implied by a good deal of evidence'.³⁹³ An evaluation of the particular documents cited by William Rusch - the Philostorgian narratives, LP 1914, and the festival oration of Gregory Nazianzen - has also been undertaken, along with reviews of certain important 'side' issues which arise out of these sources, such as the consecration of Athanasius in AD 328 and the role of the Meletians within the Egyptian church in the period between the Council of Nicaea in AD 325 and the Synod of Tyre in AD 335.³⁹⁴

From this study, certain preliminary conclusions may be stated. It should be noted, however, that these preliminary conclusions must remain tentative, rather than absolute, owing to the interpolated nature of the Philostorgian narratives and continued uncertainty as to the actual context in which LP 1914 was written. It must also be acknowledged that both Young and Rusch admit that there are elements in 'the good tradition' which 'are certainly right', and that the historical Athanasius is likely to be found 'in the middle ground'.³⁹⁵ Nevertheless, their insistence on accepting the 'evidence' of Philostorgius, LP 1914 and

Gregory Nazianzen, is representative of the more recent revisionist accounts of Athanasius which we named in the first portion of this section.³⁹⁶ Having reviewed the sources named above, certain tentative conclusions may be set forward.

There can remain little doubt that Philostorgius is a valuable source of information especially in regard to the large number of random Arian and Meletian calumnies against Athanasius which are collected and preserved in Photius' accounts of the period. That these assorted slanders have little basis in fact, however, is also apparent when they are compared with other contemporary or near-contemporary accounts of the same events - even those contained in histories which are not wholly favourable to Athanasius.³⁹⁷

The Philostorgian account of the consecration of Athanasius remains a case in point.³⁹⁸ In this particular narrative it is difficult, if not impossible, to separate the report of Philostorgius from the editorial comments of Photius. Furthermore, the figures who are named in the account, the details which are offered, and the general sequence of events which is provided, are at such variance with the other histories and documents to which we have access, as to be almost completely without credence in any attempt to provide a reasonable reconstruction of what actually took place. Certainly, Rusch is correct in writing that, 'the portrait of Athanasius [provided] by Philostorgius merits our attention, notwithstanding the hostile nature of the presentation'.³⁹⁹ To suggest, however, that Philostorgius has preserved a non-orthodox tradition concerning Athanasius of equal value to other contemporary accounts that we may only set aside

at our 'risk and peril' seems to go beyond that which the documentary evidence allows.⁴⁰⁰

The presentation of Athanasius in LP 1914 is somewhat more problematic.⁴⁰¹ As we have indicated in this study, the historical context in which LP 1914 was written is uncertain. The dating of the papyrus by H.I. Bell is completely circumstantial and by no means definitive.⁴⁰² The various factions and parties mentioned in the letter are not identified with any degree of certainty, and Bell's translation owes much to his own understanding of those events which he assumed surrounded its writing. Bell, as has been shown, tended to ignore the complexities of the religious situation in Egypt and, by means of his introduction and annotation of the papyrus, gave greater weight to this document than it might otherwise have merited.

LP 1914 remains an intriguing item of historical interest, but with certain shortcomings. The genuineness of the document both in regard to its dating and context is uncertain. The type of monastic community which is described in LP 1914 as being near to the city and hard by the military camp is difficult to reconcile with other evidence from the period.⁴⁰³ The message of the papyrus, as Bell himself admits, is to some extent unclear owing to the personal nature of the correspondence.⁴⁰⁴ The reader of LP 1914 may only speculate upon the relationship between the author, Callistus, and the events which he claims to be reporting. Finally, although Athanasius' treatment of the Meletians was brought into question at the Synod of Tyre in AD 335, the events described to the assembled bishops and the emperor's representative are not those which are related in LP 1914 except in the most general sense possible.⁴⁰⁵

All of the above comments do not, of course, diminish the relative importance of LP 1914. They do, however, call into question its use as absolute evidence of guilt on the part of Athanasius. This is most especially true if Athanasius' own writings concerning the subject of persecution are taken into account, along with the very different concerns which are mentioned in the Festal Letters in the first decade of his episcopate. Furthermore, corollary accounts contained within the histories of the period provide little substantiation for the circumstances which are described in LP 1914. In any case, current references to LP 1914 show clearly that few pieces of evidence can be used for historiography in the state in which they are found; they are necessarily subjected to the actions and subtle reasonings of the researcher and interpreter.⁴⁰⁶ Those who would seek to make use of LP 1914 as 'proof' of Athanasius' violent character have yet to show the papyrus to be decisive evidence; i.e., evidence which confirms only one view and excludes its rivals. Clearly, LP 1914 is not such a piece of evidence in its current state and, barring further corroborating materials, is likely to remain so in the foreseeable future.

Gregory Nazianzen's festival oration concerning Athanasius fits into yet another category of evidence and argument. Rusch has put forward the contention that Gregory's oration concerning Athanasius was, at least in certain sections, motivated by his desire to dispel rumours concerning the bishop's character which had arisen from non-orthodox sources.⁴⁰⁷ By putting forward this argument Rusch is attempting to look beyond and behind the oration itself to its possible motivations. The search for causation and motivation, however, is, by its very nature,

subjective. In the case of Gregory's oration such an approach is further complicated in that we must set aside Gregory's own stated intention in the address, as well as his adherence to particular standard rhetorical devices which are evidenced elsewhere, in order to accept Rusch's argument. After careful consideration of the insights provided by Rosemary Ruether and Justin Mossay into the themes and structure of *Oration 21*, such an approach as is outlined by Rusch would seem to be unacceptable.⁴⁰⁸ Moreover, many other circumstances more closely related to the context and style of the address would appear to have equal or greater claims to causation or motivation than those which have been advanced by Rusch and Young.⁴⁰⁹

To assert an absolute or certain historical knowledge concerning the character of Athanasius is, of course, difficult, if not impossible. It is possible, however, to arrive at certain reasonable conclusions on the basis of a critical examination of the documentary evidence at hand in order to assess the probability of the truthfulness of the accounts contained within such materials. Admittedly, our comprehension of the events which took place between AD 325 and AD 335 is imperfect, yet the only historical understanding we will ever arrive at concerning those crucial years is one that is based upon the extant evidence, opinions and reports. An argument which is based upon silence or upon our inability to ascertain the truth of a situation is, in reality, an argument which is without substance. This would appear to be the case with many of those more modern accusations of violence which have been advanced against Athanasius.⁴¹⁰ Furthermore, it should be acknowledged that the burden of proof is on the advocates of these fresh hypotheses which represent a

radical break from the more moderate views of earlier scholars within the field. Such proof must not only be sustained from within a given documentary source, such as those we have examined, but must also be shown to be consonant with the surrounding body of knowledge and materials. Finally, the rule governing our response to these materials must be that of probability, rather than an attempt to establish some notion of an absolute view of the events and persons in question. If this rather rigorous standard of judgement is applied, it must be admitted that the more virulent critics of Athanasius have failed to provide clear and convincing evidence for a revisionist portrait of the bishop of Alexandria.

From the documents and issues which have been examined thus far, it is clear that any view of the early career of Athanasius must take into account his relationship with the larger structures of the Church of his day, specifically ecumenical and provincial synods. Although Nicaea gained greater importance in his theological thought with the passing years, the provincial synod which took place at Tyre in AD 335 impacted upon Athanasius in an even more direct and dramatic manner, resulting in his exile from Alexandria at the conclusion of the meeting and later objections to his eventual reinstatement.⁴¹¹ It is also within the records of this synod that we find the first definitive accusations made against Athanasius by his contemporaries within an ecclesiastical setting, the majority of which have been discussed in the first section of this study in connection with contemporary scholarship within the field.⁴¹² In the second section of the present work, therefore, an attempt will be made to reconstruct an historical narrative and chronology of those events which led to the Synod

of Tyre, as well as an examination of the process by which the synod arrived at its judgements concerning the bishop of Alexandria which affected him so greatly during the first two decades of his episcopate.

SECTION I

ATHANASIUS: QUESTIONS OF CHARACTER AND CONTEXT

NOTES

- ¹The question of subjectivity in the historical writings of Athanasius has been a major point of contention for modern scholars who have sought to extract a 'pure' historical narrative out of the mass of material which came from the pen of the Bishop of Alexandria. It is important to note at this point that the writings of Athanasius were written in response to the particular theological and ecclesiastical controversies in which he was personally involved. Many of the historical narratives and records which he provides, therefore, are summoned by Athanasius as evidence for a particular point of view or partisan position. It is to this extent that we must allow that the historical writings of Athanasius do contain a decidedly partial or subjective viewpoint.
- ²*cf.* O. Seeck, 'Untersuchungen zur Geschichte des nicänischen Konzils', *ZKG* 17 (1896) pp. 1-71, 319-362; also see E. Caspar, *Geschichte des Papsttums von den Anfängen bis zur Höhe der Weltherrschaft*, Band I, Tübingen, 1930, pp. 186-187
- ³O. Seeck, *loc. cit.*, Prior to making these charges, Seeck had been involved in research on the *Dossier* of Optatus with reference to the Council of Arles, AD 314, in which he found a number of what he considered forged documents which had been attributed to Constantine. Following this investigation Seeck turned his attention to the materials which surrounded the Council of Nicaea and then leveled his charges of forgery against Athanasius. Again, the charges of forgery were concerned with letters which were purported to have come from the hand of Constantine.
- ⁴*cf.* S. Rogala, *Die Anfänge des arianischen Streits (Forschungen zur christlichen Literatur und Dogmengeschichte, Band VII, 1)*, Paderborn, 1907; N.H. Baynes, 'Athanasiana', *JEA* 2 (1925) pp. 61-65; R. Seiler, *Athanasius' Apologia contra Arianos. Ihre Entstehung und Datierung*, (Diss., Tübingen) Düsseldorf, 1932, pp. 39-40
- ⁵O. Seeck, *Geschichte des Untergangs der antiken Welt*, III, Stuttgart, 1920-1923, pp.208 ff. and p.442; *cf.* O. Seeck, 'Untersuchungen', pp. 33-34
- ⁶F.L. Cross, *The Study of Athanasius*, Oxford, 1945, p. 10
- ⁷E. Schwartz, *Zur Geschichte des Athanasius (Gesammelte Schriften, Band III)* Berlin, 1959, p.209
- ⁸W. Eltester and H.D. Altendorf, in their preface to the *Gesammelte Schriften* of Schwartz, *op. cit.*, p. vi

- ⁹ Schwartz, *op. cit.*, p. 192
- ¹⁰ N.H. Baynes, *Byzantine Studies and Other Essays*, London, 1955, p. 367
- ¹¹ Schwartz, *Gesammelte Schriften*, III, p. 188
- ¹² For the views of Caspar and Setton see Caspar, *Geschichte des Papsttums*, I, p. 182; and K.M. Setton, *Christian Attitude Toward the Emperor in the Fourth Century, Especially as Shown in Addresses to the Emperor*, New York, 1941 (Reprint, New York, 1967) p. 78
- ¹³ Cross, *The Study of Athanasius*, p. 10
- ¹⁴ *ibid.*
- ¹⁵ Opitz, *Athanasius Werke*, pp. 138-139, fn. 30f
- ¹⁶ W. Schneemelcher, 'Athanasius von Alexandrien als Theologe und als Kirchenpolitiker', *ZNW* 43 (1950/51), p. 251
- ¹⁷ Schneemelcher, *op. cit.*, p. 253
- ¹⁸ *cf.* footnote 4
- ¹⁹ Cross, *loc. cit.*
- ²⁰ J.A. Moehler, *Athanase Le Grand et L'Eglise de son Temps En Lutte avec L'Arianisme* (traduit de l'Allemand par Zickwolff et Jean Cohen), Paris, 1849, I, p. 108
- ²¹ *ibid.*
- ²² *ibid.*
- ²³ Moehler, *op. cit.*, I, p. 109
- ²⁴ Moehler, *op. cit.*, II, pp. 12-17
- ²⁵ Cross, *loc. cit.*; Also see an extended essay on this subject by G.D. Dragas, 'Conscience and Tradition: Newman and Athanasius in the Orthodox Church', *Internationale Cardinal Newman Studien*, elfte folge, Nürnberg, 1980 (Reprinted in *Athanasiana, Essays in the Theology of Saint Athanasius*, London, 1980, pp. 175-186)
- ²⁶ *cf.* Preface to *Select Treatises of St. Athanasius in Controversy with the Arians*, London, 1881, I, p. viii

- ²⁷ *Select Treatises, op. cit.*, II, p. vi
- ²⁸ *Catholic Sermons of Cardinal Newman*, London, 1957, p. 121
- ²⁹ J.H. Newman, *Apologia Pro Vita Sua: Being a History of His Religious Opinions*, London, 1890, p. 26
- ³⁰ J.H. Newman, *Lyra Apostolica* (14th edition), London, 1867, p. 117
- ³¹ *Select Treatises, loc. cit.*
- ³² *Select Treatises*, II, p. 250
- ³³ J.H. Newman, *An Essay on the Development of Christian Doctrine*, (Penguin edition) London, 1974, p. 290
- ³⁴ J.H. Newman, *Lyra Apostolica*, p. 121
- ³⁵ J.M. Neale, *A History of the Holy Eastern Church. The Patriarchate of Alexandria*, London, 1847, I, pp. vi-xiii. That Neale does, in fact, take account of the Photian *Epitome* of Philostorgius can be seen in a number of references, such as those found on pp. 128, 145, 192.
- ³⁶ Neale, *op. cit.*, p. 200
- ³⁷ *ibid.*
- ³⁸ Neale, *op. cit.*, p. 186
- ³⁹ A recent criticism of the work of Gwatkin (as well as criticisms of a number of other nineteenth and twentieth century scholars) can be found in the monograph by R.C. Gregg and D.E. Groh, *Early Arianism - A View of Salvation*, London and Philadelphia, 1981. Gregg and Groh speak of 'the need to penetrate the mist of battle between orthodoxy and heresy to uncover the scriptural hermeneutic of each party before making judgements' (p. 8). The authors contend that this is a difficult process because 'the mass of literature on Arianism (is) weighted against precisely such a venture' (p. 8). It is in this 'mass of literature' that Gregg and Groh place H.M. Gwatkin, along with J.H. Newman, J.N.D. Kelly, etc., as part of a 'mistaken consensus of scholarship' (p. 33, fn. 38). Notwithstanding such criticisms, in a recent bibliographic survey of English language books on the Arian controversy, Frances Young places Gwatkin's *Studies of Arianism* alongside *Early Arianism* as the only two entries in the category (cf. F.M. Young, *From Nicaea to Chalcedon*, London, 1983, p. 339). Admittedly, Gwatkin's chronology, as well as certain conclusions, stand in dire need of revision.

- ⁴⁰ H.M. Gwatkin, *Studies of Arianism* (Second Edition), London, 1900, p. 72, fn. 1
- ⁴¹ For a listing of Gwatkin's primary and secondary sources, cf. Gwatkin, *op. cit.*, pp. xii-xvi
- ⁴² Gwatkin, *op. cit.*, p. 74
- ⁴³ Gwatkin, *op. cit.*, p. 75
- ⁴⁴ cf. footnote 2, O. Seeck
- ⁴⁵ A. Robertson, Prolegomena to his edition of, *Select Writings of Athanasius, Bishop of Alexandria, LNPf* (Series II, Vol. IV), 1891, p. lxxvii
- ⁴⁶ *ibid.* This is a remarkable description by Robertson, especially when it is compared to the characterization provided by J. Ceska in 'Die politischen Hintergründe der Homoousioslehre des Athanasius', *Die Kirche angesichts der konstantinischen Wende* (ed. by G. Ruhbach), Darmstadt, 1976, pp. 307-308, in which Athanasius is described as always placing personal advantage over the doctrinal and ecclesiastical issues of his time.
- ⁴⁷ For an abbreviated list of Robertson's sources, cf. Robertson, *op. cit.*, pp. xi-xiii. Again, it is important to note that neither Robertson nor Seeck had access to H.I. Bell's *London Papyrus 1914*. One must, therefore, assume a certain degree of subjectivity on the part of both writers for them to have arrived at such varying conclusions concerning the character of Athanasius.
- ⁴⁸ For similar nineteenth century assessments of Athanasius, cf. A. Neander, *General History of the Christian Religion and Church*, (trans. by J. Torrey), Edinburgh, 1859, Vol. II, pp. 50ff; J. Kaye, *Works of John Kaye*, London, 1876, pp. 73ff; I.A. Dorner, *History of the Development of the Doctrine of the Person of Christ* (trans. by P. Simon), Edinburgh, 1897, Vol. II, 1, pp. 292-306, 339-346, 350-351; and three particular pieces written by W. Bright, 'Athanasius', *Dictionary of Christian Biography*, London, 1877, Vol. 1, pp. 179-203; his Introduction to *St. Athanasius' Orations Against the Arians*, Oxford, 1884, pp. i-ci; and *Lessons From the Lives of Three Great Fathers*, London, 1891, pp.1-47.
- ⁴⁹ cf. F. Fialon, *Saint Athanase*, Paris, 1877, pp. 104-110; H.R. Reynolds, *Athanasius, His Life and Work*, London, 1889, pp. 39-52, 180-188; R.W. Bush, *St. Athanasius: His Life and Times (The Fathers for English Readers)*, London, 1888, pp. 89-108, 215-226; A.P. Stanley, *Lectures on the History of the Eastern Church*, London, 1861, pp. 263-301; and F.W. Farrar, *Lives of the Fathers, Sketches of Church History in Biography*, Edinburgh, 1889, Vol. 1, pp. 445-571.

- ⁵⁰ A. Harnack, *Lehrbuch der Dogmengeschichte*, Freiburg, 1890-94, Band III, p. 814
- ⁵¹ A. Harnack, *Lehrbuch der Dogmengeschichte*, Freiburg, 1900-10, Band II, p. 224
- ⁵² cf. Fr. Lauchert, *Leben des heiligen Athanasius des Grossen*, Cologne, 1911, pp. 25-134; and G. Bardy, *Saint Athanase*, Paris, 1925, pp. 22-50, 202-207
- ⁵³ A. Robertson, *op. cit.*, p. lxviii
- ⁵⁴ cf. L.W. Barnard, 'Some Notes on the Meletian Schism in Egypt', *Studia Patristica XII (TU 115)*, Berlin, 1975, pp. 399-405; 'Athanasius and the Roman State', *Latomus* 36, 1977, pp. 422-437, see especially the comment of Barnard on Athanasius' contribution, p. 437; 'Athanasius and the Meletian schism in Egypt', *JEA* 59, 1975, pp. 183-189; and 'Two Notes on Athanasius. 1. Athanasius' Election as Archbishop of Alexandria. 2. The Circumstances Surrounding the Encyclical Letter of the Egyptian Bishops (Apologia contra Arianos 3, 1-19, 5)', *OrChrP* 41, 1975, pp. 344-356. Also cf. Frances Young *op. cit.*, pp. 65-68, and especially her concluding evaluation of Athanasius, pp. 82-83; and cf. G. Christopher Stead, 'Atanasio', *Dizionario patristico e di antichità cristiane*, (ed. A. Di Berardino), I, 1983, pp. 423-432; 'The *Thalia* of Arius and the Testimony of Athanasius', *JThS*, NS 29, 1978, pp. 20-52, see especially his remarks on Athanasius, p. 38; cf. Stead's critique of Athanasius' method of argumentation in 'Rhetorical Method in Athanasius', *VC* 30, 1976, pp. 121-137; 'Freedom of the Will and the Arian Controversy', *Platonismus und Christentum (Festschrift für Heinrich Dörrie)*, Münster, 1983, pp. 245-257, see especially Stead's comments on Athanasius' polemical writing, p. 254 ff.
- ⁵⁵ *ZKG* 90, 1979, pp. 304-338
- ⁵⁶ *op. cit.*, pp. 337, 338; cf. 'Über nikäische Orthodoxie. Der sog. Tomus ad Antiochenos des Athanasios von Alexandrien', *ZNW* 66, 1975, pp. 194-222; 'Athanasius von Alexandrien', *Theologische Realenzyklopädie*, Berlin, 1977, II, pp. 333-349; and 'Athanasius und die Einheit der Kirche. Zur ökumenischen Bedeutung eines Kirchenvaters' *ZThK* 81, 1984, Heft 2, pp. 196-219
- ⁵⁷ J. Pelikan, *The Light of the World. A Basic Image in Early Christian Thought*, New York, 1962, p. 77
- ⁵⁸ cf. e.g. G. Florovsky, *Bible, Church, Tradition: An Eastern Orthodox View*, New York, 1968, pp. 80-83; *The Eastern Fathers of the Fourth Century*, Paris, 1931; 'The Concept of Creation in Saint Athanasius', *Studia Patristica VI (TU 115)*, 1962, pp. 36-57; T.F. Torrance, 'Athanasius. A Study in the Foundations of Classical Theology', *Theology in Reconciliation*, London and Grand Rapids, 1975, pp. 215-266; 'Spiritus Creator: A Consideration of the Teaching of St. Athanasius and St. Basil',

- Theology in Reconstruction*, London, 1965, pp. 209-228; 'The Hermeneutics of St. Athanasius', *Ἐκκλησιαστικὸς Φάρος* 52, 1970, No.1-4, p-. 446-468, 89-106, 237-249, (Vol. 53), 1971, No. 1, pp. 133-149; G.D. Dragas, 'Holy Spirit and Tradition', *Sobornost*, NS 1, 1979, pp. 51-72 (contained, along with several other essays in G.D.Dragas, *Athanasiana. Essays in the Theology of St. Athanasius*, I, London, 1980); *St. Athanasius Contra Apollinarem (Church and Theology VI)*, Athens, 1985, especially cf. p. 11; E.D. Moutsoulas, *Ὁ Μέγας Ἀθανάσιος*, Athens, 1974; V. Twomey, *Apostolikos Thronos. The Primacy of Rome as reflected in the Church History of Eusebius and the historico-apologetic writings of Saint Athanasius the Great (Münsterische Beiträge zur Theologie 49)*, Münster, 1982, pp. 231 ff.; R.E. Person, *The Mode of Theological Decision at the Early Councils*, Basle, 1978
- 59 T.D. Barnes, *Constantine and Eusebius*, London and Cambridge, Mass., 1981, p. 230
- 60 C. Kannengiesser, *Athanase d'Alexandrie évêque et écrivain*, Paris, 1983; 'Athanasius of Alexandria - Three Orations Against the Arians. A Reappraisal', *Studia Patristica XVIII*, 1982, pp. 981-995; Also of importance and interest is Kannengiesser's recent review of Athanasian literature, 'The Athanasian Decade 1974-84: A Bibliographical Report', *Theological Studies*, 46, 1985, pp. 524-541. In this 'Report' Kannengiesser seems to show approval towards the efforts of M. Tetz in reexamining Athanasius' view of the episcopal office (pp. 527, 528) and W. Schneemelcher's more considered view of Athanasius' political and clerical ambitions (pp. 531, 532).
- 61 W.G. Rusch, 'A la recherche de l'Athanase historique', *Politique et Théologie chez Athanase d'Alexandrie*, (ed. C. Kannengiesser), Paris, 1974, pp. 161-180
- 62 G.K. Girardet, *Kaisergericht und Bischofsgericht. Studien zu den Anfängen des Donatistenstreites (313-315) und zum prozeß des Athanasius von Alexandrien (328-346)*, Bonn, 1975, p. 54
- 63 J.M. Leroux, 'Athanase et la seconde phase de la crise arienne (345-373)', *Politique et théologie*, pp. 145-156
- 64 W. Schneemelcher in his *Athanasius von Alexandrien als Theologe und als Kirchenpolitiker*, (Gesammelte Aufsätze) Thessaloniki, 1974, has moved away from the position of Schwartz and is more willing to allow Athanasius to stand as a theological and ecclesiastical figure whose life was not always driven by ambitious motives. Schneemelcher does remain, however, in this author's opinion, a product of the critical school as compared with the other authors named above.
- 65 A. Martin, 'Athanase et les Méletiens (325-335)', *Politique et théologie*, pp. 31-62

- ⁶⁶F. Young, *op. cit.*, p. 67
- ⁶⁷*ibid.*
- ⁶⁸*ibid.*
- ⁶⁹W. Rusch, *op. cit.*, pp. 161-177
- ⁷⁰The standard English translation of this text is by E. Walford, *The Ecclesiastical History of Philostorgius*, London, 1855, pp. 425ff. The standard critical edition was prepared by J. Bidez, *Philostorgius Kirchengeschichte* (revised edition), Berlin, 1981.
- ⁷¹In H.I. Bell, *Jews and Christians in Egypt*, London, 1924, pp. 53-71
- ⁷²Gregory Nazianzen, *Oration XXI*, in *LNPF* (Series II), Vol. VII, Oxford, 1894, pp. 269-280 (standard English translation). The Greek text is preserved in *PG* 35 Col.1081-1128 and a critical edition of the text in *SC* 270 (ed. J. Mossay), Paris, 1980, pp. 86-193.
- ⁷³Rusch, *op. cit.*, pp. 161, 162
- ⁷⁴*cf.* F. Young, *loc. cit.*; L.W. L.W. Barnard, 'Two Notes on Athanasius', *OrChrP*, 41, 1975, pp. 348, 349; and W.H.C. Frend, 'Athanasius as an Egyptian Leader in the Fourth Century', *New College Bulletin* VIII, 1974, p. 24. Frend has continued this tacit acceptance of Philostorgian accounts, although they are not credited as such, in his description of Athanasius' career in *The Rise of Christianity*, Philadelphia, 1984, pp. 523ff.
- ⁷⁵K.M. Girardet, *op. cit.*, p. 54
- ⁷⁶L.W. Barnard, *loc. cit.* The three examples given by Barnard to show that Philostorgius was not 'an out and out Arian sympathiser' (Bk. 1,3; 1,9; 2,3) do appear, in this author's opinion, from a study of Bidez's text to be interpolations of Photius. In any case, one may, at the very least, assume along with F. Young that the chief purpose of Philostorgius in the *Ecclesiastical History* was the defence of Eunomius and that, therefore, the attacks of Philostorgius are directed towards 'all who oppose Eunomius... whether homoousian or homoiousian, (or) even Arians!' (F. Young, *op. cit.*, p. 30)
- ⁷⁷J. Quasten, *Patrology*, Antwerp, 1975, III, p. 531
- ⁷⁸*ibid.*
- ⁷⁹J. Quasten, *op. cit.*, p. 532, speaks of Philostorgius' 'bias and inaccuracy'. That Quasten appears to be correct in this

assessment may be seen in the examples given in the text.

⁸⁰ *cf.* footnote 70

⁸¹ *cf.* *Apol.* 3-20

⁸² Philostorgius, *HE*, II, 11 (Bidez, *op. cit.*, pp. 22,23)

⁸³ *ibid.*

⁸⁴ *ibid.*

⁸⁵ Sozomen, *HE*, III, 5; Socrates, *HE*, II, 10; Theodoret, *HE*, II, 3

⁸⁶ Philostorgius' *Ecclesiastical History* appears to have been written between AD 425 and 433. *cf.* Quasten, *op. cit.*, p. 531

⁸⁷ Socrates most likely made use of the *Synodal Letter of the Egyptian Bishops of AD 338*, *cf.* *Apol.* 6, 5-6 (Opitz 90, 41-93, 14)

⁸⁸ Socrates, *HE*, I, 23 (PG 67, 139, C9-141, 10); English trans., *LNPF* (Series II), Vol. II, p. 26

⁸⁹ Sozomen, *HE*, II, 17 (J. Bidez, *SC* 306, Paris, 1983, p. 296, 70-73); English trans., E. Walford, *op. cit.* (see footnote 70) p. 74, he speaks of the vote 'directed by Divine will' to Athanasius.

⁹⁰ *ibid.*

⁹¹ Walford, *op. cit.*, p. 75

⁹² *ibid.* (Bidez, *op. cit.*, p. 298, 73-74)

⁹³ Walford, *op. cit.*, pp. 75,76. *cf.* Rufinus, *HE*, I, 14 and Socrates, *HE*, I, 15

⁹⁴ Walford, *loc. cit.*

⁹⁵ For the critical text *cf.* K. Holl, *Epiphanius, Panarion Haer. 65-80 (GCS)*, Leipzig, 1933. The English translations are those of the author.

⁹⁶ Quasten, *op. cit.*, Vol. III, p. 388

⁹⁷ *Haer.* 68, 7 (Holl, *op. cit.*, p. 147, 4-17). Two intriguing points are raised by Epiphanius in this passage. First is his terminology for the clergy, *ὁ τοῦ κανόνο*. Second is his 'editorial' comment that part of the reason for

the electoral crisis was that 'Alexandria never had two bishops as other cities have'. It is unclear exactly what Epiphanius means by this comment as even within the patriarchal sees there was not a system of suffragans. It also seems unlikely that he was making reference to the sad case of the divided church in Antioch with what Epiphanius would, it seems sure, have considered a schismatic bishop or rival bishop. In any case, this would not have been true of Alexandria, for the Meletian schism arose out of Meletius' usurping of Bishop Peter's authority in consecrations and ordinations (cf. K. Baus, 'Meletius of Lycopolis', *LThK*, Vol. VII; W. Telfer, 'Meletius of Lycopolis and Episcopal Succession in Egypt', *HTR*, 48, 1955, pp. 227-237; and L.W. Barnard, 'Some Notes on the Meletian Schism in Egypt', *Studia Patristica XII* (TU 115), Berlin, 1975, pp. 399-405). The concept of one bishop in one city, following the pattern of Cyprian, with presbyters taking on additional responsibilities for the area surrounding the city seems to have been followed in Alexandria and is attested to by Eusebius (*HE* 8, 13, 7; *Epist. episc. Aegypt.*, PG 10, C1566). Perhaps Epiphanius is referring to the problem of there being no other local bishop being close to hand to assist in the consecration of a successor.

⁹⁸ According to L.W. Barnard, 'Two Notes', *op. cit.*, p. 350, this election account indicates 'that the Arians elected a certain Achillas as bishop'.

⁹⁹ Despite Barnard's assertions (cf. footnote 98 above), the text is unclear as to the doctrinal persuasion of the Alexandrine electors. That the Meletians would have been excluded from the electoral process is, it would seem, certain, as the Council of Nicaea appears to have excluded from such a process all persons who had been found to have been in a schismatic state. Girardet, *Kaisergericht und Bischofsgericht*, *op. cit.*, p. 54, assumes that those Meletians who had been ordained by persons other than Meletius could have participated in the election of the Bishop of Alexandria. That this view is much 'broader' than the one which this author believes would have actually been taken by the participants is very clearly put forward by A. Martin in 'Athanasie et les Méletiens' (*Politique et Théologie*, ed. C. Kannengiesser, *op. cit.*), pp. 40-44, where the argument is put forward that it is reasonable to assume that Athanasius, as well as many of the other Egyptian clergy, would have interpreted the canonical strictures of Nicaea in accordance with their most literal sense.

¹⁰⁰ L.W. Barnard, 'Two Notes', *op. cit.*, p. 350

¹⁰¹ *Haer.* 69, 11 (Holl, *op. cit.*, p. 161, 6-23)

¹⁰² For the critical text cf. J. Mossay, *SC* 270, Paris, 1980, pp. 86-193. English trans. *LPNF* (Series II) Vol. VII, pp. 269-280

- ¹⁰³ *cf.* Mossay, *op. cit.*, pp. 99-103 for the arguments concerning the exact dating of *Oration XXI*. Mossay concludes that the *Oration* cannot be dated beyond saying that it was composed 'en 379, 380 ou 381, pour une fête solonnelle d'Athanase d'Alexandrie' (p. 103).
- ¹⁰⁴ *Oration XXI*, 7 (Mossay, *op. cit.*, p. 122, 7, 7-10); English trans., *LNPF* (Series II) Vol. VII, p. 271
- ¹⁰⁵ *Apol.* 6, 5-6 (Opitz, p. 92, 20- 93, 5)
- ¹⁰⁶ *Oration XXI*, 8 (Mossay, *op. cit.*, p. 124, 8, 1-14); English trans., *LNPF loc. cit.*
- ¹⁰⁷ *PG* 65, 341, B9-15; The English trans. is that of the author.
- ¹⁰⁸ V. Twomey, *Apostolikos Thronos*, *op. cit.*, p. 556. Although Twomey dates this passage at AD 375, the contrary opinions of Turner, Gore and Telfer are very well epitomized by E.W. Kemp, 'Bishops and Presbyters at Alexandria', *JEH*, 6, 1955, pp. 136, 137
- ¹⁰⁹ For a listing of the various editions *cf.* Quasten, *op. cit.*, Vol. III, pp. 187, 188
- ¹¹⁰ *PG* 65, 341, B9-15; The English trans. is that of the author.
- ¹¹¹ E.A.W. Budge, *The Paradise of the Holy Fathers*, London, 1907, **Vol. II**, p. 64 (sec. 284)
- ¹¹² *Apol.* 6, 5-6 (Opitz, p. 92, 20 - 93, 5). I refer to this document as the *Letter of AD 338* following the designation of Opitz: *Schreiben der Synode von Alexandrien 338*, Opitz, p. 89.
- ¹¹³ *Apol.* 3, 1 (Opitz p. 89, 1-2)
- ¹¹⁴ *Apol.* 6,5 (Opitz p. 92, 24-25)
- ¹¹⁵ *Apol.* 6, 3-6 (Opitz p. 92, 11-29). English trans., *LNPF* (Series II) Vol. IV, p. 103
- ¹¹⁶ *LNPF*, *op. cit.*, p. 503
- ¹¹⁷ *ibid.*
- ¹¹⁸ *Apol.* 61-62, the earlier dating of AD 332 seems preferable for this letter, *cf.* Opitz, p. 141, notes 2 and 4. This is, however, an admittedly earlier dating than AD 334 which is suggested by P.R. Coleman-Norton, *Roman State and Christian Church*, London, 1966, Vol. I, p. 198.

- 119 *Apol.* 62, 3 (Opitz 142, 4-6); English trans., *LNPF, op. cit.*, p. 133. The age of Athanasius at the time of his consecration has continued to be the focus of controversy. A. Martin raised the point that Athanasius may indeed have been younger than the canonical age of 30 (with reference to the synod of Neocaesarea 318/320 and its imposition of that age for the episcopate) in 'Athanasie et les Méliitiens', *op. cit.*, pp. 32-61; cf. 'Aux origines de l'Eglise copte: L'Implantation et le développement du christianisme en Egypte (I^e - IV^e siècles)', *Revue des études anciennes*, 88, 1981, pp. 35-56, also by A. Martin. Also of interest on this point of Athanasius' age at the time of his consecration, cf. G.F. Hernández, 'El cisma meleciano en la Iglesia egipcia', *Geriôn*, 2, 1984, p. 168. From the evidence of the *Historia acephala* and the *Index* of Athanasius' festal letters (both contained in a new critical edition SC 317, 1985, ed. M. Albert) it seems that Athanasius may have been either 30 years of age or very slightly younger in the summer of AD 328.
- 120 *Apol.* 62, 4 (Opitz 142, 10-11); English trans., *LNPF, op. cit.*, p. 133
- 121 i.e. Eutychius, Melchite Patriarch of Alexandria, AD 933-943
- 122 W. Telfer, 'Episcopal Succession in Egypt', *JEH*, 3, 1952, p. 10
- 123 The fourth canon of the Council of Nicaea states: 'The Bishop shall be appointed by all (the bishops) of the eparchy (province); if that is not possible on account of pressing necessity, or on account of the length of journeys, three (bishops) at the least shall meet, and proceed to the imposition of hands (consecration) with the permission of those absent in writing. The confirmation of what has been done belongs by right, in each eparchy, to the metropolitan.' C.J. Hefele, *A History of the Christian Councils* (trans. by W.R. Clark), Edinburgh, 1871, Vol. I, p. 381. A more complete examination of the significance of this canon, as regards the church of Alexandria, will be undertaken in the text below.
- 124 Telfer, *op. cit.*, pp. 10,11
- 125 W. Telfer, 'Meletius of Lycopolis', *op. cit.*, pp. 236, 237
- 126 H. Nordberg, *Athanasius and the Emperor (Commentationes Humanarum Litterarum XXX, 3)*, Helsinki-Helsingfors, 1963, p. 17
- 127 Nordberg, *op. cit.*, pp. 17, 18. This is, of course, very much in keeping with Nordberg's major thesis in this monograph, namely that the Meletians are at the very heart of Egyptian church policy decisions made during the first four decades of the fourth century.
- 128 Nordberg, *op. cit.*, p. 18

- 129 Nordberg, *op. cit.*, p. 18. Alexander of Alexandria died on 22 Pharmuthi (17 April) in the 44th year of Diocletian (AD 328). From the *Festal Letters Index* we know that Easter for this year was celebrated on 19 Pharmuthi (14 April). From the available evidence, it appears that Athanasius was enthroned in Alexandria on 14 Pauni (8 June) in this same year. *cf. Festal Index, LPNF* (Series II) Vol. 4, pp. 502, 503.
- 130 Nordberg, *loc. cit.*
- 131 Sozomen, *HE*, II, 17
- 132 Philostorgius, *HE*, II, 11
- 133 Nordberg, *loc. cit.*
- 134 Nordberg's assumption concerning Athanasius' seeking confirmation of his election from Constantine does seem very much open to question. To place this practice at the time of Athanasius is possibly archaic and the documentary evidence summoned by Nordberg to support his contention may not be what it seems. The primary text for this confirmation procedure from the hand of Constantine, also alluded to by Girardet (*Kaisergericht, op. cit.*, p. 56), is a letter of doubtful provenance contained in Philostorgius (*Bidez, op. cit.*, pp. 23, 31ff.). This letter, as the editor Bidez points out (*op. cit.*, p. xci), is most likely the product of an Arian historian who is unknown to us. We may not, therefore, give unqualified assent to the information contained in the text of the letter, which may well be an *ex parte* statement.
- 135 L.W. Barnard, 'Two Notes', *op. cit.*, pp. 344-356
- 136 *cf.* W. Telfer, 'Meletius of Lycopolis', *op. cit.*, p. 235; and L.W. Barnard, *op. cit.*, pp. 350, 351
- 137 Barnard, *loc. cit.*
- 138 Barnard, *op. cit.*, p. 345
- 139 Barnard, *op. cit.*, p. 346
- 140 E.W. Kemp, 'Bishops and Presbyters at Alexandria', *JEH*, 6, 1955, pp. 125-142
- 141 *cf.* Kemp, *op. cit.*, pp. 127-129; and Telfer, 'Episcopal Succession', *op. cit.*, pp. 4,5
- 142 Kemp, *op. cit.*, p. 129
- 143 Kemp, *op. cit.*, p. 132

- 144 Epiphanius, *Haer.* 69, 11 (Holl, *op. cit.*, p. 161)
- 145 The supposed custom of succession in Alexandria being that no time was to intervene between the death of one bishop and the enthronement of his successor. This is according to Epiphanius, *loc. cit.*
- 146 Kemp, *loc. cit.*
- 147 *ibid.*; cf. Telfer, *op. cit.*, pp. 6, 7
- 148 Quoted by Kemp, *op. cit.*, pp. 137, 138; Eutychius, *Annals*, PG 111, col. 982
- 149 Kemp, *op. cit.*, p. 138
- 150 Quasten styles the *Vita Petri* as 'a late falsification' which is not attributable to Alexander in any way (Quasten, *op. cit.*, Vol. III, p. 17). Telfer, however, speaks of this panegyric as having been 'pronounced by Alexander' (Telfer, *op. cit.*, p. 7). cf. Kemp, *op. cit.*, p. 134
- 151 Telfer, *op. cit.*, pp. 6,7; Kemp, *op. cit.*, pp. 132-134
- 152 Telfer (*op. cit.*, p. 1) here draws on the work of E.W. Brooks, 'The Ordination of the Early Bishops of Alexandria', *JThS*, II, 1901, pp. 612, 613. It is clear, however, that Telfer has drawn more extensive conclusions from the extract from Severus than even Brooks allowed in his study of the material. cf. Kemp, *op. cit.*, p. 137
- 153 Kemp, *op. cit.*, p. 134
- 154 *ibid.*
- 155 Telfer, *op. cit.*, p. 10
- 156 *ibid.*
- 157 Kemp, *op. cit.*, p. 136
- 158 Kemp, *op. cit.*, pp. 128, 129
- 159 Kemp, *op. cit.*, p. 139
- 160 *ibid.*
- 161 Kemp, *op. cit.*, p. 140

161a A recent study of Arius by Rowan Williams has also considered the evidence concerning the unusual situation of the bishops of Alexandria in the early fourth century. In the debate between Kemp and Telfer as to whether or not Athanasius represented part of the 'old' tradition of 'presbyterial consecration' or the more 'current' Nicene model, Williams has sought middle ground. The following excerpt from Williams' study is representative:

The bishop of Alexandria occupied at this date what may seem a highly paradoxical position in the Egyptian church: on the one hand - as our evidence has already hinted - he more closely resembled an archbishop or even a patriarch than any other prelate in Christendom. The letter of the four imprisoned bishops to Meletius speaks of Peter as something more than a mere senior confrere: the plain implication of the text is that he has the right to appoint 'commissaries' in vacant sees; and there is a fair amount of evidence that he normally consecrated other Egyptian bishops, and perhaps even nominated them. At least from the time of Dionysius, he was addressed as *papa*, and other bishops in Egypt refer to him as their 'father'. On the other hand, within Alexandria itself the bishop was surrounded by powerful and independent presbyters, supervising their own congregations: there is already something like a 'parochial' system, with the bishop as president of a college of near equals. Dionysius still writes to his 'fellow presbyters' in the mid third century. A rather confused tradition long survived that, until the accession of Athanasius in 328, the bishop was consecrated by the Alexandrian presbyterial college and not by any other bishop; and although the evidence is unclear, such a practice would by no means be surprising. Despite his unique powers in the rest of Egypt, the Alexandrian pope remained, in his own city, a *primus inter pares*. (*Arius. Heresy and Tradition*. London, 1987. p. 42)

Although we would agree with Williams concerning the unique powers enjoyed by the bishop of Alexandria, it does seem, from the evidence presented, that the practice of 'presbyterial consecration' in Alexandria did not, as we have indicated in the text, survive beyond the mid-third century. It should be stated, however, that Williams' collecting of materials, both with regard to this issue and the emergence of Alexandria's parochial system (with commentary on Epiphanius' 'Mendidion'), is a valuable contribution to the study of early fourth century Alexandria (*op.cit.*, p.42). The consideration of such documents gains even greater importance given Williams' conclusion in setting the background for the emergence of Arius in Alexandria, that, 'the presbyters - as has been noted - were not docile diocesan clergy but members of a collegiate body. It is not entirely surprising that we should come across disputes between bishop and presbyters over the respective limits of their authority' (*ibid.*, p.44).

- 162 Kemp, *op. cit.*, pp. 139, 140
- 163 J. Lécuyer, 'Le problème des consécérations épiscopales', *Bulletin de Littérature Ecclesiastique* 65, 1964, pp. 256, 257
- 164 PG 65, Col. 341, B9-15
- 165 *cf.* the appended note of C.H. Turner in Brooks, *op. cit.*, p. 613
- 166 C. Gore, 'On the Ordination of the Early Bishops of Alexandria', *JThS* III, 1902, pp. 279, 280
- 167 Telfer, *op. cit.*, p. 11
- 168 In Budge's translation (*Paradise of the Holy Fathers, op. cit.*, p. 64) the 'heretics' accuse 'the Archbishop of Alexandria' in the singular, but then state that 'they (i.e. the Archbishops of Alexandria as a group) were consecrated like other priests'.
- 169 In the Greek version the 'heretics' simply 'speak against' (καταλαλεῖν) the archbishop, whereas in the longer Syrian recension they (according to Budge) 'calumniate' the archbishop and 'speak evil things concerning him'. *cf.* PG 65, Col. 341, B9-15 and Budge, *loc. cit.*
- 170 *Haer.* 69, 11
- 171 Philostorgius, *HE* II, 11
- 172 E.W. Brooks, *The Sixth Book of the Select Letters of Severus Patriarch of Antioch in the Syrian Version of Athanasius of Nisibis*, London, 1903, Vol. II, p. 213 (II, 3)
- 173 Telfer, *op. cit.*, p. 6
- 174 Kemp, *op. cit.*, p. 138
- 175 Kemp, *op. cit.*, p. 139
- 176 *ibid.*
- 177 Telfer, 'Meletius of Lycopolis', *op. cit.*, p. 237
- 178 Telfer, 'Episcopal Succession', *op. cit.*, p. 12
- 179 In pressing his argument concerning the late date of a change from presbyterial to episcopal election and consecration in Alexandria (i.e. after the time of Nicaea and beginning with the consecration of Athanasius), Telfer is seeking to uphold

his own theological position which rejected the necessity of an unbroken chain of the laying on of hands by bishops as that which constitutes Apostolic Succession. This is made clear in the course of a report of the Committee appointed by the Archbishop of Canterbury in 1951 to negotiate with the Churches of Norway, Denmark and Iceland, in which we read: 'Professor Molland also referred to the fact that the Alexandrian Church did not have the Apostolic Succession up to the Council of Nicaea... *Dr. Telfer agreed with this last point*, but said that after the Fourth Canon of Nicaea, Athanasius was consecrated by the Egyptian bishops, and the great Church of Egypt came into line with the rest of Christendom.' (*The Church of England and the Churches of Norway, Denmark and Iceland*, London, 1952, p. 30, Emphasis added.) In his own article, Telfer was to add that in the days of Nicaea 'there was no general belief that valid episcopal succession was inseparable from an unbroken chain of consecrations by laying on of hands.... The tyranny of legalism was still at bay.' (Telfer, *op. cit.*, p. 12)

180 The Greek text is found in Hefele, *op. cit.*, Vol. I, p. 328. The translation is that of the author.

181 *cf.* Hefele, *op. cit.*, Vol. I, p. 388 (Canon 6) and p. 404 (Canon 7). In Canon Six the jurisdiction of the churches of Alexandria, Antioch, and Rome are spoken of in a specific manner. Similarly, the ancient rights of the Bishop of Aelia (Jerusalem) are confirmed by name in Canon Seven.

182 The real change in procedure concerning the election and consecration of bishops which was effected at Nicaea seems to have consisted mainly in a change of emphasis from the joint suffrage of *plebs*, *prebyters* and bishops, to the wishes of the 'bishops of the province' (Canon 4). One must admit, however, that the joint suffrage of the three groups named above continued for some time after Nicaea, especially in the West. For a more complete discussion of this point *cf.* H. Hess, *The Canons of the Council of Sardica AD 343, A Landmark in the Early Development of Canon Law*, Oxford, 1958, pp. 90-94, and in the text below.

183 *De his qui usurpant sibi quod soli debeant episcopos ordinare, placuit ut nullus hoc sibi praesumat nisi assumptis secum aliis septem episcopos. Si tamen non potuerit septem infra tres non audeat ordinare.* (Hefele, *op. cit.*, p. 195)

184 *cf. e.g.* the statement of Hippolytus that a bishop should be chosen by all the people (ὕπὸ παντός τοῦ λαοῦ) and that the choice made by the people should then be approved by all the presbyters and bishops who have assembled (*The Apostolic Tradition*, I, ii, 1-2, ed. G. Dix, London, 1968, pp. 2, 3). The material in Hippolytus may be of even greater importance in the present discussion if one accepts the argument for its early circulation in the Churches of Syria and Egypt (*op. cit.*, p. xlvi). In any case, we may accept Dix's dating of the collection to c. AD 215 (*op. cit.*, p. xxxvii) a date which is early enough for the *Apostolic Tradition* to have been formative

for other and later collections of canonical prescriptions concerning the election and consecration of bishops.

- ¹⁸⁵ Hefele, *op. cit.*, p. 385
- ¹⁸⁶ Telfer, 'Meletius of Lycopolis', *op. cit.*, p. 237
- ¹⁸⁷ Philostorgius, *HE* II, 11
- ¹⁸⁸ *ibid.* (Walford, *op. cit.*, p. 439; Bidez, *op. cit.*, pp. 22, 23)
- ¹⁸⁹ Telfer, 'Episcopal Succession', *op. cit.*, p. 10; Barnard, *op. cit.*, p. 349
- ¹⁹⁰ Barnard, *loc. cit.*; *cf.* Nordberg's acceptance of the possibility that Athanasius was consecrated by as few as two bishops, *op. cit.*, p. 18.
- ¹⁹¹ *cf.* the discussion of this point in footnote 99
- ¹⁹² If, as Hefele states, 'Meletius was probably the occasion of this canon' (*op. cit.*, I, p. 384), it seems almost unbelievable that Athanasius would hold to a synodal decree by which he set aside the Meletians as electors, and then immediately open himself to charges of uncanonical consecration under that very same canon which have been intended for use against the Meletians!
- ¹⁹³ *Haer.* 69, 2 (Holl, *op. cit.*, p. 153)
- ¹⁹⁴ *Historia Acephala* V (*LNPF*, Series II, Vol. 4, p. 497). For further discussion of this point, *cf.* 'Les premiers siècles du christianisme à Alexandrie', *Revue des Etudes Augustiniennes* 30, 1984, pp. 212, 213. In the text of this article one should especially consider the comment of A. Calderini (p. 212, n.7) on the manner in which Epiphanius made use of the listing of churches.
- ¹⁹⁵ Philostorgius, *loc. cit.*
- ¹⁹⁶ Epiphanius, *Haer.* 68, 6
- ¹⁹⁷ Nordberg, *op. cit.*, p. 18; Girardet, *op. cit.*, p. 56; and Barnard, 'Two Notes', *op. cit.*, p. 346. Also *cf.* the discussion in footnote 134.
- ¹⁹⁸ Philostorgius, *loc. cit.*
- ¹⁹⁹ Hefele, *loc. cit.*

- 199a *cf.*, T.D. Barnes, *Constantine and Eusebius*, London, 1981, p. 11, for other examples of decrees not being promulgated in the West despite Diocletian's issuance of such decrees 'in the name of all the emperors' and his speaking 'as if legislating for the whole empire'.
- 199b Galerius seems to have issued, if not an edict of toleration, at least a monition in the spring of AD 311. For a Greek translation see Eusebius, *HE* 8. 17, 1-10; the Latin text is preserved in Lactantius, *de Mort.*, 34.
- 199c *Codex Verona LX*, the critical text in F.H. Kettler, 'Der melitianische Streit in Ägypten', *ZNTW* 35 (1936), pp. 155-193. For a discussion of Apollonius and the accession of Meletius, see, R. Williams, *Arius. Heresy and Tradition*, London, 1987, p. 259 (fn. 40).
- 199d The names of these four bishops are given in *Codex Verona LX*, which is cited above in fn. 199c.
- 199e The exact nature of these 'visitors' remains disputed. For a discussion of the E. Schwartz's contention that these 'visitors' were not, in fact, presbyters see, R. Williams, *op. cit.*, p. 259 (fn. 39).
- 199f Kettler, *op. cit.*, p. 160
- 199g Williams, *op. cit.*, p. 37. For an example of the consensus opinion that these ordination did take place during the imprisonment of either Meletius or those who were ordained, see C. Schmidt, *Fragmente einer Schrift des Märtyrbischofs Petrus von Alexandrien*, (TU 5, NS), Leipzig, 1901.
- 199h Epiphanius, *Haer.* 68, 140ff; *cf.*, H. Achelis, 'Meletius von Lycopolis', *PRE* (third ed.), Vol. 12, pp. 558-562 concerning Epiphanius' possible use of Meletian documents by means of a Meletian convert to the catholic side of the schism.
- 199i *cf. supra* fn. 199b
- 199j Williams, *op. cit.*, p. 35
- 199k The length of the vacancy is disputed. For an interesting, although dated, discussion see, J.M. Neale, *op. cit.*, p. 113 (fn. 1).
- 199l *Ad epp. Aeg. et Lib.* 23 (PG 25, 592 B)
- 199m *ibid.*; *Apol.* 59 (Opitz, p. 139, 1-18); Epiphanius, *Haer.* 68, 140ff.

- 200 Telfer, 'Meletius of Lycopolis', *op. cit.*, pp. 232-237
- 201 Martin, 'Athanasie et les Méletiens', *op. cit.*, pp. 40-44
- 202 Telfer, *op. cit.*, p. 235
- 203 *ibid.*
- 204 *Apol.* 71 (Opitz, p. 150, 34)
- 205 Telfer, *op. cit.*, p. 236. We may note that Athanasius considers 'Archaph' to be a native name (*Apol.* 70), while the church historian Socrates turns this appellation into the ill-fated scriptural name of Achab (*HE* I, 30). H.I. Bell identifies John Archaph with the ἀπα Ἰωάννου who is mentioned in London Papyrus 1914. Although there is convincing evidence that the designation of ἀπα does correspond to that of ἀββᾶ in Coptic usage, Bell does not present any evidence that positively links the personage in L. 1914 with John Archaph and certainly not with the John of Memphis who is found in the schedule. The common use of the name Ἰωάννου, which may be seen in Preisigke's *Namenbuch* (Heidelberg, 1922), and the uncertain nature and use of titles for clergy during this period makes any positive identification of a person from circumstances alone very risky (*cf. Jews and Christians in Egypt*, London, 1924, p. 67, fn. 34).
- 206 Telfer, *loc. cit.*, *cf. Apol.* 70 (Opitz, p. 148, 13ff)
- 207 Barnard, 'Two Notes', *op. cit.*, pp. 350, 351
- 208 *Apol.* 71 (Opitz, p. 150, 34)
- 209 Robertson, *LNPF* (Series II, Volume IV), p. 137, fn. 6. Epiphanius also refers to the fact that Meletius was considered to be ἀρχιεπισκόπος of the province of Thebaïs (*Haer.* 69, 3). Although Epiphanius does not seem to be using the term in its later specific sense, its use may be used as a support to Robertson's identification of Meletius as the person who is the subject of this reference.
- 210 Robertson, *loc. cit.*
- 211 Nordberg, *Athanasius and the Emperor*, p. 13
- 212 L.W. Barnard, 'Some Notes on the Meletian Schism in Egypt', *Studia Patristica* XII (*TU* 115), Berlin, 1975, p. 401. Opitz also indicates that the John listed in the schedule is John Archaph, the leader of the Meletians, but gives no evidence for such a claim beyond referring the reader to Athanasius' statement in *Apol.* 70, which does not bring any additional clarity or help in the process of identification (Opitz, p. 150, fn. to line 34).

- 213 Barnard, *loc. cit.*
- 214 Barnard, 'Two Notes', *op. cit.*, p. 351
- 215 Martin, 'Athanasie et les Méletiens', *op. cit.*, p. 41
- 216 *ibid.*, cf. Sozomen, *HE*, II, 17 (J. Bidez, *SC* 306, Paris, 1983, p. 296)
- 217 Martin, *loc. cit.*
- 218 Martin, *op. cit.*, p. 43
- 219 *ibid.*
- 220 The text of the letter is preserved in Socrates, *HE* I, 9; Theodoret, *HE* ix. 7ff; and Gelasius, *HE* II, 33. This translation is based upon the text in Theodoret, *HE* ix. 7ff (*GCS*, edited by L. Parmentier and F. Schneidweiler, second edition, Berlin, 1954, pp. 39-41).
- 221 E. Ferguson, 'Attitudes to Schism at the Council of Nicaea', *Schism, Heresy and Religious Protest* (ed. Derek Baker) Cambridge, 1972, p. 58
- 222 *ibid.*
- 223 Martin, *op. cit.*, p. 43. This conclusion may be compared not only to Telfer's 'prospective rights' argument ('Meletius of Lycopolis', *op. cit.*, p. 235), but also to the legalistic interpretation of Girardet that Nicaea was concerned only with those bishops who had actually been ordained by Meletius and not with those who had followed him into schism or supported him (*Kaisergericht und Bischofsgericht*, p. 54). Clearly the intent of the synodal letter of Nicaea was to deal with all of those in schism. We agree with Martin that Athanasius and his followers would have been unwilling to allow disputing bishops who had recently been schismatic to participate in the election.
- 224 Space does not permit a full discussion of the 'second session' debate concerning the Council of Nicaea. It is sufficient to say that the hypothesis was first put forward by Seeck (*ZKG* 17, 1896, p. 69ff.) and taken up in turn by Schwartz (*GS*, III, p. 205ff) and Opitz (*ZNW* 33, 1934, pp. 156-158). According to this hypothesis the second session of the Council of Nicaea was summoned by Constantine in order to reconcile the Arians who had refused to subscribe to the decisions of the Council, such as Eusebius of Nicomedia and Theognis of Nicaea. This reconstruction of events has gained wide acceptance by a large number of respected scholars such as H. Lietzmann

(*Geschichte* III, pp. 111, 112), Nordberg (*Athanasius and the Emperor*, p. 13), and Girardet (*Kaisergericht und Bischofsgericht*, pp. 53, 54). The document on which this hypothesis is partly based however, has been doubted as to its authenticity even though Opitz included it in his *Urkundensammlung* (Urkunde 31, p. 65) as being genuine. For the dissenting opinions concerning this document see Rogala, *Anfänge des arianischen Streites*, pp. 78-85, and Baynes, 'Athanasiana', *JEA* 2 (1925), p. 58.

- 225 The initial argument of Montfaucon (*PG* 25, lvii) has been followed by Robertson (*LNPF*, Series II, Volume IV, xxi) and in more recent times by Telfer ('Meletius of Lycopolis', *op. cit.*, p. 234). More complete arguments against the 'second session' hypothesis have been advanced by Jan-M. Szymusiak in Appendice I, 'A propos d'une deuxième session du Concile de Nicée', in *Apologie a l'empereur Constance. Apologie pour sa fuite*, (SC 56) Paris, 1958, pp. 169-173; and Colm Luibhéid, 'The Alleged Second Session of the Council of Nicaea', *JEH* 34, No. 2, April 1983, pp. 165-174.
- 226 *Apol.* 59 (Opitz, p. 139, 15-18)
- 227 Theodoret, *HE* I, 26
- 228 Gelasius, *HE* 2, 37,38; cf. Philostorgius, *HE* 2, 7
- 229 Luibhéid, 'Alleged Second Session', *op. cit.*, p. 172; and Eusebius, *VC* 3, 21
- 230 *Apol.* 71 (Opitz p. 149, 13,14)
- 231 Hefele, *History of the Councils*, I, p. 388
- 232 *ibid.*
- 233 Hefele, *op. cit.*, pp. 381, 386
- 234 Hefele, *op. cit.*, p. 384
- 235 *vide supra*, fn. 220
- 236 T.D. Barnes, drawing upon the *Chronicle* of Jerome, states that the final event of the Council of Nicaea was the celebration on 25 July AD 325 of the emperor's *vicennalia*, after which 'he summoned them once again for a farewell discourse' before the bishops departed (*Constantine and Eusebius*, p. 219). This agrees with Eusebius' account in *VC* 3, 15ff. The Coptic calendar, however, celebrates the three hundred and eighteen Fathers on 5 November, keeping alive the tradition that Alexander and Athanasius did not return until that time and only then were the synodal letters published. That the decisions of Nicaea strengthened the hand of Alexander

upon his return from the Council, we may refer to the comment by R. Williams that,

Nicaea dealt not only with the Meletian problem and the case of Arius, but also with the regularization of episcopal succession and jurisdiction in Egypt; and it is not fanciful to see behind this conjunction some sense of interrelatedness of these issues. ('Arius and the Meletian Schism', *JThS*, NS Vol. 37, Pt. 1, April 1986, p. 52)

²³⁷ Telfer, 'Meletius of Lycopolis', *op. cit.*, p. 234

²³⁸ Eusebius, *VC* 3, 23

²³⁹ Luibhéid, *op. cit.*, p. 174

²⁴⁰ Eusebius, *loc. cit.*

²⁴¹ *Apol.* 72 (Opitz, p. 151, 10)

²⁴² As we know that Alexander of Alexandria died on 17 April AD 328 from the evidence of the *Festal Index* (Robertson, *LNPF*, Series II, Vol. IV, p. 503 and Larsow, *Fest-Briefe*, *op. cit.*, pp. 26,27), we may approximate the time of the short-lived reconciliation by counting back five months to the latter portion of AD 327.

²⁴³ *Apol.* 59 (Opitz, p. 139, 15,16). The statement of Epiphanius that Meletius had died before the Council of Nicaea (*Haer.* 68, 3) may certainly be discounted on the strength of the statement by Athanasius that he presented his bishops to Alexander in person (*Apol.* 72). The exact date of Meletius' death is unknown, although during the next phase of the controversy - those events which led directly to the Synod of Tyre - John Archaph is the recognized leader of the Meletians. Neale reports the conflicting claims as to whether or not Meletius himself died in schism (Neale, *Patriarchate of Alexandria*, p. 150, fn. 2). In any case, it seems clear that Meletius was removed from the controversy at about the same time as Alexander of Alexandria died.

²⁴⁴ *Festal Index*, *op. cit.* (cf. *supra*, fn. 242)

²⁴⁵ *Haer.* 68, 7 (Holl, *op. cit.*, p. 147, 4-17) (cf. *supra*, fn. 97)

²⁴⁶ *ibid.*; Sozomen, *HE* II, 17; Theodoret, *HE* II, 26

²⁴⁷ *Haer.*, *loc. cit.*; It is difficult to fully agree with the statement of T. Barnes that after Theonas died, 'the Meletians clearly replaced him, since the accidental find of a papyrus shows that a Meletian bishop of Alexandria existed in 334' (Barnes, *Constantine and Eusebius*, p. 230). Barnes is making reference to London Papyrus 1914, which only comments concerning ἐπισκόπου ἐν τῇ παρεμβολῇ near

to Alexandria, but in no sense does this indicate that the person in question was the 'Meletian bishop of Alexandria' (London Papyrus 1914, l.7ff).

248 Barnard, 'Two Notes', *op. cit.*, p. 352

249 *Haer.* 69, 11 (Holl, *op. cit.*, p. 161)

250 *Apol.* 6 (Opitz, p. 91, 17,18)

251 *cf.* Barnard, 'Two Notes', *op. cit.*, p. 349

252 *Festal Index*, *loc. cit.*; Also on the question of the age of Athanasius and its relationship to the question of his election and consecration, *cf.* Martin, *op. cit.*, pp. 32-61. It is very possible that the canonical difficulty concerning Athanasius' youth derived from the stipulations of the synod held at Neo-caesarea which placed the age of 30 years as the youngest age permitted for an episcopal candidate. Some, as Gonzalo F. Hernández, have therefore concluded that Athanasius was less than thirty years of age in the summer of AD 328 (*cf.* 'El cisma meleciano en la Iglesia egipcia', *Gerión*, Vol. 2, 1984, p. 168). Charles Kannengiesser has shown considerable concern as to the effect of the date of Athanasius' birth on the dating of his 'earliest writings' and tends to agree that Athanasius was slightly younger (perhaps only by months) than the age set by the synod (*cf.* 'La date de l'apologie d'Athanase "Contre les païens" et "Sur l'Incarnation"', *RSR*, Vol. 58, 1970, pp. 383-428). (*cf. supra*, fn. 119 for further references on this issue.)

253 Nordberg, *op. cit.*, p. 19

254 *Apol.* 6 (Opitz, pp. 91-93)

255 John Gwyn Griffiths, 'Egyptian Influences on Athanasius', *Studien zu Sprache und Religion Ägyptens (Festschrift W. Westendorf)*, Bd. 2, Göttingen, 1984, p. 1023

256 Μακάριος πρεσβύτερος τῆς Παρεμβολῆς, *Apol.* 71 (Opitz, p. 151, 9, no. 42 in the schedule). Nordberg is convinced of this identification (*cf.* Nordberg, *op. cit.*, p. 22). Opitz, however, is more cautious in his note on the matter (Opitz, p. 140, fn. to l. 15ff).

257 Robertson, *LNPF*, Series II, Vol. IV, p. xxi, fn. 6

258 Nordberg, *op. cit.*, p. 29

259 *ibid.*

259a The return from exile of Eusebius and Theognis at about AD 328 on the basis of their appeal to Constantine (Opitz, *Urk.* 31)

is verified by both Sozomen (*HE* 2, 16) and the less reliable Philostorgius (*HE* 2, 7). Kopecek sees in their return to Nicomedia and Nicaea and their acceptance, at least verbally, of the Constantinian settlement, the end of 'the initial stage of the Arian controversy' (Thomas A. Kopecek, *A History of Neo-Arianism*, Vol. 1, Philadelphia, 1979, p. 59).

²⁶⁰ Kopecek, *op. cit.*, p. 76

²⁶¹ Concerning the importance of this document and its history and contents *vide*, W. Telfer, 'The Codex Verona LX (58)', *HTR* 36, pp. 169-246. The portion which deals with the question of the identity of Arius may be found on p. 184. A critical text of those portions of the Codex which deal with the Meletian schism may be consulted in F.H. Kettler, 'Der melitianische Streit in Ägypten', *ZNTW* 35, pp. 159-163.

²⁶² Rowan Williams, 'Arius and the Meletian Schism', *JTS* NS 37, Pt. 1, p. 50. His argument is in opposition to that of Kopecek that 'Arius had backed the Meletian schism in the first decade of the fourth century' and only broke with Meletius after about AD 322 when Arius 'articulated a theological position which Meletius found to be totally unacceptable' (Kopecek, *op. cit.*, pp. 3,4).

²⁶³ Williams, *op. cit.*, p. 46

²⁶⁴ Epiphanius, *Haer.* 68, 6 (Holl, *op. cit.*, p. 144, 1-5). In this account the story is preserved of Meletius first instigating the accusation of heresy against Arius. We may note, however, that Epiphanius does not indicate any earlier association even though, as Williams says, he 'has quite a bit to say about the Arian-Meletian alliance and the role of Eusebius of Nicomedia in organizing and cementing it' (Williams, *op. cit.*, p. 46).

²⁶⁵ *Apol.* 59 (Opitz, p. 139, 20)

²⁶⁶ *LNPF*, *op. cit.*, p. 517 (Larsow, *Fest-Briefe*, p. 88)

²⁶⁷ *LNPF*, *op. cit.*, p. 531. I have here followed the chronology for the *Festal Letters* which has been put forward by R. Lorenz, *Der Zehnte Osterfestbrief des Athanasius von Alexandrien*. Berlin and New York, 1986, pp. 30-31. Lorenz is convincing in redating the AD 334 letter to AD 345 and placing the fragment assigned to the later date within the earlier year. Lorenz has also put forward a forceful argument for placing the tenth letter in the year AD 338 upon the assumption that it was in this year that Antony the Hermit visited Alexandria. Within this context (p. 81) Lorenz also observes that the tenth letter contains the first open attack on Arianism. This contention appears to agree with the case which I have put forward in the present study that Athanasius was far more concerned with the Meletian threat and only later became aware of their links with the Eusebian or pro-Arian party. This restating of the Schwartzian chronology is, therefore, most helpful.

268 The question concerning the relative strength of the Arians in Egypt before the emergence of their alliance with the Meletians is yet to be answered in a satisfactory manner. Nordberg is convinced that the major threat in Egypt in the early years of Athanasius' episcopate was the Meletian schism. Recent scholarship, for a variety of reasons, has tended to support this view (cf. Barnes, *op. cit.*, p. 230; W.H.C. Frend, *The Rise of Christianity*, Philadelphia, 1984, p. 525). The more controversial aspect of Nordberg's claim, however, is that the fragment of a letter from Constantine to Athanasius, preserved in *Apol.* 59 (Opitz, p. 140 and Opitz, *Urk.*, doc. 45), is a command from the emperor to readmit the Meletians to the fellowship of the church. Most scholars have accepted that this letter concerns Arius rather than the Meletians (cf. Frend, *loc. cit.*; Lietzmann, *op. cit.*, 3, pp. 129-132; Barnes, *op. cit.*, p. 231; L.W. Barnard, 'Athanasius and the Roman State', *Latomus* 36, p. 425, to name but a few). Even the dating of the letter has been the subject of some controversy (cf. N. Baynes, 'Athanasiana', *JEA* 2, pp. 58ff), although a date between AD 328 and AD 330 seems probable (cf. Dörries, *op. cit.*, p. 95; H. Kraft, *Kaiser Konstantins religiöse Entwicklung. Beiträge zur historischen Theologie* 20. , Tübingen, 1955, p. 352 ff; and Barnes, *op. cit.*, p. 231). The fragment of this letter preserved by Athanasius is as follows:

As you now have knowledge of my will, which is that all who wish to enter the church may freely do so, you must not forbid entrance to any. For if I should learn that you have hindered or excluded any who have been willing to be admitted to the communion of the church, I will immediately send and depose you by my decree, and will send you from your place. (Opitz, p. 140, 7-10)

Athanasius' reply to this order was to inform the Emperor that 'communion between an anti-Christian heresy and the catholic Church' could not exist ('μηδεμίαν εἶναι κοινωनीαν τῆ χριστομάχῃ αἰρέσει πρὸς τὴν καθολικὴν ἐκκλησίαν') (*Apol.* 60, Opitz, p. 140, 11,12). This statement seems to refer to Arius (cf. Barnard, 'Athanasius and the Roman State', *op. cit.*, p. 425), although, depending upon the dating of the letter, Athanasius could be referring to the Meletians in terms of their alliance with Eusebius of Nicomedia. Nevertheless, such a conclusion would require an almost complete reordering of the evidence as well as a very early knowledge by Athanasius as to the existence of the alliance. Such does not appear to be the case from Athanasius' *Festal Letters* from the period under consideration.

269 *cf. Apol.* 59ff.

270 Of the forty-two Meletian clerics listed in the *Breviarium Melitii* (*Apol.* 71, Opitz, pp. 149-151), Nordberg identifies 'at least seventeen' individuals who later supported Athanasius at the synod of Tyre in July AD 335 (Nordberg, *op. cit.*, p. 29).

In reviewing Nordberg's evidence, the process of identification falls into two categories. Twelve of the individuals listed in the *Breviarium Melitii* may be identified somewhat certainly owing to the unusual nature of their name, a particular association (as in the case of the Meletian presbyters who are grouped together in the schedule, or Timotheus of Diospolis who appears to have remained with his bishop, Ammonius when they reappear at Tyre), or other references in various church histories (as the identification of the Meletians who accompanied John Archaph to Tyre by Sozomen in *HE* 2, 25 as well as the position of Macarius as a follower of Athanasius). Another five of Nordberg's identifications appear to be based almost exclusively on name and approximate location in AD 335 or the mention of their death in possession of an orthodox bishopric in later years by Athanasius in a *Festal Letter* (as in the case of Theodoros of Kopto and Pelagius of Oxyrhynchus in *Festal Letter* 19 for the year AD 347). The following chart indicates those Meletians from the *Breviarium Melitii* who appear to have accompanied Athanasius to Tyre. The listed numbers at each side correspond to those in Opitz for the *Breviarium Melitii* (pp. 149-151) and the brief presented by Athanasius' supporters at Tyre (p. 159)

	<u>Breviarium Melitii</u>		<u>Tyre</u>
	5	'Αμμώνιος ἐν Διοσπόλει	5
	12	Πελάγιος ἐν 'Οξυρύγχῳ	27
	13	Πέτρος ἐν 'Ηρακλέους	4
	23	'Αρποκρατίων ἐν Βουβάστῳ	10
	24	Μωσῆς ἐν Φακουσαῖς	11
	32	Κρόνιος ἐν Μετήλι	41
	33	'Αγαθάμμων ('Αλεξανδρέων)	22
More Certain	35	'Απολλώνιος πρεσβύτερος	15
	37	Διόσκορος πρεσβύτερος	37
	38	Τυραννος πρεσβυτερος	6
	39	Τιμόθεος διάκωνος	38
	42	Μακάριος πρεσβύτερος	39

	9	Θεόδωρος ἐν Κόπτῳ	21 or 32
	14	Θέων ἐν Νειλουπόλει	28
Less Certain	16	'Ηρακλείδης ἐν Νικίους	20 or 48
	31	Πιπινούθης ἐν Φθενεγύ	29
	36	Εἰρηναῖος πρεσβύτερος	33

270^a Barnard, 'Some Notes', *op. cit.*, p. 400; London Papyrus 1917 does indicate a theology which is somewhat removed from what is usually associated with the Arians of the time, although Barnard perhaps grants more attention to the matter of language in this document than is appropriate. The papyrus does, however, indicate the independent state which these monastic communities appear to have enjoyed. (cf. London Papyrus 1917 in H.I. Bell, *Jews and*

- Christians in Egypt*, London, 1924, pp. 80-86). Further questions as to the exact monastic structure which was employed by these monks have been raised by E.A. Judge in his review of the London papyri which make up the collection from the archive of Apa Paieous in 'The Earliest Use of *Monachos* for "Monk" and the Origins of Monasticism', *Jahrbuch für Antike und Christentum*, 20, Münster, 1977, pp. 84, 85.
- 271 W.H.C. Frend, 'Athanasius as an Egyptian Christian Leader in the Fourth Century', *Religion Popular and Unpopular in the Early Christian Centuries*, London, 1976, p. 30
- 272 Nordberg, *op. cit.*, p. 16
- 273 Charles W. Griggs, *History of Christianity in Egypt to AD 451*, PhD Thesis, University of California, 1979, (University Microfilms International, 80/360), pp. 107ff.
- 274 A study which contends that the Colluthian schism was linked to Arius in the ante-Nicene period has been written by Vlasios Feidas, *ΤΟ ΚΟΛΛΟΥΘΙΑΝ ΣΧΙΣΜΑ ΚΑΙ ΑΙ ΑΙΤΧΑΙ ΤΟΥ 'ΑΡΕΙΑΝΙΣΜΟΥ*, Athens, 1973, esp. pp. 28ff. Although one is unable to accept all of Feidas' conclusions, the study does point to the exceptional power of Alexandrine presbyters during the time of Alexander's episcopate. Concerning the connection of Ischyras with the Colluthians *cf.* *Apol.* 12 (Opitz, p. 97, 8ff.).
- 275 *Apol.* 77 (Opitz, p. 157, 9-11) This is just one of several references which link the activities of the Arians, Meletians, and Colluthians in *Apol.* 77 and 78. In both of their letters of petition, to the bishops gathered in Tyre (*Apol.* 77), and to Count Flavius Dionysius (*Apol.* 78), the connection between these three groups is perceived by the Athanasians to be a συσκευῆν ἄδηλον (Opitz, p. 156, 24 and p. 158, 3).
- 276 *Apol.* 74 (Opitz, pp. 153 and 154). Concerning Colluthus himself, *cf.* Epiphanius, *Haer.* 69; Theodoret, *HE* 1, 3; and Augustine, *Haer.* 65.
- 277 Edward R. Hardy, *Christian Egypt: Church and People*, Oxford, 1962, p. 57
- 278 Kopecek, *op. cit.*, I, p. 58
- 279 Rufinus, *HE* 10, 11ff.; Socrates, *HE* 1, 37; Sozomen, *HE* 2, 29
- 280 Rowan D. Williams, 'The Quest of the Historical *Thalia*', *Arianism. Historical and Theological Reassessments. Papers from the Ninth International Conference on Patristic Studies.* (ed. Robert C. Gregg), Philadelphia, 1985, p. 25
- 281 *ibid.* Williams notes that Arius' disciples (i.e. those who

accepted his view of 'the Son's limited knowledge') were more likely in Egypt than without, and were Arius' 'less prominent and powerful supporters'. Given our limited knowledge of the Arian party in Egypt following Nicaea, however, it seems reasonable to assume that there was some diversity of opinion even among his earliest followers in Alexandria and the region which lay round about.

- 282 In Athanasius' *Festal Letter* for AD 329, the Arians are not mentioned. Even the Meletians, who may have been creating disturbances during this period, are not given a single word. The letter for AD 330, however, speaks of heresy in general terms and is linked with exhortations to 'hold to the tradition' (5, 6) and to recognize that, 'there is no fellowship whatever between the words of the saints and the fancies of human invention' (7). The third *Festal Letter* for AD 331, misplaced by an ancient editor as letter fourteen for AD 342 (cf. Lorenz, *Der Zehnte Osterfestbrief*, pp. 30-31), only states that the bishop has 'confidence in your wisdom and doctrinal care' and 'such points as these have often been touched upon by us and in various letters' (2). In his fourth letter for AD 332, he makes plain references to the Meletians and his political problems, but again with no mention of the Arians. In the letter for AD 333, Athanasius only condemns the schismatics who 'rend the coat of Christ' (4). The *Festal Letters* of AD 334-337 are lost (apart from a fragment for AD 334) and it is not until AD 338 and the tenth letter that Athanasius fully attacks the Arians (Lorenz, *op.cit.*, p. 81). This all points to a gradual realization concerning the Meletian-Arian alliance and the minority status of the Arians in Egypt through to Tyre in AD 335.
- 283 Griffiths, *op. cit.*, pp. 1029, 1030
- 284 P.M. Fraser, *Ptolemaic Alexandria*, I, Oxford, 1972, p. 138
- 285 *Vita Antoni* 68 (PG 26, 940B)
- 286 Schwartz, *Zur Geschichte des Athanasius*, p. 286
- 287 The struggle for the support of the monastic communities appears to have been a prolonged process for Athanasius. Gregg and Groh are certainly correct in speaking of early monastic communities (AD 330s) 'who viewed the orthodox leadership in Alexandria with suspicion or enmity' (*Early Arianism*, p.135). Athanasius' eventual success in winning over the majority of the monks through the years is clear. As Frend has commented, 'Athanasius was the true archbishop' for the monks of Egypt, and appears to have won them over by his 'many-sided' personality and strength of will. In later years, the monks of Egypt became 'the eyes and ears of the archbishopric'. (Frend, 'Athanasius as an Egyptian Christian Leader', *op. cit.*, pp. 32, 33)
- 288 *Hist. Arian.* 5 (Opitz, p. 185); cf. R.P.C. Hanson, 'The Fate of Eustathius of Antioch', *ZKG* 95, 1984, 2, pp. 171-179,

who presents a convincing argument that 'Eustathius was deposed, not in 326, but in 328 or 329' (p. 179); the reasons presented for his deposition perhaps skirts the 'intricate movements of ecclesiastical politics' and do not provide a wholly satisfactory conclusion (*ibid.*) It still appears as though his deposition had to do with his opposition to the Arians of his see rather than immorality (Socrates *HE* 1, 21) as Hanson allows.

- ²⁸⁹ Writing about the whole of Athanasius' episcopate, Colin Walters has commented how the initial fragmented condition of the Egyptian church was transformed, writing that, 'it is in this period that one detects the emergence of a unified Egyptian Church, with the Alexandrian and Egyptian elements coming together to present a solid front to the common enemy' (*Monastic Archaeology in Egypt*, Warminster, 1974, p. 5).
- ²⁹⁰ H.I. Bell, 'New Lights on Saint Athanasius', *The Adelphi*, 1924, p. 1006
- ²⁹¹ *ibid.*, p. 1008
- ²⁹² *ibid.*, p. 1009
- ²⁹³ H.I. Bell, *Jews and Christians in Egypt*, London, 1924, London Papyrus 1914, pp. 53-71
- ²⁹⁴ Bell, *op. cit.*, p. 57
- ²⁹⁵ *ibid.*, p. 55
- ²⁹⁶ *ibid.*
- ²⁹⁷ *ibid.*; Bell here disputes the traditional dating of Robertson (that Athanasius left for court in late AD 330). Bell argues rightly that the evidence of the texts of the *Festal Letters* for this period should been given a greater weight of evidence than the often mistaken *Acephala* (cf. Robertson, *LNPF*, *op. cit.*, p. xxxviii and Bell, *op. cit.*, p. 55, fn. 2). For further discussion on Athanasius' movements during this period *vide* Nordberg, *op. cit.*, pp. 22-30.
- ²⁹⁸ Bell, *op. cit.*, p. 56
- ²⁹⁹ *ibid.*
- ³⁰⁰ *ibid.*; cf. London Papyrus 1913, Bell, *op. cit.*, pp. 45-53
- ³⁰¹ Bell, *op. cit.*, p. 57

- 302 *ibid.*
- 303 *ibid.*
- 304 *ibid.*, p. 53
- 305 *ibid.*
- 306 An unusual feature of LP 1914 is the setting of Nicopolis as the scene of this encounter. From the evidence of the *Breviarium Melitii*, the areas of Meletian strength seemed to be, without exception, outside the immediate vicinity of Alexandria (cf. Barnard, 'Some Notes', *op. cit.*, p. 400).
- 307 Bell, *op. cit.*, p. 68, fn. 42
- 308 *ibid.*, p. 69, fn. 48
- 309 *ibid.*, p. 57
- 310 *ibid.*
- 311 *ibid.*, p. 58
- 312 *ibid.*
- 313 *ibid.*
- 314 H.I. Bell, 'Athanasius: A Chapter in Church History', *The Congregational Quarterly*, Vol. III, No. 2, April, 1925, p. 164
- 315 Sozomen, *HE* II, 22, 25; Bell, *Jews and Christians*, p. 47
- 316 Hilary of Poitiers, IV (CSEL 65, Feder 48,9-67,20)
- 317 Bell, *op. cit.*, p. 46
- 318 Concerning Seeck, Bell states that 'I do not think Seeck is successful in his attempt to prove him (i.e. Athanasius) a downright liar and forger' (Bell, 'Athanasius', *op. cit.*, p. 175). Of Schwartz, Bell asserts that in regarding the popularity Athanasius achieved in later years, 'the enthusiastic devotion of the Alexandrines, pagans as well as Christians, would be incredible had he been the cold, selfish, unscrupulous schemer portrayed by Schwartz' (*ibid.*, p. 176).
- 319 *ibid.*, p. 175

- 320 Nordberg, *op. cit.*, p. 27
- 321 A.H.M. Jones, *The Later Roman Empire*, Oxford, 1964, p. 827;
L.W. Barnard, 'Some Notes', *op. cit.*, p. 402
- 322 Barnard, 'Athanasius and the Roman State', *op. cit.*, p. 426
- 323 Barnes, *op. cit.*, pp. 235, 236
- 324 Frend, 'Athanasius as an Egyptian Christian Leader', *op. cit.*,
p. 32; cf. Frend, *The Rise of Christianity*, p. 526
- 325 R.C. Gregg and D.E. Groh, *Early Ariansim*, p. 191, fn. 131
- 326 Some of the more important studies include: J. Van Haelst,
'Les sources papyrologiques concernant l'Eglise en Egypte à
l'époque de Constantin', *Proceedings of the Twelfth Inter-
national Congress of Papyrology*, Toronto, 1970, p. 499
(nos. 29-35); J.G. Winter, *Life and Letters in Papyri*,
Ann Arbor, Michigan, 1933, pp. 175ff.; O. Montevecchi,
La Papirologia, Torino, 1973, p. 258 (no. 70); Hans Hauben,
'On the Melitians in P. London VI (P. Jews) 1914: The Problem
of Papas Heraiscus', *Proceedings of the XVI International
Congress of Papyrology*, Chicago, 1981, pp. 447-456; E.A. Judge,
'The Earliest Use of Monachos for "Monk" (P. Coll. Youtie 77)
and the Origins of Monasticism', *Jahrbuch für Antike und
Christentum*, 20, 1977, pp. 72-89; and E.A. Judge and S.R.
Pickering, 'Papyrus Documentation of Church and Community in
Egypt to the Mid-Fourth Century', *op. cit.*, pp. 47-71.
- 327 Judge and Pickering make a number a very helpful comments
in their, 'Papyrus Documentation of Church and Community',
op. cit., concerning the changes in social structure which
were taking place during this time (pp. 66-71). That the
soldier commanding the attackers in LP 1914 returns the next
day to offer a personal apology, is seen to 'make clear where
the social precedence now lies' (p. 71). Such an observation
also adds to the complexity of this text. Could the Meletians,
living in a suburb of Alexandria enjoy such a privileged
position while Athanasius was constantly attacking them
with the aid of the military - even with the aid of Meletian
sympathizers among the soldiers?
- 328 H.I. Bell, *Egypt from Alexander the Great to the Arab Conquest,
A Study in the Diffusion and Decay of Hellenism*, Oxford, 1948
- 329 H.I. Bell, *Cults and Creeds in Graeco-Roman Egypt*, London,
1953, p. 96
- 330 Bell, *Jews and Christians*, p. 41
- 331 cf. LP 1917, *op. cit.*, pp. 80-86

- 332 Bell, *op. cit.*, p. 69, fn. 48
- 333 *ibid.*, p. 41
- 334 A complete bibliography of H.I. Bell's published works may be consulted in *JEA* 40, 1954, pp. 3-6, with additions and corrections in *JEA* 53, 1967, pp. 139, 140.
- 335 *Apol.* 12 (Opitz, p. 97)
- 336 *Apol.* 71 (Opitz, pp. 149-151)
- 337 *Apol.* 12 (Opitz, p. 97)
- 338 *Apol.* 64 (Opitz, p. 143)
- 339 *Apol.* 37 (Opitz, p. 116, 22,23)
- 340 We may note that the supposed object of an Athanasian 'murder', Arsenius of Hypsele, was also reconciled to Athanasius and in AD 346/347 succeeded to the sole episcopate of that place according to the Nicene settlement - even though he had not been listed in the *Breviarium Melitii* (cf. *Festal Letter* for AD 347, *LNPF, op. cit.*, p. 548). This is another example of a Meletian, with strong monastic connections, who after being allied with the Eusebians, returned once again to the side of Athanasius. His case might also be considered as an example of either Athanasius' reasonable nature or his political astuteness, or both.
- 341 Bell, *Egypt*, p. 105
- 342 Bell, *Jews and Christians*, p. 53
- 343 *ibid.*, p. 61
- 344 H.I. Bell, 'The Problem of Translation', *Literature and Life, Addresses to the English Association*, London, 1948, p. 14
- 345 *A Patristic Greek Lexicon*, ed. G. Lampe, Oxford, 1961, pp. 362, 363. No cognate references are listed in *Lexicon Athanasianum*, ed. G. Müller, Berlin, 1952. Within the Athanasian corpus διαφέρω is used exclusively in the sense of 'difference' (cf. Mueller, *Lexicon Athanasianum*, col. 328)
- 346 H.I. Bell, 'The Problem of Translation', *op. cit.*, p. 25
- 347 E.A. Judge, 'The Use of Monachos', *op. cit.*, p. 84
- 348 Bell, *Jews and Christians*, pp. 63, 64

- 349 Hans Hauben in 'On the Meletians in P. London VI (P. Jews) 1914: The Problem of Papas Heraiscus', *op. cit.*, pp. 447-456, contends that Heraiscus was, in fact, the Meletian bishop of Alexandria (p. 453). This assertion is based entirely upon the information contained within LP 1914 with no other contemporary external sources cited. Although the grammatical structure of LP 1914 could lead one to such a conclusion, the lack of external confirmation seems even more important in such an evaluation. It is difficult to believe that Athanasius would fail to mention such a person in the course of his polemics and that the Meletian leader, John Archaph and Eusebius of Nicomedia would fail to include such an individual in the events surrounding Tyre. Although such an identification solves some questions such as the report of Theonas' succession by Epiphanius (*Haer.* 68, 7), it fails to adequately deal with the position of John Archaph, Achilles (*Haer.* 69, 11) and related issues. Hauben, however, may be right in identifying Heraiscus as the bishop of this particular group in LP 1914. If this is so, then Hauben is right in his suggestion that this indicates a new era in the schism in which a point of no return had been reached (p. 456). Furthermore, it is possible that this confirms the scattered nature of the schism at this point in time, as well as the independence of the various Meletian communities. That the Meletian group in LP 1914 had contact with 'mainstream' Meletians is clear from the visit of Isaac of Letopolis and the apparent mention of John Archaph in Antioch (only spoken of, however, as ἀπὸ Ἰωάννην in l. 34 of the text). We may only speculate on what sort of contact this constituted.
- 350 Bell, *op. cit.*, p. 63, fn. 7
- 351 Bell, 'Athanasius', *op. cit.*, p. 167, fn. 1
- 352 Bell, *Jews and Christians*, p. 63, fn. 42
- 353 There are also other examples of difficulties in translation and interpretation in LP 1914. For example in line 29 we read the following: 'Αθανάσιος δὲ μεγάλως ἄθυμῶ καὶ αὐτὸς παρέχει ἡμῶν κάματον διὰ τὰ γραφόμενα ... It is obvious from this portion of the text that Athanasius is 'very despondent', but it is less than clear how or why his writings are causing distress among the colleagues of Callistus. A suggestion might even be made that the distress caused is from sympathy rather than antipathy, although this would not seem to be in keeping with the remainder of the letter.
- 354 *cf.* Bell, *op. cit.*, p. 55 and Nordberg, *op. cit.*, pp. 18, 19, for very different impressions of Athanasius' position after his enthronement.
- 355 Bell, *loc. cit.*

- 356 We know, for example, that Isaac of Letopolis was prominent in the actions against Athanasius which took place in Tyre, for later Ischyra places some of the blame for his false accusations on his influence (*Apol.* 64; Opitz, p. 143, ll. 18-20). Sozomen recounts that Isaac was one of those who also accused Athanasius of violent conduct (*HE* 2, 25). Later he was one of the signatories at the Oriental Council of Sardica (Hilary of Poitiers, IV, 77). John Archaph was exiled following the synod of Tyre (Sozomen *HE* 2, 31) but we may assume that he remained active in the strongholds of Eusebian power, one of which was Antioch.
- 357 Bell, *op. cit.*, pp. 56, 57
- 358 *cf.* Bell, 'Athanasius', *op. cit.*, p. 160; *HTR* 42, 1949, p. 53
- 359 Bell, *Jews and Christians*, pp. 115-120. Bell's enthusiasm for the identification of LP 1929 as an authentic letter of Athanasius, may be appreciated from the following: 'The most we can say is that there is at least a reasonable probability that we have in the present document a specimen of the hand of the great champion of orthodoxy, and the mere possibility gives to our letter an interest which, in its sadly mutilated state, it would not otherwise possess.' (p. 118). In his article one year later, 'Athanasius', *op. cit.*, Bell states that, 'several considerations suggest that this (letter) may be (from) St. Athanasius himself' (p. 171).
- 360 *Cambridge Ancient History* (ed. S.A. Cook, F.E. Adcock, and M.P. Charlesworth), Cambridge, 1954 (second edition), I, p. 655
- 361 *Hist. Arian.* 33 (Opitz, p. 201, l. 15ff.)
- 362 *ibid.* (Opitz, p. 201, ll. 20-23)
- 363 *Apol.* 2 (Opitz, p. 88, ll. 16, 17)
- 364 *Hist. Arian.* 67 (Opitz, p. 219, l. 39 - p. 220, l. 1)
- 365 *Hist. Arian.* 33 (Opitz, p. 201, ll. 15-19)
- 366 Bell, *Jews and Christians*, p. 57; *cf.* Barnard, 'Some Notes', *op. cit.*, p. 402
- 367 We may also note that the Alexandrine synod of AD 338 was very specific in stating that, οὐ πρεσβύτερος, οὐ δικάκωνος ἀνηρέθη παρὰ Ἀθανασίου · οὐ φόρον, οὐκ ἐξοριστίαν ἔδρασεν ὁ ἄνθρωπος, *Apol.* 5 (Opitz, p. 91, ll. 8, 9).

- 368 *cf. Festal Letter X, LNPF Series II, Vol. IV, pp. 527-532, the Oxford translation revised by Payne-Smith, cf. note 267 above.*
- 369 *Festal Letter 10, 4-5 (LNPF, op. cit., p. 529)*
- 370 *ibid.*
- 371 H.-J. Vogt, 'Parties in the History of the Church' (trans. by F. McDonagh), *Concilium 1973-1979, Pt. I*, p. 49
- 372 The critical text of *Oration 21* is contained in Justin Mossay, *Grégoire de Nazianze, Discours 20-23 (SC 270)*, Paris, 1980, pp. 110-193. Mossay has also provided an introduction to the text, *op. cit.*, pp. 86-109. The Benedictine edition of the text may be found in *PG 35*, cols. 1081-1128.
- 373 *Oration 21*, section 1; Mossay, *op. cit.*, p. 111, ll. 1-2
- 374 The exact date of *Oration 21* is uncertain. Mossay considers it to have been composed in Constantinople, in 379, 380 or 381 for the feast of Athanasius of Alexandria (Mossay, *op. cit.*, p.103). As it seems to have been delivered in Constantinople on 17 January or 2 May (*cf. Mossay, pp. 99-102*), it would appear that AD 380 is a preferable date owing to the later arrival of Gregory in Constantinople in AD 379. There is, however, the possibility that the oration was delivered after Gregory's installation in the Church of the Apostles, and that, therefore, the address was not delivered until AD 381 (*cf. Mossay, pp. 102, 103 ; Rosemary Reuther, Gregory of Nazianzus. Rhetor and Philosopher. Oxford, 1969, pp. 43-46; and Kopecek, A History of Neo-Arianism, II, p. 510ff.*).
- 375 Young, *Nicaea to Chalcedon*, p. 67
- 376 Rusch, 'A la recherche de l'Athanase historique', *Politique et Théologie*, p. 176
- 377 *cf.*, Mossay, *op. cit.*, pp. 95-99
- 378 Mossay, *op. cit.*, p. 128, section 10, ll. 6, 7
- 379 Reuther, *op. cit.*, p. 77
- 380 *ibid.*, pp. 77, 78
- 381 Rusch, *op. cit.*, p. 176
- 382 Young, *loc. cit.*

- 383 Mossay, *op. cit.*, pp. 92-95. The Trinitarian concerns in the orations is also considered by E.P. Meijering, 'The Doctrine of the Will and of the Trinity in the Orations of Gregory of Nazianzus', *NedThT* 27 (1973), pp. 224-234.
- 384 Mossay, *op. cit.*, p. 95
- 385 Mossay, *op. cit.*, p. 186, ll. 35, 36
- 386 Reuther, *op. cit.*, p. 111
- 387 *ibid.*; Reuther also notes that, 'In the two orations on Cyprian and on Athanasius, both being models of powerful churchmen in times of upheaval, Gregory follows the *topoi* of the encomium somewhat more closely' than in his other orations on particular persons (*op. cit.*, pp. 109, 110).
- 388 *ibid.*, p. 111
- 389 A useful compression of the events taking place during this period in Constantinople is provided by Kopecek who relates, '...the arrival of Theodosius in Constantinople in late November A.D. 380 and his subsequent support of the Nicene position. Already in February of the same year Theodosius had heralded his Nicene commitment in his famous edict *Cunctos populos*: the theological positions of Damasus of Rome and Peter of Alexandria were set up as the touchstones of imperially-approved "Catholic" Christianity. Then, soon after he entered Constantinople in triumph the emperor summoned Demophilus, the official bishop of the capital. Theodosius gave the prelate a choice: assent to the Nicene Creed or surrender the city's churches. The bishop chose the latter and began to celebrate the Eucharist outside the city's walls. With Demophilus out of the way, Theodosius gave episcopal control of the capital's churches to the Neo-Nicene Gregory of Nazianzus. On January 10, A.D. 381 the emperor issued a law which widened his attack on Arianism and his support of Nicaea to include the entire eastern empire.' (Kopecek, *op. cit.*, II, p. 510)

Although we cannot be certain as to Gregory's intentions, it would certainly seem reasonable to see a reflection of the the events in Constantinople AD 379 - AD 380 in the particular themes which Gregory chose to emphasize in *Oration 21*.

- 390 Reuther, *op. cit.*, p. 19, fn.4; Although Reuther states that 'Gregory speaks of Athanasius with great affection' (*ibid.*), possibly as a result of meeting him in AD 350, Charles G. Browne and James E. Swallow wrote that *Oration 21* 'lacks... the charm of personal affection and intimate acquaintance with the inner life which is characteristic of the orations concerned with his own relatives and friends' (*LNPF*, Series II, Vol. 7, p. 269).

- ³⁹¹ *Oration 21*, section 14; Mossay, *op. cit.*, p. 138, ll. 5-7
- ³⁹² *ibid.*, section 15; Mossay, *op. cit.*, p. 140, section 15, ll. 7-9
- ³⁹³ Young, *op. cit.*, p. 67
- ³⁹⁴ Rusch, *op. cit.*, pp. 161-177; There are other issues which arise in this decade concerning Athanasius' character. The vast majority of these accusations, however, are brought forward at Tyre in AD 335. Certain of these charges have already been discussed in the first section of the present work. Other accusations will be considered in the second section within the discussion on the Synod of Tyre.
- ³⁹⁵ Young, *op. cit.*, p. 68; Rusch, *op. cit.*, pp. 176, 177
- ³⁹⁶ *vide supra* fn. 54 for others who have taken a moderate position concerning the character of Athanasius while accepting many of the accusations made against him.
- ³⁹⁷ *cf.* Sozomen, *HE*, II, 17 (J. Bidez, *SC* 306, Paris, 1983, p. 296); Socrates, *HE*, I, 23 (PG 67, 139, C9-141); and Philostorgius, *HE*, II, 11 (J. Bidez, *Philostorgius Kirchengeschichte* [revised edition] *GSC*, pp. 22-23).
- ³⁹⁸ Philostorgius, *HE*, II, 11 (Bidez, *loc. cit.*)
- ³⁹⁹ Rusch, *op. cit.*, p. 162
- ⁴⁰⁰ *ibid.*, p. 177
- ⁴⁰¹ H.I. Bell, *Jews and Christians in Egypt*, pp. 53-71 (esp. LP 1914, ll. 8, 9; 29-47)
- ⁴⁰² Bell, *op. cit.*, pp. 54-57
- ⁴⁰³ LP 1914, ll. 5-15; E.A. Judge comments concerning the location of this 'monastic community' that, it 'also makes one wonder what kind of 'solitaries' they were - certainly not ones in full retreat from society' (E.A. Judge, 'The Earliest Use of Monachos', *op. cit.*, p. 84).
- ⁴⁰⁴ Bell, *op. cit.*, p. 53
- ⁴⁰⁵ It may be noted here that in addition to the accusation concerning the murder of Arsenius, Athanasius was also charged with the arrest and imprisonment of a number of Meletian church dignitaries, including Ischyrras, Callinicus (bishop of Pelusium),

and others who were not named (Sozomen, *HE*, II, 25, 3ff. [Bidez, *SC* 306, pp. 301ff]; cf. Schwartz, *GS*, 3, pp. 248ff.). Although the charges are similar to the actions described in LP 1914 ll. 41-47, the names given are different and no further information is provided to connect this incident and the accusations at Tyre, if, indeed, there is any connection to be made.

406 An example of this may be seen in K. Holl, *Gesammelte Aufsätze* 2 (1928), p. 286, in which it is claimed that Bell did 'not recognize the reference to Tyre' in LP 1914 ll. 31, which would secure the dating of the papyrus. Although the papyrus contains a break followed by $\text{U}\rho\psi$, it is impossible, either from the papyrus itself or the context, to insist upon this reading to the exclusion of others. Holl, however, was convinced by Bell's circumstantial evidence for the dating of the letter and carried this assumption in his examination of LP 1914. In Bell's writings, however, this author has yet to find his acknowledgement of Holl's reading. Holl's reading has, however, been taken up by T.D. Barnes who provides a colourful, if not wholly factual, rendering of the events described in LP 1914 (T.D. Barnes, *Constantine and Eusebius*, pp. 235, 336; 387 fns. 100, 101).

407 Rusch, *op. cit.*, p. 176

408 Ruetter, *op. cit.*, pp. 77, 78; Mossay, *op. cit.*, pp. 95-99

409 *vide supra*, fn. 389

410 T.D. Barnes states that, 'In Alexandria itself, [Athanasius] maintained the popular support which he enjoyed from the outset and buttressed his position by organizing an ecclesiastical mafia'. Furthermore, Barnes comments that Athanasius was 'like a modern gangster' and that, 'he evoked widespread mistrust, proclaimed total innocence - and usually succeeded in evading conviction on specific charges' (Barnes, *op. cit.*, p. 230). In using such terms as 'mafia' and 'gangster', Barnes is, of course, intimating that much of what Athanasius did was in secret and was protected by an extended organization which the modern scholar is, for the most part, unable to penetrate. Such an argument, however, is one that is based upon silence and surmise rather than documentary evidence. Moreover, the reasoning in such an approach must of necessity be circular, i.e. there is little documentation because of the secret method of operation, therefore, we must assume a secret method of operation because there is little documentation. Such a contention, however, does not take into account much of the documentation which we do possess and tends to read such documents within a set pattern of bias. Barnes argument, if understood correctly by this author, appears to take on these characteristics.

⁴¹¹ cf. Colm Luibheid, *The Council of Nicaea*, Galway, 1982, pp. 136-143; J.N.D. Kelly, *Early Christian Creeds*, third edition, London, 1972, pp. 254-262; and Leo Davis, *The First Seven Ecumenical Councils (325-787). Their History and Theology*. Wilmington, Delaware, 1987, p. 90

⁴¹² *vide supra*, fn. 405

SECTION II
ATHANASIUS AND THE SYNOD OF TYRE

SECTION II

ATHANASIUS AND THE SYNOD OF TYRE

1. THE BACKGROUND OF THE SYNOD OF TYRE

By the time of his third exile, AD 356 - AD 362, Athanasius had formulated a particular view concerning the authority, structure, and validity of ecclesiastical synods. His views were largely based upon his own experience of condemnation and vindication by a variety of synods in the thirty years which separated his third exile from the decrees of the Council of Nicaea in AD 325. The questions of context and character which have been examined in the first section of this present study, especially in regard to those events which surrounded the Synod of Tyre in AD 335, were an ever-present source of concern for the bishop of Alexandria. The sentence of banishment imposed by Constantine following the Synod of Tyre provided Athanasius' enemies with an opportunity for continual attacks throughout this period of time and, as has been noted above, gave rise to lingering doubts concerning the character and motivation of the bishop of Alexandria. It is, then, to the Synod of Tyre that we must give our full attention in any attempt to understand Athanasius' early episcopal career and the manner in which this synod affected his later actions and writings.

Frances Young states that Athanasius' 'deposition at Tyre was based, not on doctrinal considerations, but upon his

misconduct in Egypt'.¹ There can be little doubt, however, that the series of events which reached their peak at Tyre began with Athanasius' refusal to re-admit either Arius or the Meletians to the communion of the Church of Alexandria in accordance with the command of Constantine.²

Following the return of Eusebius, Bishop of Nicomedia, to his see, a campaign had been set into motion which had as its primary objective the readmission of Arius to the Church in Alexandria along with a secondary demand for a greater Meletian presence and role in the affairs of the Egyptian Church. Rowan Williams appears to be correct in tracing the genesis of this movement to the Bithynian synod of late AD 328 which met under the chairmanship of Eusebius and issued a 'renewed appeal to Alexandria for Arius' restoration' (as well as for the settling of the Meletian schism by their reception).³ In spite of the fact that the request had been given approval and sanction by the emperor, it was refused outright by Athanasius.⁴ Although ultimately threatened with deposition and exile by the emperor, Athanasius remained intransigent.⁵ In reply to the imperial demands, the bishop of Alexandria 'wrote and sought to convince the emperor, that an anti-Christian heresy had no fellowship with the Church Catholic'.⁶ This sentiment is echoed in Athanasius' Festal Letter for Easter AD 330 in which he states that, 'there is no communion at all between the words of the saints and the fanciful thoughts of human invention'.⁷

1.1 Athanasius at Psamathia, AD 331/332

The Arian-Meletian alliance appears to have been arranged by Eusebius of Nicomedia during the period which immediately followed the Synod of Bithynia, that is, ca. AD 329 - AD 331.⁸ According to Athanasius, Eusebius persuaded the Meletians 'to produce some pretext, such as they had done against Peter, Achilles and Alexander, in order [that they might] invent and spread reports against us as well'.⁹ Epiphanius places the beginning of the alliance in a slightly different context by indicating that when a delegation of Meletian bishops arrived at court to present a petition to the emperor which requested protection for their churches from repeated catholic intrusions, the emperor's attendants refused to grant them access to Constantine. Remaining in the region of Constantinople and Nicomedia, they turned to Eusebius of Nicomedia for assistance in bringing their case before the emperor. Eusebius granted their request, but only with the condition that they would accept Arius into fellowship.¹⁰

Once again, however, Epiphanius appears muddled in regard to dating and context, indicating that this interview took place while Alexander was still alive, that is, before the spring of AD 328. Timothy Barnes has indicated that such a scenario is impossible, for 'even Athanasius concedes that the Meletians caused no trouble in the winter of 327/8, and Constantine left Nicomedia in the spring of 328, not returning for fully two years'.¹¹ By connecting the presentation of charges to Constantine through the 'good offices' of Eusebius of Nicomedia, however, Epiphanius may be relating from Meletian sources the substance of an account of the beginning of the Arian-Meletian

alliance which should, in reality, be set in the summer of AD 330, following Constantine's return to the East and the dedication of Constantinople.¹² As Eusebius had failed to enjoin enforcement of Constantine's earlier letter to Athanasius, the Meletians would have presented a new opportunity for attacking the bishop of Alexandria. It is possible, therefore, that the account of Epiphanius and the first set of accusations made against Athanasius before the emperor in Nicomedia are related and may signal the beginning of their common cause alliance against the bishop of Alexandria.

In Athanasius' own account of the beginning of the alliance written almost thirty years after the events in question, he relates that three Meletian clergy, Ision of Athribis, Eudaemon of Tanis, and Callinicus of Pelusium, with the advice of Eusebius, put forward the initial accusation that as bishop he had imposed an unlawful tax in kind upon the Egyptians, possibly taking over the prerogative which by civil decree and custom had formerly belonged to the hierarchy of the pagan temples and, therefore, violating the rights of the local Roman administration.¹³ The exact nature of the tax is uncertain, apart from it being related to a local levy on linen tunics which, so the delegation claimed, had been first imposed upon the Meletians themselves.¹⁴ The location of this first accusation was most probably Constantinople where Constantine was in residence from 16 July AD 330 - 30 June AD 331.¹⁵ It is possible, however, that Constantine visited Nicomedia during this period as well, although Epiphanius' account of the matter is unclear.¹⁶

The exact location of Athanasius at this time also remains uncertain. The Index to the Festal Letters indicates that he

visited the Thebaid during the winter of AD 330/331 and from that location issued his Easter letter of AD 331.¹⁷ E. Schwartz, however, argued that this letter, traditionally ascribed to AD 331, should, in fact, be redated in favour of AD 342.¹⁸ In reply, L.T. Lefort constructed a convincing argument for maintaining the traditional dating of the letter, which would, therefore, place Athanasius in the Thebaid during the time period in question and at a good distance from Alexandria and more direct communication with either Constantinople or Nicomedia.¹⁹

This first accusation concerning illegal taxation, therefore, was not answered directly by Athanasius, but rather by two Alexandrine presbyters, Apis and Macarius, who were at court.²⁰ Henric Nordberg comments that,²¹

This detail alone is interesting as it reveals how Athanasius kept up a continuous contact with Constantine. Already during Alexander's time the presbyter, Apis, was his envoy to Constantine, which proves that the Archbishop had an established embassy or in any case a stationary envoy at the court.

According to Athanasius, the result of their advocacy on his behalf was the condemnation of the Meletian envoys, in particular Ision, and his own acquittal on the charge.²² This was very possibly owing to the presence of Macarius who appears to be identical with the presbyter of the same name listed in the Breviarium Melitii from the village of Parembole on the Mareotic lake.²³ The combination of the ex-Meletian, Macarius, and the presbyter, Apis, who had been an envoy at Constantine's court since the time of Alexander, would have been especially effective in confronting and turning aside the accusation of the Meletian delegation.²⁴ Notwithstanding his condemnation of the Meletians, however, Constantine ordered Athanasius to appear

before him.²⁵ The reason for the summons is not given by Athanasius and the letters of Constantine which he quotes are no longer extant within the text of Apologia contra Arianos.

Athanasius, according to custom, would have returned to Alexandria from the Thebaid, to be present for the Easter celebrations which took place during the second week of April, AD 331. The Festal Letter Index III, appears to be misplaced in the chronological sequence as its description of events obviously belongs to Festal Letter IV.²⁶ The summons from Constantine does not seem to have been urgent, if one judges from Athanasius' lack of timely compliance with the emperor's request. He finally arrived at the imperial residence of Psamathia, on the outskirts of Nicomedia, to appear before Constantine in the late autumn of AD 331 and remained there through the greater portion of the winter (ca. November, AD 331 - January, AD 332).²⁷ He was still at court when he sent his Easter letter to the Church of Alexandria for AD 332 during the early portion of that same year.²⁸

It appears that when Eusebius learned that Athanasius had been summoned to appear before the emperor, he convinced the Meletian delegation to remain in the area of Nicomedia with the intent of presenting the emperor with a series of accusations against Athanasius. The three members of the Meletian delegation, Ision, Eudaemon, and Callinicus, were joined by a fourth person whom Athanasius describes as 'the ridiculous Hiercammon, who being ashamed of his name, calls himself Eulogius'.²⁹ Of the four, Hiercammon is the only member of the delegation who is not listed in the schedule of Meletian clergy which had been presented to Alexander approximately four or five years earlier.

The initial 'civil' charge of illegal taxation which had originally been brought forward by the Meletians would be joined to three further accusations - two of an ecclesiastical nature and an additional civil indictment. When Athanasius appeared before Constantine at Psamathia the four charges he had to answer were as follows:

1. The original accusation of illegal taxation of the Egyptian populace, and the Meletians in particular, in regard to the linen tunics mentioned above, was reiterated. Such a method of taxation in kind would not have been unusual in Egypt during the Roman period, but, as has been indicated above, would have usurped the authority of the Egyptian civil administration unless it had been confined to the Church as a form of voluntary offerings.³⁰

2. The second accusation, not mentioned by Athanasius but indicated in the Festal Letter Index, was that he had been 'appointed [as bishop] while too young'.³¹ Although this brief reference to Athanasius' age at the time of his election appears to refer directly to Canon 11 of the ante-Nicene Synod of Neocaesarea, it may be reflective of a more general consecration controversy which surrounded his elevation to the throne of St. Mark in AD 328.³²

3. The third accusation was that Macarius, the ex-Meletian priest who had defended Athanasius when the Meletian delegation had first arrived, acting upon the instructions of Athanasius and under his responsibility, had earlier been sent to the region of Mareotis to summon Ischyras, a schismatic priest, to Alexandria. In the course of this 'pastoral visitation' Macarius is said to have been involved in an altercation

during which he broke a chalice belonging to the church of Ischyras.³³

4. The fourth, and most serious accusation, appears to have been put forward by what Socrates refers to as 'the Eusebian party', that is, Eusebius of Nicomedia, Theognis of Nicaea, Maris of Chalcedon, Ursacius of Singidnum in Upper Moesia, and Valens of Mursa in Upper Pannonia.³⁴ Athanasius was charged with treasonable conspiracy in that he was alleged to have provided Philumenus, a former Master of the Offices accused of having plotted to assassinate Constantine, with a casket of gold.³⁵ Although Hans Lietzmann, among others, suggests that this was only a question of 'the bribery of a king's messenger', it is clear from Athanasius' own account that the charge was treason, that is, being the 'enemy of the emperor'.³⁶

Clearly, the intent of the Meletians and Eusebians in presenting these charges against Athanasius before Constantine was to secure his deposition from the see of Alexandria. The odd catalogue of civil and ecclesiastical misdeeds which are set out above appear to have no common link apart from this desired end. It is probable that the Eusebians had already learned that such a mixture of innuendo, scandal, and theological or canonical improprieties could be an effective method in their campaign to remove the more vocal proponents of the Nicene definition. That Athanasius had become the primary object of this campaign was most likely owing to his rejection of Arius and his relative lack of support at this time among the eastern bishops.

An earlier target of such a campaign had been Eustathius of Antioch. Although R.P.C. Hanson has put forward the case that Eustathius was deposed, in AD 328 or 329, primarily for

Sabellianist views at the instigation of the Eusebians (in this case, however, Eusebius of Caesarea), there were certainly other charges which were brought against him.³⁷ Furthermore, although Eusebius of Caesarea may have taken the lead in the proceedings, it is difficult not to place Eusebius of Nicomedia and Theognis of Nicaea as co-conspirators in the actions taken against Eustathius. The accusations made against the bishop of Antioch were similar, in character and number, to those which were leveled against Athanasius (cited above) only a few years later.

The Eastern bishops at Sardica hint that the bishop of Antioch was deposed not for doctrinal reasons, but because of his evil manner of life.³⁸ Athanasius, writing thirty years after the event, states that Eustathius, 'a confessor and a man of sound faith', was deposed owing to 'invented accusations' against him, including the charge that he had 'insulted' Constantine's mother.³⁹ Had Eustathius been deposed on a charge of Sabellianism alone, one would not expect such a characterization by Athanasius given the theological climate in which he was writing. Barnes summarizes the case made against Eustathius as follows:⁴⁰

His opponents believed him guilty of Sabellianism and included this among the counts against him. Yet that was not the main charge. Eustathius was deposed for moral delinquencies; he dishonored the priesthood, he lived in a disorderly fashion, he kept a mistress, and he had spoken disrespectfully of the emperor's mother while she was in the East. The charges may have been exaggerated or partly invented. But the council [of Antioch, ca. AD 328] sustained them, and Constantine, who reviewed the case and examined Eustathius in person, raised no objection to the verdict of the council.

There can be little doubt that the Eusebians, with the help and assistance of the Meletian delegation, believed that such a strategy would also be effective in removing Athanasius from

Alexandria. The absence of a theological issue in the case of Athanasius is of little surprise. The primary Eusebian objective in removing Athanasius from Alexandria remained the reinstatement of Arius. The raising of a theological point in regard to Athanasius over against Arius would only have provided the bishop of Alexandria with an opportunity to resort to the Nicene definition and anathemas to which Constantine had already given his assent. Alexandria's unique position as the focus and starting-point of the Arian controversy would have added to the danger of such a course of action. In contrast, the removal of Athanasius on civil, or more precisely, canonical grounds would accomplish the same purpose without an immediate reexamination of the Nicene formulations.

It is important to note, therefore, that although certain of the charges against Athanasius were of a civil nature, the desired end remained his canonical deposition from Alexandria. This could be accomplished only by the decision of a synodal assembly and the assent of the emperor, unless, of course, Athanasius was found to be guilty of a treasonable act of a purely political or civil nature. In such circumstances the Eusebians might be assured of a summary judgement on the part of Constantine, such as a sentence of exile, or the immediate calling of a synodal assembly which could pass a sentence of deposition. If, however, other, less dramatic, civil charges could be proven, such as the tax relating to linen tunics, canonical deposition remained possible. The second canon of Nicaea stated that clergy who, upon the proof of two or three witness, were found guilty of a 'grave' or 'capital offense' would be subject to immediate deposition.⁴¹ Hefele's paraphrase of this section

of the canon that, 'the rule is that they shall be deposed if they commit a serious offence', contains the meaning and intent of this particular canonical prescription of the council.⁴² The civil charges of illegal taxation and treasonable conspiracy would both fall under the jurisdiction of this canon, as would the ecclesiastical accusation concerning Macarius' breaking of the chalice.

The numerous accusations concerning irregularities in regard to Athanasius' election and consecration as bishop of Alexandria have been considered in greater detail in the first section of the present work and require little further comment. It is important to note, however, that, without exception, all of the charges surrounding Athanasius' elevation to the throne of St. Mark are connected to canonical prescriptions, whether of age, the number of consecrating bishops, or the exclusion of Meletian involvement in the election itself.⁴³ Yet, as has been pointed out by A.H.M. Jones in numerous examples, there remained a lack of consistency during this period concerning the manner in which bishops were elected and the age which was required for consecration.⁴⁴ It is, therefore, unlikely that Constantine would have considered this charge to have been substantial, and, as will be seen, his response to this accusation was derisory. In any case, as has been noted, Constantine had given his approval to the election and consecration of Athanasius almost immediately after the actual event and would have been loathe to rescind such a decision given the present circumstances.

Some have attempted to interpret the charges which were placed against Athanasius as being primarily of a civil nature, with only the accusation concerning the breaking of the chalice

being of an ecclesiastical nature.⁴⁵ Such a view, however, appears to ignore the motivation which stood behind the charges on the part of the Meletians and the Eusebians, namely, the reinstatement of Arius. Owing to Athanasius' intransigence concerning Arius' return to Alexandria, the only possibility which remained appeared to be the deposition of the bishop of Alexandria by any means possible. In the case of Eustathius, little attention was given to whether the charges were civil or ecclesiastical by the Synod of Antioch or, apparently, by Constantine who reviewed the case afterwards. Clearly, the only point at issue for the Eusebians was the removal of Eustathius by any means possible. Under the second canon of Nicaea, all that was necessary for a bishop's deposition was his conviction of an offence of a suitably serious nature - whether civil or ecclesiastical. The multiplicity of charges made against both Eustathius and Athanasius, civil and ecclesiastical, were merely meant to provide sufficient cause for such a deposition or, at the least, to provide for an embarrassing judicial inquiry by a synodal assembly. During the course of such an inquiry, further allegations might be raised and, hopefully, in a carefully selected assembly, the final verdict would be a foregone conclusion.

When Athanasius arrived at Psamathia in November of AD 332, he appears to have been unaware of the forces which were arrayed against him. Throughout the interview with Constantine concerning the charges which had been raised, Athanasius seems to have been under the impression that the Meletians were the primary source of the accusations. Even the charge concerning the gold sent to Philumenus appears to have been brought to Constantine's

attention through the representations of the Meletian delegation.⁴⁶ Although Athanasius would later indicate that Eusebius of Nicomedia was the 'secret friend' of the Meletians, his awareness of this fact at the time was limited.⁴⁷ The process of the interviews with Constantine and the investigation into the various charges took place over a period of approximately four months, from ca. November, AD 331 - ca. February, AD 332. During these months which constituted an inclement winter, Athanasius was afflicted with a severe illness, possibly as a result of the 'lengthy journey' he had undertaken from Alexandria to Nicomedia.⁴⁸

As a result of Constantine's investigation and his interviews with Athanasius during these months, the bishop of Alexandria was apparently acquitted in regard to all of the charges which had been brought against him. Unfortunately, no record remains as to the exact disposition of the various accusations, although Athanasius indicates that the emperor rejected the charge concerning Ischyras as a part of the 'falsehood' of the Meletians.⁴⁹ Concerning the remainder of the charges, Athanasius was apparently able to convince the emperor of his complete innocence.

Athanasius celebrated his triumph, writing in his Easter letter for AD 332, that,⁵⁰

...I am at the Court, having been summoned by the emperor Constantine to see him. But the Meletians, who were present there, being envious, sought our ruin before the emperor. But they were put to shame and driven away as slanderers, being confuted by many things.

Athanasius had apologized earlier in the letter for being late in writing and, therefore, unable to give proper notice of the beginning of the Lenten fast.⁵¹ This may indicate that the

entire case was not decided until late January, or early February, AD 332. As it was, the Easter letter had to be sent by a special messenger under the command of one of Athanasius' friends at Court, Flavius Ablavius, who served as a praetorian prefect under Constantine.⁵² Although the letter was sent later than usual, Athanasius considers it to be,⁵³

...well timed, since our enemies having been put to shame and reproved by the Church, because they persecuted us without a cause, we may now sing a festal song of praise, uttering the triumphant hymn against Pharaoh; 'We will sing unto the Lord, for he is to be gloriously praised; the horse and his rider he has cast into the sea'.

In the references cited above, Athanasius writes of his enemies being 'put to shame' before Constantine and 'reproved by the Church'. It is possible that Athanasius writes of 'reproof by the Church' in only general terms and for an intended effect upon the Alexandrine and Egyptian faithful. It is also possible, however, that Athanasius, and perhaps others, viewed the investigation which had taken place under Constantine's oversight as a joint civil/ecclesiastical inquiry. It is not unlikely that the Meletian delegation which had first appeared before Constantine were in violation of the eleventh canon of the Synod of Antioch, held very shortly before, which forbade bishops or priests to go to court without the prior consent of their metropolitan and the approval of their provincial synod.⁵⁴

Although it is doubtful that Athanasius would have upheld the authority of the synod which had deposed Eustathius, and perhaps many others, this may, in fact, have been the reason why Constantine did not meet with the Meletian delegation after their first arrival at court and his subsequent recourse to the Alexandrine presbyters, Macarius and Apis. Such a scenario may

also explain Athanasius' summons to court and the merely peripheral actions of Eusebius of Nicomedia at this stage of the controversy in regard to the bishop of Alexandria. It is, therefore, possible that Constantine called for Athanasius not only to question him concerning the accusations which had been made against him, but to inquire more fully into the actions of the Meletian delegation who were then 'put to shame and driven away as slanderers'. If the crux of the issue was the resolution of the Meletian issue, rather than the catalogue of accusations which had been presented, Athanasius would have been correct in viewing the proceedings as essentially ecclesiastical in nature. Admittedly, such involvement in canonical concerns would not, of course, have been unusual for Constantine. As A.H.M. Jones has commented, 'Constantine's conviction that he was God's servant impelled him to intervene in ecclesiastical disputes with conviction and energy'.⁵⁵ Furthermore, Constantine held to the general principle 'that it was the right and duty of the imperial government to suppress heresy and schism'.⁵⁶

That Athanasius did not whole-heartedly share this conviction is evident from his earlier refusal to obey Constantine in regard to both Arius and the Meletians. That he did allow for the authority of the emperor in select issues touching ecclesiastical matters throughout his career is also clear, although, after the death of Constantine in AD 337 Athanasius is also willing to denounce those decisions made by emperors which were at variance with his own position.⁵⁷ At this stage in his relationship with Constantine, however, the following statement of L.W. Barnard is an apt summary of Athanasius' attitude:⁵⁸

Athanasius accepted imperial jurisdiction in civil matters and did not even contradict the power of the Emperor to repudiate and banish bishops if the civil power acted according to canonical principles. The case was however very different in matters which touched the essence of the Christian faith. Here Athanasius was uncompromising. He held that the Church was a sacramental body with a mystical character with which the Emperor could have nothing to do... .. His ideal was probably cooperation between the Church and State with the bishops having the freedom to decide Church matters in their own gatherings and the Emperor having the right to maintain the peace of the Church and to defend its faith.

During the years which immediately followed the Council of Nicaea, through to the aftermath of the Synod of Tyre in AD 335, Athanasius very likely held to a view of imperial authority that was not substantially different from Eusebius of Caesarea, although Athanasius never attempted to formulate a theology of the emperor.⁵⁹ Nevertheless, he appears to have willingly accepted the post-Nicene action of Constantine toward the Egyptians when he 'confirmed and sanctioned the decrees of the council'.⁶⁰ Given this background, and considering that no doctrinal issues appear to have been brought forward at this time, one can easily accede to the possibility that Athanasius viewed the whole affair at Psamathia as a quasi-ecclesiastical event and attempted to present it as such to the Egyptian Church. In any case, given the content of the Easter letter of AD 332, it is difficult to imagine that Athanasius regarded what had taken place as merely being a successful civil judicial hearing.

Athanasius was dismissed in peace from the emperor's presence and returned in triumph to Alexandria, arriving in late March of AD 332.⁶¹ Constantine appears to have departed from Psamathia during the late winter to take command of the last stages of the campaign against the Goths. By 12 April, AD 332 he was resident in Marcianopolis, later to be the headquarters

of Valens in the Gothic war of AD 367, and of Lupicinus in AD 376.⁶² On 20 April, AD 332, the Goths surrendered to Constantine, having been decimated by cold and starvation.⁶³ Before taking leave for his campaign, however, Constantine had dispatched a letter 'to the people of the catholic church at Alexandria' in which he castigated those who had brought the charges against their bishop and praised Athanasius.⁶⁴

Certain aspects of this letter from Constantine to the catholic Christians of Alexandria merit special attention. In his address, Constantine makes no mention of the accusations concerning the tax on the linen tunics, Philumenus, or the case of Ischyras. He does, however, intimate that the root cause of the present problems have to do with the envy of Athanasius' enemies concerning his election as bishop of Alexandria. Although they are not mentioned by name, the enemies which Constantine appears to have in mind are the Meletians. In the letter they are described 'quarrelsome men' who have left the 'haven of brotherly love'.⁶⁵ Moreover, the emperor states that the confusion and trouble which has been stirred up in Alexandria is owing to the 'envy' and the 'defects of ungrateful men'.⁶⁶ In reference to the multitude of accusations which were placed before him by the Meletians, Constantine writes that these 'foolish men carry their maliciousness at the tips of their tongues'.⁶⁷ The primary motivation for the wide variety of charges which have been brought against Athanasius is described by Constantine as follows:⁶⁸

... their very turning aside makes them disgruntled, while they unwisely put forward themselves to places of preeminence, although they are unworthy.⁶⁹ What wickedness this is! They say, 'this one is old and

this one is young;⁷⁰ the honour⁷¹ belongs to me, it is owed to me; this must be taken away from him, I will win over others to my side, and by my power I will seek to put him to the test.'⁷²

Constantine describes the manner in which Athanasius was to be put to the test as having arisen out of 'their outrageous gatherings and assemblies of election'.⁷³ The emperor assures the Alexandrines, however, that 'those wicked persons'⁷⁴ have no power against their bishop, Athanasius, whom Constantine is convinced is a 'man of God'.⁷⁵

From this letter, certain conclusions may be made. Firstly, although they were assisted by Eusebius of Nicomedia, the Meletians were the primary accusers of Athanasius at Psamathia.⁷⁶ Secondly, their central concern appears to have been to discredit the election of Athanasius either on the basis of his age, an irregularity in the election itself, or some unknown prior understanding that they would have certain rights in the election of the successor of Alexander, although, as has already been stated, this seems unlikely.⁷⁷ Thirdly, it would appear that Constantine did not regard the other charges which were brought against Athanasius to have any substance or merit and seems to have set them aside without any further consideration. It may be noted that the accusation concerning the illegal taxation of the linen tunics is never repeated in subsequent actions against Athanasius. The same is also true of the more serious charge of treasonable conspiracy in regard to the case of Philumenus. Such silence in regard to the latter, must once and for all set aside the suggestion that Athanasius supported a rebellion in Alexandria as a protest against Constantine's

choice of Byzantium as the site of the new capital of the empire.⁷⁸ Finally, the altercation which involved Macarius and Ischyrras is not mentioned specifically, although the charge would be expanded and would reappear in the near future. It may be assumed, however, that with the presence of Macarius at court to defend himself and give personal testimony concerning the matter, Constantine was satisfied as to his innocence and gave no further attention to the matter.

For Constantine, the central issue at hand appears to have been the validity of Athanasius' election which was being contested owing to the envy of the Meletians. It is almost certain, as has been stated above, that Athanasius was not yet thirty years of age when elected as bishop of Alexandria, although the shortfall is more likely to be measured in months, rather than years.⁷⁹ That this issue in itself would raise no real impediment to his election and consecration is clear from the widespread disregard of the eleventh canon of Neocaesarea within the Church throughout the fourth to sixth centuries.⁸⁰ It must also be allowed that the language of Constantine's letter suggests that youth may not have been the central issue, but simply the passing of the office from the elder Alexander to the younger Athanasius as a matter of course and in spite of Meletian protests at the time.⁸¹ Constantine, however, considered the Meletians to be 'ungrateful'; for having received generous treatment as a result of the provisions agreed upon at Nicaea, they continued to put themselves forward for positions of honour and were filled with envy and malice when they were passed over.⁸² With all of this in mind, and surely with some understanding of the liturgical significance of the

term, Constantine wrote that they did not receive places of honour because, in fact, they were 'unworthy' of such positions.⁸³

It is clear throughout the letter that Constantine envisioned himself as being involved in a matter that was primarily ecclesiastical in nature. Although he did not hesitate in making use of his civil authority in such cases, his judgement at Psamathia appears to have referred back to his role in confirming and sanctioning the decrees of Nicaea, especially in regard to the Meletians.⁸⁴ That Constantine did not consider the proceedings at Psamathia to be of a civil nature, at least in regard to the final judgement which he delivered, may be seen in the fact that two years later he threatens the Meletians with punishment under civil law (something not yet done) if they persist in their disruptive behaviour.⁸⁵ It seems possible that Eusebius of Nicomedia recognized this turn to precedent on the part of Constantine, and following the dismissal of the other accusations separated himself from the Meletians, at least in the public eye, while remaining their 'secret friend'.⁸⁶ This would explain Constantine's almost total absorption with the Meletians in his letter, as well as Athanasius' lack of suspicion concerning any conspiratorial alliance between the Eusebians and the Meletians at this particular time.⁸⁷

1.2 The Concern Over Libya, AD 332 - AD 333

With Constantine's public declaration concerning the proceedings at Psamathia in the hands of the catholic community in Alexandria, Athanasius celebrated the Paschal Feast with his church on 2 April, AD 332, having completely triumphed over his adversaries. During the course of the year he undertook pastoral visitations throughout the regions of the Pentapolis and Ammoniacca (Libya superior and Libya inferior).⁸⁸ It appears as though Athanasius' visit to the Pentapolis was relatively brief, while his stay in the area of Ammoniacca (the oasis of Ammon, close by the Qattara depression) was of a longer duration.⁸⁹ Although some have sought to characterize these travels as part of a 'policy of visiting troubled areas under his jurisdiction', such journeys, as to the Thebaid in the winter of AD 330/331 and to Libya in AD 332, may only have been the normal routine of a somewhat newly elected metropolitan.⁹⁰

It has also been suggested that Athanasius may have visited Libya during this time in order 'to intervene in Libyan episcopal elections' over against renewed Arian activities in the area.⁹¹ Although such an explanation may seem plausible, there is little exact information available concerning the situation in Libya during this period. During the time immediately preceding the Council of Nicaea, Arianism appears to have had its greatest degree of support within Libya. In the Thesaurus of Nicetas Choniates, preserved by Philostorgius, the Libyan bishops who supported Arius are listed first and include the major sees of the Pentapolis, as well as certain smaller towns:⁹²

From Libya superior: Sentianos of Boreion, Dachios of Berenice, Secundus of Teuchera, Zopyrus of Barka, Secundus of Ptolemais, Theonas of Marmarica...

At Nicaea, Dachios of Berenice, Secundus of Teuchera and Zopyrus of Barka, all appear to have signed in support of the definition, but the name of Sentianos does not appear.⁹³ Secundus of Ptolemais and Theonas of Marmarica, who had already been excommunicated by Alexander in AD 324, however, proved intransigent at the Council and, along with Arius, were banished by Constantine, although no replacements appear to have been named.⁹⁴ If Philostorgius is to be believed, Secundus and Theonas left Nicaea harbouring a sense of betrayal and ill-will towards those who had been less firm in their convictions, especially Eusebius of Nicomedia.⁹⁵ Their unwillingness to 'sign and explain later' concerning their theological position, as was the case with the Eusebians, remains a mystery. Some, as Otto Seeck, have contended that it was their 'intimate friendship' with Arius, rather than any doctrinal concern, that made them unable to part company from him at Nicaea.⁹⁶

It is uncertain whether or not Secundus and Theonas had been restored to their sees by the time of Athanasius' journey to Libya in AD 332. Although Rowan Williams states that 'Athanasius often speaks as if their restoration had been part of the great Eusebian campaign of the years after 328', the only clear references to the post-Nicene activities of Secundus we have from the bishop of Alexandria date from the time of his third exile, that is, after AD 356.⁹⁷ Henry Chadwick, however, also indicates that,⁹⁸

... probability favors the view that their return was quite soon, perhaps 327-8. It was certainly earlier than the Jerusalem dedication of September when the inferior clergy of Alexandria, once associated with Arius, were reconciled.

Although Chadwick considers the provisions of the Jerusalem encyclical as applying specifically to 'presbyters', it seems probable that the mention of 'Arius and his fellows' most likely indicates the inclusion of deposed bishops, such as Secundus and Theonas.⁹⁹ Such an interpretation would, therefore, stand in opposition to Chadwick and suggest that Secundus and Theonas were fully restored, both to their sees and imperial favour, along with Arius, as a result of the Synod of Jerusalem in September AD 335 rather than at an earlier date. Philostorgius only indicates that Secundus, and those with him, were restored by Constantine, but does not record either the date or circumstances of the recall.¹⁰⁰ It is only during Athanasius' first exile following the Synod of Tyre, that the evidence shows Secundus becoming active once again in the area, even attempting to supplant the absent bishop of Alexandria with Pistus, a candidate of his own choice, during the summer of AD 337.¹⁰¹

On balance, the evidence would tend to support the conclusion that Secundus and Theonas had not yet been restored to their sees at the time of Athanasius' journey through the Pentapolis, although they may, along with Arius, have been in the region.¹⁰² Their presence, and the independent nature of the Libyan churches, which the sixth canon of Nicaea probably sought to restrain, may have provided Athanasius with adequate incentives to personally take matters in hand in the region, although, again, this is by no means certain.¹⁰³ The evidence, however, does not suggest that episcopal elections were taking place in the region, or that any other single issue impelled Athanasius to engage upon this course of visitations. It is, perhaps, only a matter of coincidence, that the next issue which

occupied both Constantine and the faithful in Alexandria, was to arise out of Libya as a result of Arius' frustration with the refusal of Athanasius to allow his restoration within the Alexandrine church.

By the latter portion of AD 332, almost thirteen years had passed since Arius' expulsion by Alexander from his home church in Alexandria. Condemned by the Council of Nicaea in AD 325 and subsequently rehabilitated by Constantine and the Bithynian synod in late AD 328, Arius had, nonetheless, lived in virtual exile during these years.¹⁰⁴ Although Constantine, in AD 328, had attempted to effect his readmission to the Alexandrine church, Athanasius, as has been noted, remained obstinate in his refusal to allow such an action to take place. For almost five years afterwards, Arius wandered from place to place seeking to enlist support for his readmission to the Alexandrine church. H.M. Gwatkin has suggested that some of this time may have been spent in Illyricum, where Ursacius and Valens became his 'personal disciples'.¹⁰⁵ R. Williams is of the opinion that, 'Constantine's letter inviting Arius to court promises him the chance to return to his "native land" if all goes well; and it is likely enough that he was in Libya for some years'.¹⁰⁶

Writing from the Thebaid in early AD 331, Athanasius indicates that 'the time is one of tribulation which the heretics excite against us'.¹⁰⁷ During this time Athanasius refers to the Meletians only as being 'schismatics', and, therefore, may be referring to a resurgence of Arian activity in either Egypt or, more probably, Libya.¹⁰⁸ If Arius had returned to Libya in AD 330/331 in an attempt to garner support for his position, such a move may well have been in conjunction with the efforts

which were being made on his behalf at court by Eusebius of Nicomedia. Athanasius' subsequent appearance and vindication at Psamathia and his tour of the Pentapolis in AD 332, bearing with him the emperor's testimony and approval as a 'man of God', may have forced Arius' hand and impelled him to present his case to Constantine in a more strident manner.¹⁰⁹

Late in AD 332, or early in AD 333, Arius wrote, most likely from Libya, what appears to have been an indignant letter of protest to the emperor.¹¹⁰ It has been plausibly suggested that, 'the surviving fragments of this letter suggest a man at the end of his tether'.¹¹¹ In his appeal to Constantine, Arius gravitated between pleading for the emperor's assistance over against the uncompromising attitude of those who will not receive him into communion and threatening the possibility of schism if the matter is not resolved to his satisfaction.¹¹² Arius appears to have indicated to the emperor that he retained a sufficient base of support within Libya, where many had received him, that he could, in fact, organize and remain within a body of churches which would be independent of Alexandria's metropolitan authority.¹¹³

Such an arrangement, of course, would have been in direct violation of the sixth canon of Nicaea and one may be sure that Athanasius would have protested such an infringement of his rights, especially in regard to the ordination of bishops within the region.¹¹⁴ It is probably correct, however, that it is 'an anachronism to think of anything like a self-consciously "Arian" church in Libya emerging or being envisaged at this date'; but there can be little doubt that Arius was suggesting an arrangement which would have effectively separated the actions of those

Libyan churches which had received him from the authority of Alexandria.¹¹⁵ Perhaps with the Donatists in mind, or more likely, with the recent Meletian troubles in view, Constantine's reply to Arius was to be unyielding and severe in the extreme.

Constantine immediately dispatched two documents to Alexandria which arrived, most probably, in early AD 333, and were carried by the agentes in rebus Syncletius and Gaudentius.¹¹⁶ The first of the two documents is an imperial edict which is addressed to the bishops and the laity and was read by the prefect Paterius in an open forum in the governor's palace.¹¹⁷ In this edict Constantine compares Arius to the pagan Porphyry, 'that enemy of piety', whose written works against the Church were destroyed.¹¹⁸ Likewise, Arius, and those who follow him, whom the emperor designates as 'Porphyrians', should also have their works destroyed.¹¹⁹ The treatises of Arius are to be 'consigned to the flames' and those who attempt to conceal any writing of Arius are threatened with immediate execution upon conviction.¹²⁰

The second document, an open letter addressed to Arius and his followers, has been rightly characterized as being 'long, rambling, and abusive, the work of a man who feels angry and affronted'.¹²¹ The contrast between Athanasius, Constantine's 'man of God', and Arius, who is described as 'an evil interpreter [who] in reality is the image and representation of the devil', is striking.¹²² The emperor names Arius as 'Ares', a god of war, who is only interested in creating an atmosphere of violence and ill-will.¹²³ The theology of Arius, which appears to have been presented to Constantine in yet another profession of faith, is denounced and ridiculed. The

contention of Arius that the Son is an 'alien hypostasis' from the Father is contrasted with the Nicene definition that the Father and the Son are of 'one essence (οὐσία)'.¹²⁴ Constantine refers to the Sibylline Oracles concerning the judgement from heaven that will come upon the Libyans because of their sins and misdeeds, and castigates Arius concerning his supposed support in that region.¹²⁵ The result of Arius' continued lawlessness, the emperor asserts, may clearly be seen in his own half-dead appearance.¹²⁶ Arius and his followers are threatened with penalties for their continued separation from the catholic community consisting of additional taxes and threats of conscription for public service.¹²⁷

Within the conclusion of the letter, however, Constantine softens his tone by means of a personal appeal and extends an unexpected invitation to Arius:¹²⁸

Come to me, come I say, to the man of God. Be assured that I will search out the deepest parts of your heart with my questions. And if folly is found, I shall heal you in a glorious way by an appeal to the grace of God. If, however, you appear to be healthy in your soul, I will perceive in you the light of truth and, by God's grace, will rejoice with you over your piety.

Arius appears to have accepted the invitation of the emperor to appear at court and while there satisfied him as to his theology and intentions, for he is next observed at the Synod of Jerusalem in AD 335, being received along with Euzoius by the bishops who had assembled for the celebrations on the occasion of the consecration of the Church of the Holy Sepulchre in September of that year.¹²⁹

Despite Arius' ultimate acceptance by Constantine, it is important to place Athanasius' position in AD 333 in the proper perspective. It was, without doubt, a position of strength,

regardless of a good number of continuing problems in the hinterlands of Egypt and Libya. Since his election and consecration in AD 328, Athanasius had managed to consolidate his base of support within Egypt to a considerable degree. Although what has been described as 'the growth of a patriotic spirit among the Egyptian monks and an intensification of their loyalty to their bishop' probably still lay in the future, by AD 333 Athanasius had achieved much.¹³⁰ A process of winning converts from the Meletians still within Egypt appears to have progressed steadily in these years.¹³¹ Athanasius had appeared before Constantine at Psamathia, refuted completely the charges which had been made against him, and had returned to Alexandria bearing the emperor's own letter of commendation. His journeys to the Thebaid and the Pentapolis had, it appears, extended his support beyond Alexandria, and their success may have prompted the rash behaviour of the Meletians and, in regard to the latter visitation, Arius. Finally, his earlier refusal to readmit Arius (and probably the Meletians) to the Alexandrine church on the orders of Constantine had been vindicated publicly by the response of the emperor to the machinations which he had now witnessed for himself.

Perhaps even more important for Athanasius during this period, was the attitude of Constantine towards those issues, both theological and disciplinary, which had been decided upon at Nicaea. All of the issues which occupied Athanasius and, in consequence, Constantine, in regard to Egypt, were intimately connected with Nicaea, as has been indicated above. It appears that Constantine viewed himself during this period as the

protector of the Nicene decrees. A. Grillmeier has summarized the situation as follows:¹³²

In the document [sic] between 325 and 335 Constantine betrays a wish to regard himself as a fellow-servant of the bishops, but also to watch over the dogmatic and disciplinary decisions of the Council of Nicaea (and also of other synods). This still would not amount to an involvement in the formation of doctrinal decisions, but would rather be a guarantee of their validity, in their function for the unity of the Church. In this sense we may understand the saying coined by Eusebius for the emperor, that he is ... the inspector general, for the observance of the decrees of the council.

Certainly, the provisions concerning the consecration of bishops (as Athanasius), the position of the Meletians in Egypt, and the attachment of Libya to the see of Alexandria would all fall under this category. If, in fact, this is a proper representation of Constantine's attitude during this period, Athanasius' intransigence over these issues, as well his actions concerning Arius, becomes much more understandable.

Furthermore, it would seem as though Constantine had good reason to maintain a reasonable relationship with Alexandria and its metropolitan. With the founding of Constantinople on 8 November, AD 324 and its ceremonial dedication on 11 May, AD 330, a new demand for Egyptian grain was created. On 18 May, AD 332, Constantine began the distribution of free grain within the city and the 'harvests of Egypt, formerly transported to Italy, were diverted eastward'.¹³³ According to Socrates, the imperial city soon required a daily ration of 80,000 modii, of which the greater portion was shipped through the port of Alexandria.¹³⁴ The keeping of the peace in Alexandria, therefore, was very much an economic and political priority as well as an ecclesiastical concern. The timing of Constantine's decree concerning the provision of grain for Constantinople also appears to have

coincided with the numerous events concerning Athanasius which have been outlined above as having taken place in AD 332/333. It would seem safe to conclude, therefore, that the continuing difficulties in Alexandria had, in some sense, become an increasingly important matter of imperial policy in the mind of Constantine.

At this point in time, that is, in early AD 333, Athanasius appears to have enjoyed a brief respite which may be seen in his Easter letter for that year. The theme of the letter is reflected in Athanasius' call for unity:¹³⁵

This [feast] also leads us on from the cross through this world to that which is before us, and God produces even now from it the joy of glorious salvation, bringing us to the same assembly, and in every place uniting all of us in spirit; appointing us common prayers and a common grace proceeding from the feast. For this is the marvel of his lovingkindness, that He should gather together in the same place those who are at a distance; and make those who appear to be far off in the body, to be near together in unity of spirit.

In contrast to the unity of the faithful which the feast proclaims, Athanasius comments that 'the schismatics keep it [i.e., the feast] in separate places and with vain imaginations'.¹³⁶ Moreover, he exhorts his readers to keep the feast as a witness of their unity 'to the schismatics, in not rending the coat of Christ, but in one house, even in the Catholic Church, let us eat the Passover of the Lord'.¹³⁷ Athanasius' repeated references in this letter to schismatics may indicate the continuing difficulties within Egypt concerning the Meletians and, perhaps, the Colluthians. No mention is made, however, of 'heretics' (i.e., Arians), or any other disturbances within the Egyptian Church, such as had been the case in the Easter letters for the previous three years. The reality of the Arian-Meletian

alliance appears to have remained hidden from from the sight of Athanasius during this period. Certainly, he must have been aware of the continuing activities of the Eusebians, as well as the other competing sects in Egypt and Libya, but with the actions of the emperor against Arius and his own vindication at Psamathia, Athanasius probably considered such groups to have become somewhat less of a threat than they had been at the outset of his episcopate.

1.3 The Arsenius Affair, AD 333 - AD 334

There remains a good deal of confusion as to exactly when the next series of accusations were brought against Athanasius, but it appears as though these charges must have been put forward shortly after the publication in Alexandria of Constantine's letters concerning Arius. With Arius at least temporarily in disgrace in Egypt and with no hope that Athanasius would allow his readmission into the Alexandrine church under any foreseeable circumstances, it once again became apparent to the Eusebians that their only recourse was the deposition of Athanasius. The Meletians in Egypt were also being seriously constrained by the continued presence and visitations of the bishop of Alexandria and would have found little encouragement in the fact that many of their former brethren were now active associates of Athanasius. Once again acting in concert, these two groups conspired together against the bishop of Alexandria, with, however, the Meletians again taking the position of being the primary or sole accusers.

Athanasius indicates that after his first interview with Constantine at Psamathia, 'the Meletians remained subdued for a short time, but after this they manifested their hostility once more'.¹³⁸ Sozomen states simply that, 'after the failure of their first attempt, the Meletians secretly invented other written [accusations] against Athanasius'.¹³⁹ Athanasius names the Meletian accuser, possibly at court, as 'Archaph, who is also called John'.¹⁴⁰ The two charges were as follows:

1. Athanasius had ordered Macarius to break the chalice of Ischyras. This was a repeat of an earlier charge which

had been made at Psamathia. It is probable, however, that the Meletians added further elaborations to the initial accusation.

2. Athanasius had arranged the murder of Arsenius, a Meletian bishop of Hypsele in Upper Egypt. Furthermore, Athanasius had cut off the dead bishop's arm and had retained it for magical purposes. The arm, however, had fallen into the possession of the Meletians who were able to produce it as irrefutable proof of Athanasius' guilt.¹⁴¹

The substance of the two charges were presented to Constantine by the Meletians in a written form.¹⁴² Once again, the object of the charges appears to have been the deposition of Athanasius on the basis of the Nicene settlement concerning the Meletians and the second canon of the council concerning serious offenses committed by those in orders.

The additional item in the second indictment, that Athanasius had cut off Arsenius' arm for magical purposes, may be regarded as either simple embellishment or as an attempt by the Meletians to picture the bishop of Alexandria as one who continually engaged in such practices. There is reason to believe that the Meletians had already promulgated such a rumour about Athanasius in regard to his consecration as bishop. This assertion possibly survives in the account of Philostorgius who reported that Athanasius possessed the power to compel his consecrators to ordain him although this was strongly contrary to their own desires.¹⁴³ The Arabic paraphrase of the ninth canon of Nicaea suggests that a bishop or presbyter convicted of making use of magic was subject to deposition.¹⁴⁴ That Constantine would have been sensitive to such an indictment is certain. There were several instances in which the emperor showed himself

to be harsh and unyielding in his punishment of persons who were suspected of making use of magic, the most celebrated case being that of Sopater, a one-time advisor of Constantine, who being condemned for 'fettering the winds' and preventing the grain ships from reaching Constantinople, was ordered to be beheaded.¹⁴⁵ In evaluating Constantine's attitude towards such practices, the opponents of Athanasius may have hoped that by adding such an accusation to their written indictment of the bishop of Alexandria, the emperor would be spurred to a faster and more severe response than had been the case in the past.

Constantine refused to reopen the case of Ischyras. Since the first appearance of this charge at Psamathia, Athanasius had presented the emperor with further information concerning this supposed sacrilege. It appears as though Ischyras had first been 'ordained' by Colluthus and chose to remain in a schismatic state even after his leader's readmission into the Alexandrine church.¹⁴⁶ During the time in question, Ischyras lived in a small village in the Mareotis named Secontarurus.¹⁴⁷ Although, under the provisions which were attached to the readmission of Colluthus, the status of Ischyras was that of a lay person, he appears to have continued to perform the functions of a priest in the home of an orphan named Ision.¹⁴⁸ His church was only designated as a private house and his congregation seems to have consisted of only those in his immediate family.¹⁴⁹ A nearby Catholic presbyter complained to Athanasius concerning this violation while the bishop of Alexandria was on one of his visitations of the region.¹⁵⁰

Subsequently, apparently during the period before Macarius was at court, that is, sometime before AD 330, he was sent by

Athanasius to summon Ischyras to Alexandria, presumably to be disciplined. When Macarius arrived in Secontarurus along with the local presbyter, Ischyras was ill, although a catechumen was found in the house along with the father of the schismatic priest.¹⁵¹ Macarius and his fellow presbyter informed the father of the consequences should his son continue such practices, apparently received assurances from the family that they would encourage Ischyras to desist, and then departed. When Ischyras recovered, however, he forsook the Colluthian cause and joined himself to the Meletians.¹⁵² As a consequence of this action, Ischyras appears to have been compelled by two Meletian presbyters, Issac and Heraclides, and the Meletian bishop, Issac of Letopolis, to fabricate the charge of sacrilege against Macarius and Athanasius.¹⁵³ While at Psamathia the accusation had focused upon the destruction of the chalice, by the time of this second presentation of the indictment it appears to have included overturning an altar, the burning of liturgical books and the smashing of the chalice during the very act of offering the oblation.¹⁵⁴

The information which Athanasius had already presented to Constantine consisted of a written confession from Ischyras himself that the charges were fabricated.¹⁵⁵ Athanasius may have been able to obtain this statement during his earlier encounter with Constantine at Psamathia, although he only indicates that the emperor had 'earlier heard of the matter concerning the cup'.¹⁵⁶ It seems more likely, however, that this letter was obtained by Athanasius after his return to Alexandria, for he indicates that Ischyras had been pressured by his friends and family to present himself to the bishop for a personal

interview.¹⁵⁷ The letter of Ischyras confirms this sequence of events as follows:¹⁵⁸

When I came to you, my lord bishop, desiring to be received into the Church, you reproved me for what I had said at the first, as though I had gone to such extremes of my own choice, I therefore lay before you this my apology in writing, so that you may understand that violence was used toward me and I was beaten by Issac and Heraclides, and Issac of Letopolis, and by those who were with them. And I take God as my witness in declaring that you are not guilty of any of those matters of which they have spoken. For no breaking of a cup happened, no casting over of the holy table occurred, but they forced me by violence to bring this forward. And this defense I bring to you in writing, desiring and requesting for myself to be placed within your congregation.

That this confession and recantation on the part of Ischyras took place in or near Alexandria is further attested to by the witnessing of the document by five presbyters from the Mareotis: Ammonas of Dicella, Heraclius of Phascos, Boccon of Chenebri, Achillas of Myrsine, Didymus of Taphosiris, and Justus of Bomotheus.¹⁵⁹ Four deacons from the Mareotis, Ammonius, Pistus, Demetrius, and Gaius also witnessed the document in addition to three deacons from Alexandria, Paul, Peter, and Olympius.¹⁶⁰ All of those who signed were senior clergy, both in the case of those from the Mareotis, who had held their positions from the time of Alexander, and the Alexandrine deacons who appear to have been attached to the bishop's household in Alexandria for some years.¹⁶¹ It may be assumed that Athanasius' choice of local Mareotic clergy (who would have been fully acquainted with Ischyras) and senior Alexandrine deacons (who may have cared for the administration of the diocese) as witnesses was intended to leave little doubt in Constantine's mind that the charges were false. The letter was very probably sent to Constantine after the initial interview at Psamathia and

may have been unknown to either the Meletians or Eusebius.¹⁶² In any case, Constantine was sufficiently satisfied with the evidence at hand and refused to reopen the case concerning Ischyras on this second occasion.

Although Constantine declined to hear the case concerning Ischyras, the alleged murder of Arsenius and the charge that Athanasius was involved with magic remained unresolved. Rather than hearing the case himself, however, the emperor wrote to his half-brother Flavius Dalmatius, then resident in Antioch, and ordered him to initiate a judicial inquiry.¹⁶² The son of Constantius and Theodora, Dalmatius had been recalled to court some years earlier (ca. AD 326) and had eventually received from Constantine the title of ensor, perhaps during his time as consul in AD 333.¹⁶⁴ He was apparently given certain executive powers in this case for Socrates states that he had both the ability to try the accused parties and to order the punishment of those convicted.¹⁶⁵

Dalmatius sent word to Athanasius concerning the alleged murder of Arsenius and instructed him to prepare his defense.¹⁶⁶ It is probable that this letter was received by Athanasius some time within the first few months of AD 333 and that this is the summons referred to by Sozomen as having taken place 'thirty months' before the bishop of Alexandria's arrival at the Synod of Tyre in August, AD 335.¹⁶⁷ Certainly, Athanasius' Easter letter for AD 333 betrays little anxiety concerning such an accusation having been brought against him, although, as will be seen below, his Easter letter for AD 334 is filled with denunciations of those who have 'sworn deceitfully' to their neighbours.¹⁶⁸ It appears probable, therefore, that Athanasius

received the letter from Antioch at some point after he had written the Easter letter for AD 333, but still somewhat early in the year, perhaps February/March.

Although Athanasius may have sought to appear unconcerned in regard to this allegation of murder and magic, the letter from Dalmatius, and perhaps private information from his envoys at court, informed him that the emperor had become 'troubled' over this particular charge.¹⁶⁹ The indictment had stated that a bishop within the jurisdiction of the Alexandrine church named Plusianus had, under orders from Athanasius, beaten Arsenius with leather thongs and had then burned him alive within his own house, although the bishop of Alexandria commented that he had not seen Arsenius in five or six years.¹⁷⁰ It is possible that Arsenius had earlier committed some offense and had fled to the Meletians in order to escape disciplinary action on the part of Athanasius.¹⁷¹ As Arsenius was already in hiding the Meletians apparently had promised him continuing protection if he would agree to play a part by concealment in this latest intrigue against Athanasius.

Soon after receiving the note of inquiry from Dalmatius, Athanasius sent letters to the bishops in Egypt to ask their assistance in locating Arsenius and sent a deacon into the Thebaid where, apparently, he suspected 'the murdered man' was in hiding.¹⁷² That Arsenius was initially kept in this region points to the continuing strength of the Meletians which Athanasius may have only begun to suspect through the course of events. Sozomen reports that the deacon learned where Arsenius was being kept in the Thebaid through the assistance of some monks in the region.¹⁷³ They indicated that Arsenius was being

sheltered at the monastery of Ptermenkurkis, in the nome of Antepolis, by its Meletian presbyter, Pinnes.¹⁷⁴ The monks who had supplied the deacon with this intelligence, Pecysius (a presbyter), Silvanus, Tapenacerameus, and Paul appear to have had an intimate knowledge of the affair and accompanied the deacon to Pinnes' monastery, along with a number of other associates.¹⁷⁵ One of the monks, Paul, was from Hypsele and, therefore, would have been able to identify Arsenius.¹⁷⁶ Before their arrival at Ptermenkurkis, however, Pinnes had received word of their approach and had instructed a monk, Elias, to place Arsenius on a boat bound for the lower country.¹⁷⁷

When Athanasius' deacon and his party arrived at the monastery, they found that their quarry had escaped. Pinnes and Elias, however, were taken to Alexandria for questioning before the dux of Egypt.¹⁷⁸ T.D. Barnes contends that the dux 'tortured them separately, and they disclosed the truth', but Pinnes, in a letter written after the event, only stated that he 'did not have the strength to deny' that Arsenius was still alive, and that the monk, Elias, made the same confession.¹⁷⁹ For Athanasius, it only remained to communicate these findings to Dalmatius and the emperor and then to find Arsenius who remained in hiding among the Meletian communities in the lower country.

1.4 The Synod of Caesarea, March/April, AD 334

While the search for Arsenius was taking place in Egypt, Athanasius' enemies remained active at court. Eusebius of Nicomedia, Theognis of Nicaea and Theodorus of Perinthus pressed Constantine to convene a synod, presumably to consider the ecclesiastical ramifications of the judicial inquiry which had been undertaken by Dalmatius.¹⁸⁰ For some time, these leaders of the Eusebian party had been attempting to convince Constantine that Athanasius and his bishops bore the primary responsibility for a supposed series of violent attacks upon other church parties in Egypt, as well as the continuing divisions and schisms which had come to characterize the region over the last decade.¹⁸¹

At length, Constantine relented and called for a synod to meet at Caesarea in Palestine.¹⁸² Although T.D. Barnes states that, 'the censor Dalmatius was to be there, occupying a position analogous to that of the emperor at Nicaea', there is no documentary evidence to support this view.¹⁸³ It is equally possible that Eusebius of Caesarea was chosen to preside over this synod which was to meet in his see city.¹⁸⁴ Constantine most probably considered Eusebius as holding a 'centerist' position in this controversy and, at the earlier Synod of Antioch, he had presided over a similar inquiry concerning Eustathius of Antioch. Certainly, the Festal Letter Index VI indicates that part of Athanasius' refusal to attend this synod was based upon the location and, presumably, the leadership of the meeting.¹⁸⁵

In early AD 334, 'sacred imperial letters' were sent out 'by the most pious emperor Constantine ordering certain persons from Egypt, both bishops and priests and many others ... to

proceed to Caesarea in Palestinian Syria' for the synod.¹⁸⁶ Whether, in fact, Dalmatius or Eusebius had been instructed to preside over the workings of the assembly, it is clear that Constantine was responsible for calling the synod and that this was accomplished not through episcopal letters, but by an imperial summons. One of those called to the Synod of Caesarea was a Meletian presbyter, Aurelius Pageus the son of Horus, the head of a monastic community at the village of Hipponon in the Heracleopite nome.¹⁸⁷ On 18 March, AD 334, this native Egyptian priest wrote to leaders of the monastic community at Hathor in the Upper Cynopolite nome informing them that a deputy had been appointed to watch over Hipponon until his return from the synod.¹⁸⁸ It is puzzling why Pageus, a small village priest, would have been called to the synod. It is improbable that he was summoned to be a direct participant in the deliberations, but he may have been included as a witness. It seems clear from his invitation, however, that there was an attempt on the part of either Constantine or the Eusebians to include a number of 'local' Meletian clerics in the proceedings.

Pageus apparently ascertained from the imperial summons that the Synod of Caesarea was being called 'to come to a legal decision [or judgement] concerning the purification of the holy Christian people'.¹⁸⁹ The force of the statement, as H.I. Bell admits, is that 'the Synod of Caesarea was of the nature of a judicial assembly'.¹⁹⁰ That the synod was to result in the purification of the Church 'seems to suit Constantine's conception of its functions very well'.¹⁹¹ The Synod of Caesarea, so far as the Eusebians were concerned, was intended to provide a legal vehicle, authorized by Constantine, which would secure the

deposition of Athanasius under both an ecclesiastical and civil decree. The constitution of the synod, while similar to the assembly in Antioch which had deposed Eustathius, would enable Eusebius and his party to make use of the legal procedure for a criminal trial which had become set by this time: (a) establish jurisdiction, (b) issue the summons to the concerned parties, (c) the trial, (d) judgement by the presiding officer, and (e) execution of the sentence.¹⁹² As the emperor remained competent to judge in all cases, and following the principle that 'jurisdiction goes with administration', the judgement and sentence of such a synod could be expected to receive almost immediate confirmation by Constantine.¹⁹³ There can be little doubt that the Eusebians and the Meletians envisaged Athanasius' condemnation as the probable outcome of the proceedings at Caesarea, and believed that Constantine, as in the case of Eustathius, would confirm the sentence.

As the accused party, Athanasius also received the imperial summons to the Synod of Caesarea. His sources of information at court and throughout Egypt would certainly have informed him of the large number of invitations which were being extended to even minor Meletian clerics as Pageus. Having witnessed the expulsion of a number of pro-Nicene bishops over the previous several years by the Eusebians, Athanasius had few illusions as to what lay in wait for him at Caesarea. According to Theodoret, Athanasius was 'well aware of the evil intentions of those who were to try him [and] refused to appear at the synod'.¹⁹⁴ It was generally assumed that Athanasius was suspicious of those who had gathered at Caesarea owing to the power of its bishop, Eusebius.¹⁹⁵ Upon receiving word of Athanasius'

refusal to appear at Caesarea, the bishops who were gathered in that place sent word to Constantine concerning Athanasius' 'arrogance' and 'contumacy'.¹⁹⁶ This action of the bishop of Alexandria would later be used at the Synod of Tyre as an example of the manner in which Athanasius had 'set aside the commands of the ruler'.¹⁹⁷

While the bishops were gathering at Caesarea, however, Athanasius had been busy in Egypt. Soon after the dux had released Pinnes and Elias from custody, the two Meletians attempted to warn John Archaph to desist in his accusations against Athanasius concerning Arsenius. Written from the monastery of Ptemencyrcis by the hand of a fellow-monk, Paphnutius, Pinnes informed Archaph concerning the details of their capture and confession, ending the communication with the following warning:¹⁹⁸

Thus, I inform you of these things, father, lest you should set yourself to accuse Athanasius; for I said he [Arsenius] was alive, and that he had been hidden with us. And all these things are known in Egypt and cannot be kept secret any longer.

Through the course of events, this letter from Pinnes to Archaph was intercepted by Athanasius' supporters and was given to the bishop who, subsequently, sent it on to Constantine. Meanwhile, Arsenius still remained at large and Athanasius turned his full attention to apprehending the 'murdered man'.

It seems likely that during the winter of AD 333/334 Athanasius went through the Lower Country of Egypt in search of Arsenius.¹⁹⁹ The search was made more difficult owing to the ability of Arsenius to constantly change his place of concealment, probably with the assistance of the numerous Meletian sympathizers who had remained within the region.²⁰⁰ At length,

however, Arsenius was forced by the pressure of Athanasius' activities to quit Egypt and seek safety in Tyre. While there, however, he was discovered. Two servants of Archelaus, the governor of the province, overheard a conversation at an inn which suggested that Arsenius was alive and in hiding nearby. They reported this information to Archelaus who thereupon seized Arsenius after discovering his place of concealment, and immediately informed Athanasius. At first Arsenius would not admit to his own identity, but upon his appearance in an ecclesiastical court presided over by Paul, the bishop of Tyre, who was an old acquaintance, he could no longer maintain the fiction.²⁰¹ Thereupon, according to Tillemont, 'he was convicted of being himself'.²⁰²

It is unfortunate that in the midst of these activities, that is, in early AD 334, we have no fully extant Easter letter that might allow us insight into Athanasius' state of mind.²⁰³ The fragment which we do possess, mistakenly placed by an ancient editor in the year AD 345, informs us only concerning the day Easter is to be observed in Alexandria and the outlying districts.²⁰⁴ This dating by R. Lorenz²⁰⁵ solves the chronological enigma observed by A. Roberston in his edition of the letters.²⁰⁶ Such a revision of the Schwartzian chronology leaves us, however, with little from the pen of Athanasius for this critical year.²⁰⁷

As a consequence of the letters and reports which Constantine had received from the dux of Egypt, Athanasius, and the governor Archelaus - all of which affirmed the innocence of the bishop of Alexandria - the charges against him were dismissed. Having further been reminded by Athanasius of 'what he had heard in Psamathia concerning Macarius the presbyter' two

years earlier (apparently referring to the letter of Ischyras), Constantine wrote to Dalmatius and ordered the cessation of the judicial inquiry which had been undertaken by the court of the censor, indicating that the charges against Athanasius were false and fraudulent. The emperor then informed 'Eusebius and his fellows' that the synod being held at Caesarea was to be dissolved and ordered them to return to their various cities.²⁰⁸ From Athanasius' language, it seems as though some of the bishops had not yet reached Caesarea, although Sozomen indicates that the Eusebians later complained of having been 'kept waiting' at the synod owing to Athanasius' non-attendance.²⁰⁹

Constantine then sent a letter to Athanasius in which he reviewed the events whereby Arsenius, whom the Meletians claimed 'had been killed with the sword' was now seen to be alive.²¹⁰ The emperor also commented upon the Meletian accusation concerning Macarius breaking the chalice of Ischyras, which he concluded was simply a malicious plot fabricated against Athanasius.²¹¹ After rehearsing this catalogue of what Constantine calls 'false and pretended crimes', the emperor states that,²¹²

... I desire this letter to be read frequently by your wisdom in public, in order that it may come to the knowledge of all men, and may especially be heard by those who have acted like this and have raised such disturbances; for my judgement is expressed justly and is confirmed by the stated facts. Because we see in such conduct [of the Meletians] that there is great offense, let them understand that I have judged in this way and have come to this determination, that if they promote any further trouble of this sort, I will, in my own person, take notice of the matter, and [judge] not according to ecclesiastical, but according to public law ...

This latter provision for the prosecution by civil authorities of those ecclesiastical parties who continued to cause public

disturbances would find its logical end in the proceedings of the Synod of Tyre which would be presided over by an imperial official, the comes Dionysius. It also indicates that the court of the censor and the Synod of Caesarea were, in all probability, two separate forums.

Athanasius' envoy at court in Constantinople, Macarius, quickly informed a number of influential bishops by letter of the sequence of events which had resulted in the vindication of his bishop in Alexandria.²¹³ As a result, Athanasius received a number of letters of congratulation from fellow-bishops who were sympathetic to his cause.²¹⁴ Among the letters was one from Alexander of Thessalonica. Athanasius had earlier informed Alexander of the situation in Egypt by a letter which had been delivered in Thessalonica by Sarapion, the son of Sozon.²¹⁵ As Sozon had been known and esteemed by Alexander, the use of Sarapion as a messenger by Athanasius may have been calculated to more deeply involve the elderly and well-respected bishop of Thessalonica in the controversy.²¹⁶ In his letter to Athanasius it is evident that Alexander had also received some contrary reports from John Archaph concerning the alleged murder of Arsenius. It seems likely, therefore, that a great deal of correspondence was taking place on the part of the involved parties in an attempt to gain wider support for their respective positions. For Alexander's part, his letter to Athanasius reports that he has been given 'great pleasure' to hear that 'the false accuser Archaph has met with disgrace' and hopes that he and his associates will receive the punishment 'his crimes deserve' from 'the righteous judge'.²¹⁷

As in the case of Ischyras, Athanasius also received a letter of submission from 'Arsenius, [bishop of those who were under Meletius] in the city of Hypsele, along with the presbyters and deacons'.²¹⁸ As W.H.C. Frend has commented, this submission of Arsenius was 'a tribute to [Athanasius'] powers of persuasion'.²¹⁹ Arsenius states in the letter that both he and his clergy 'desire peace and union with the catholic Church' and wish 'to place ourselves under the canon of the Church'; therefore, 'according to ancient custom' they are writing their letter of submission to Athanasius as their 'beloved father'.²²⁰ As Arsenius and his clergy had refused to submit to Alexander in company with Meletius almost six years earlier,²²¹ he pledges to no longer hold communion with other schismatics, 'whether bishops, presbyters, or deacons', and not to take part in any synods which such persons might call.²²² Arsenius further promises that he and his clergy will not,²²³

... send messages [i.e., letters] of peace to them or receive [messages] from them; neither without your consent [as] bishop of the metropolis, will we set out any decision concerning bishops, or on any other common church matter, but we will be obedient to all the canons which have before been set forward, following the good example of bishops Ammonian, Tyrannus, Plusian, and the other bishops.

Arsenius ends the letter by asking Athanasius first to answer them quickly and then to inform the other clergy in the various districts concerning his decision.²²⁴

The letter of Arsenius is an important piece of evidence concerning the situation in Egypt in c. AD 334. It is evident that even though Athanasius had succeeded in attracting the support of a large number of the Meletian clergy who had made their submission to Alexander along with Meletius, there remained a substantial, albeit more hard-pressed, Meletian community

scattered throughout Egypt. Along with the Colluthians, and most probably certain Arians and other smaller sects, they appear to have established a variety of ecclesiastical structures of their own devising which existed in the shadows alongside those of the catholic community. From the events connected with the flight of Arsenius it is certain that the Meletians, at least, maintained a loose network of monastic establishments, but one that included communities with varying degrees of loyalty which were not immune to internal rivalries. In the letter of Arsenius to Athanasius it is also apparent that the Meletians, and perhaps the other schismatic groups as well, maintained communication through 'letters of peace',²²⁵ had a structured ministry of bishops, presbyters and deacons, occasionally met in regional synods, and made determinations concerning the validity of episcopal incumbents and other common ecclesiastical matters. In his letter Arsenius further indicates that the acceptance of Athanasius' authority was a matter which was related to 'obedience to all the canons', perhaps referring back to the Nicene accords concerning the absolute metropolitan rights of Alexandria or the letter which set forth the terms of the Meletian settlement.²²⁶

Arsenius appears to have kept his pledge of loyalty, for thirteen years later, in his Easter letter of AD 347, Athanasius informs his readers that Arsenius is in Hypsele, 'having been reconciled with the Church'.²²⁷ The identity of the other bishops whose examples are mentioned by Arsenius is less certain. It is equally possible that they were Meletians (two names, Ammonian and Tyrannus, are listed in the brief presented to Alexander) who had been lately reconciled to Athanasius, or,

although less likely, simply catholic bishops with whom Arsenius was acquainted.²²⁸ In either case, Ammonian and Tyrannus are listed among the signers of the petition which was presented at Tyre on behalf of Athanasius,²²⁹ and later, in AD 347, are reported as having lost possession of their sees, perhaps through death.²³⁰ The remaining bishop mentioned, Plusian, would reemerge at Tyre, accused by the Meletians, surprisingly enough, of playing a major part in attempting to murder Arsenius at an earlier time.²³¹

There was a final and intriguing sequel to the events surrounding the Synod of Caesarea. John Archaph, the Meletian bishop of Memphis and the chief accuser of Athanasius in the Arsenius affair, sent a letter to Constantine in which he confessed his part in the episode and 'expressed his repentance'.²³² Furthermore, it is implied that Archaph informed the emperor that he had joined the communion of the Church and was at peace with Athanasius.²³³ Finally, he requested permission to travel to court (probably from Antioch) to appear before Constantine.²³⁴ The emperor immediately replied to Archaph's request. He was commended for 'setting to the side all petty feelings' and instructed to make use of the cursus publicus in order that there might be no delay in making his appearance at Constantine's 'court of clemency'.²³⁵

H. Nordberg was of the opinion that Archaph was encouraged by the Eusebians to make this approach to Constantine, believing that, as in the case of Arius, the emperor would be sympathetic to a repentant church leader and invite him to court.²³⁶ The hope for a successful outcome as the result of such a personal

interview was, according to Nordberg, based upon the Eusebians judgement of how the emperor would react:²³⁷

They had many years of experience of Constantine's ways of handling church matters and knew that he was not sufficiently competent as a church politician to be able to judge independently a more complicated matter; his greatest ambition was to keep peace in the church. For this reason, almost every time one of the church leaders visited the Emperor personally, the result was one or several marks of favour on the Emperor's part. As a matter of fact, the same thing had recently happened to Athanasius himself.

As John Archaph made his way to appear before the emperor, probably during second half of AD 334, Sozomen reports that the Meletians in Egypt, who had been alarmed by Constantine's threat of punishment under civil law, became more quiet for a time and that the churches throughout Egypt enjoyed peace and prospered.²³⁸ Athanasius, however, seems to have recognized that the peace was artificial. He makes no mention of a reconciliation with John Archaph on his part, and it is possible that none took place apart from Archaph stating his intention to do so in order to obtain an interview with Constantine. The bishop of Alexandria was certain that although the Meletians were, for the time being, 'set back and covered with shame', the issue which remained central was the readmission of Arius to the Alexandrine church.²³⁹ The primary concern of the Eusebians, therefore, remained Athanasius' deposition as bishop of Alexandria.

SECTION II

ATHANASIUS AND THE SYNOD OF TYRE

2. THE SYNOD OF TYRE

In his assessment concerning the importance of the Synod of Tyre, W.H.C. Frend has made the following observation:²⁴⁰

For the future relationship between church and state in the East, the Council of Tyre was as important as that of Nicaea. It had been summoned by the emperor and organized like a court of justice but, unlike Arles (assembled to hear the Donatists' petition), it was presided over by an imperial official, the count Dionysius, a former consul. The emperor had intervened directly in a matter of church discipline and though sentence would be pronounced by the bishops, their proceedings would be supervised by a layman. This was to be the pattern for all the great councils of the patristic age.

It is possible that Frend has overstated the case by implying that Tyre 'was to be the pattern for all the great councils of the patristic age', but his comments concerning the importance of the synod relative to Nicaea are essentially correct.²⁴¹ At Nicaea, however, the discussions were primarily concerned with doctrinal matters; the issues of church order and discipline were of secondary importance. The deposition of Eustathius at the Synod of Antioch, as has been stated, appears to have been the result of a combination of doctrinal and disciplinary or judicial concerns. At the Synod of Caesarea and the court of the censor at Antioch, two jurisdictions were employed, one ecclesiastical and one judicial, in an attempt to arrive at a decision concerning the accusations which had been

brought against Athanasius. The Synod of Tyre would combine these two jurisdictions, although the ultimate sentence of the gathering would be pronounced by the bishops, not the count Dionysius, and would be forwarded to Constantine for his approval.²⁴²

2.1 The Calling of the Synod of Tyre, AD 335

John Archaph's interview with Constantine, probably during the latter portion of AD 334, resulted in yet another reexamination of the many charges which had been brought against Athanasius. Whether Nordberg is correct in his assertion that the Eusebians were the motivating force behind the visit of Archaph is uncertain, but their involvement in 'contriving that a letter should be presented, as though coming from the Colluthians, the Meletians, and Arians' directed against Athanasius is documented.²⁴³ It is possible that Archaph transmitted this letter to Constantine in person at court. Having been presented once again with evidence of instability and division within the Egyptian church, and being desirous of achieving unity before the offering of the gift of the Church of the Holy Sepulchre in Jerusalem in the autumn of AD 335, the emperor called for a synod to convene in Tyre. The purpose of the synod, as set forth by Constantine, was as follows:²⁴⁴

... to defend those in need of protection, to restore health to your brothers who are in danger, to bring back to unity of opinion those who are divided, to correct errors while there is still time; in order that you may restore harmony to many provinces ...

It was the emperor's avowed intention to resolve the Egyptian controversies which had troubled the peace of the church for almost half of his reign. To this end, Constantine agreed to send to Tyre the former governor of Syria, comes Flavius Dionysius, along with a military guard, for the purpose of supervision and maintaining 'good order'.²⁴⁵ Constantine, however, clearly indicated that the judgement of the case would remain with the bishops who gathered at Tyre, as was consistent 'with ecclesiastical and apostolic order'.²⁴⁶ It seems probable

that the emperor intended the Synod of Tyre to act as a preliminary judicial assembly which would merely serve as a preparatory event to the main business of church reunification which was to be completed at the Tricennalia of Constantine in Jerusalem. There, during the celebrations, a larger gathering would reinstate Arius and Euzoius and their followers and thus, so the emperor hoped, bring an end to the Egyptian schisms.

The Eusebians, perceiving that Constantine's patience with the Egyptian troubles was almost at an end, had set to the task of organizing the Synod of Tyre to their advantage. Flavius Dionysius, the presiding secular official was, according to Athanasius, one of their own party.²⁴⁷ Furthermore, the Eusebians persuaded Constantine to approve their own list of delegates to the synod (probably including a number of Meletian clerics) and to order the immediate arrest of Athanasius' envoy at court, Macarius, as one of the material witnesses in the Ischyras episode which was to be reexamined.²⁴⁸ In order to ensure Athanasius' attendance, for the Eusebians may have feared a repetition of the debacle at Caesarea, Constantine wrote to the bishop of Alexandria and ordered him to make his way to Tyre.²⁴⁹ Although Athanasius was unwilling to make the journey, he eventually relented, perhaps owing to a threat of arrest issued by Dionysius or, the distinct possibility that he was 'escorted' to Tyre by a military guard.²⁵⁰ If this latter suggestion is indeed true, and from Athanasius' language it does appear likely, then the alleged account of the bishop's hesitant departure for Tyre in LP 1914 would seem to be incorrect or an intentional fabrication on the part of the Meletians.²⁵¹ Athanasius departed for Tyre on 11 July AD 335.²⁵²

Before leaving for Tyre, however, Athanasius had begun to make provision for what he was about to face. It was apparent to all concerned that the Synod of Tyre was going to take the form of an ecclesiastical trial in which Athanasius would stand as the accused party. The principal accusers would be the Meletians (led by John Archaph) and the Eusebians who, since the Synod of Caesarea, had become more open and public in their opposition to Athanasius. In order to provide himself with an adequate defense, the bishop of Alexandria undertook three separate measures.

Firstly, Athanasius attempted to match the numerical strength of the Eusebians and Meletians at Tyre. During this period there were, according to Athanasius, between ninety and one hundred bishops in Egypt and Libya.²⁵³ If the preface to Apologia contra Arianos 78 is correct, Athanasius selected forty-seven, or almost half, of those bishops resident in Egypt and Libya to accompany him to Tyre.²⁵⁴ Of these forty-seven clerics, at least twelve (and possibly seventeen), had at one time been supporters of Meletius.²⁵⁵ Certain of these former Meletians, such as Apollonius, Dioscorus, and Tyrannus, had been presbyters in the schismatic group and appear to have been raised to the episcopate by Athanasius along with the deacon, Timothy.²⁵⁶ Others, such as Agathammon (in 'the inland of Alexandria', i.e. Mareotis), Harpocraton of Bubastus, Moses of Phacusae, Peter of Heracleopolis, Pelagius of Oxyrhynchus, Ammonius of Diospolis, and Cronius of Metelis, had been raised to the episcopate by Meletius and, following their submission to the Alexandrine see, had retained their positions under Alexander and Athanasius.²⁵⁷ It is possible that Athanasius also

engaged the assistance of one Irenaeus, a former Meletian presbyter,²⁵⁸ who, at an earlier time, had been an Arian deacon.²⁵⁹ Athanasius was fully aware that the Meletian controversy would be one of the main issues under consideration at Tyre and, therefore, included a good number of ex-Meletians in the large company of clerics he had sent on to Tyre.

Secondly, Athanasius sought to ensure the availability of witnesses who would contradict the Meletian claims. Macarius, as has been mentioned above, had been taken into custody by the emperor and was already at Tyre. The former Meletian bishops who were included by Athanasius in his delegation would be able to supply first-hand knowledge of Meletian activities within Egypt and could testify as to the way in which the Nicene accords had been put into effect under both Alexander and Athanasius. An essential witness, however, was the Meletian bishop Arsenius who, by his very presence at the synod, could disprove the accusations of murder and magic which had earlier been brought against the bishop of Alexandria. To this end, Athanasius arranged for Arsenius to remain in hiding outside of Tyre until the time of his presentation before the assembled bishops.²⁶⁰

Thirdly, Athanasius brought with him to Tyre documentary evidence as to his innocence. The use of writing as being 'evidentiary' (as in the older Roman system) had become accepted practice and properly subscribed and witnessed documents were, in the fourth century, considered legally binding.²⁶¹ In the East, hellenistic influence helped to increase the value of written statements as binding upon the individual (or individuals) who subscribed to such briefs.²⁶² This approach was

applied in an exacting way to those documents which contained confessions or described obligations.²⁶³ If Athanasius intended to make use of the living Arsenius to disprove the charge of murder, he would present the synod with the schedule of clergy submitted by Meletius to Alexander to prove that Ischyras had never received valid ordination and was, therefore, outside of the Nicene accords concerning the Meletian settlement.²⁶⁴ Presumably, Athanasius would also have been able to present the letter of Ischyras in which the schismatic priest confessed that no violence had taken place. It is certain that Athanasius entered this letter as evidence, along with the Meletian schedule and other documents, at the later Synod of Alexandria, AD 338/339, and the Synod of Rome, AD 340/341.²⁶⁵

Athanasius was well aware of the dangers which awaited him at Tyre and if, as both Socrates and Sozomen suggest, he was apprehensive, there was good reason.²⁶⁶ The Eusebians had failed in their attempt to convince the emperor to issue a summary judgement at Psamathia. At least one, or according to K. Girardet, two, civil actions brought against Athanasius had also failed to secure his conviction.²⁶⁷ Within the first few months of AD 334 Paterius was replaced as the Prefect of Egypt by Flavius Philagrius, an appointment which filled Athanasius with anxiety, for he recognized in the new authority one who was hostile in regard to the Church.²⁶⁸ Finally, the Synod of Caesarea had been dissolved before any judgement of an ecclesiastical nature could be agreed upon or enacted and the Eusebian and Meletian delegates had dispersed in frustration and anger.

Perhaps reflecting on these events, early in AD 335 Athanasius had written in his Easter letter that,²⁶⁹

Thus it is that sinners, and all those who are aliens from the catholic Church, heretics, and schismatics, since they are excluded from glorifying [God] with the saints, cannot properly even continue as observers of the feast.

Athanasius had probably come to realize the strength of the alliance which had been formed against him and had responded by insisting upon a clear line of demarcation as to the true nature of the Church as well as those who could legitimately participate in ecclesiastical affairs.

2.2 Procedure and Authority at the Synod of Tyre

It is difficult to ascertain with any degree of exactitude the precise procedure which was employed at the Synod of Tyre. P. Batiffol made a distinction between Eastern and Western conciliar procedure. He considered the synods of the East to resemble the sort of open debate which was practiced in the schools. The West, in his opinion, modeled church councils on the practices and procedures of the Roman Senate.²⁷⁰ N.H. Baynes, without making the distinction between East and West, simply states that, 'it has long been recognized that the procedure of the early Christian Councils was based upon that of the Roman senate'.²⁷¹ This model, however, which involved a relatio in which the matter being discussed was read to the assembly, followed by a role call in which each delegate stated his sententia, after which a vote was taken, was not limited to the Roman Senate, but had been taken up by the municipalities as well.²⁷² In the case of the North African synods which indirectly followed this process, the resolution once voted upon would be placed in the form of a letter which was then sent to all of the interested parties and placed in the archives of the church where the synod had been held.²⁷³

The appearance of the relatio-sententia sequence in synodal gatherings was, in all probability, owing to the wide-spread popularity of this format, rather than being a direct copy of Roman senatorial practice.²⁷⁴ As such, it is perhaps best to view the procedures employed by ecclesiastical gatherings in the fourth century as being hybrids which retained much that was familiar in civil affairs, but which also provided vehicles for the church to express itself in terms of limited juridical

authority.²⁷⁵ Although both F. Dvornik and H. Hess somewhat exaggerate the dependence of church synods upon the senatorial model, and perhaps muddle the legislative distinctions between the magisterial and conciliar concerns of that body, there can be little doubt that there is a similar procedural tradition.²⁷⁶ While it is beyond the scope of this study to fully comment upon the procedure which was used at the Council of Nicaea, it must be noted that the senatorial model of Baynes is substantiated only by the account of Eusebius, which may have placed Constantine in a more central position than is fully justified.²⁷⁷

E. Caspar, while allowing for certain distinctions between Nicaea and Tyre, contends that they were essentially similar, for as Reichskonzilien they combined ecclesiastical and civil jurisdiction and each met under the direct oversight of imperial authority.²⁷⁸ In this case, an assumption is made that the procedure employed by each synod was also similar. K. Girardet has considered 'the Reichssynode of Tyre' at somewhat greater length.²⁷⁹ Although Girardet gives little credence to the Athanasian accounts of Tyre, he clearly considers the synod to have been little more than an ecclesiastical trial which operated under the civil jurisdiction of the state. As Girardet has stated, 'The iudex in this process is Constantine [in the person of Dionysius], the bishops being his consilarii'.²⁸⁰ The sentence which such a synod would decide upon, therefore, would only be advisory in nature rather than an actual judgement, which would be left to Constantine.²⁸¹ V. Twomey suggests, however, that the Synod of Tyre possessed greater power than that of 'an advisory votum of the imperial consilarii' and

expected to 'pass sentence on Athanasius, a sentence which they [i.e., the Eusebians] assumed had automatically the weight of a civil judgement and not simply an ecclesiastical one'.²⁸² His conclusion is that, 'Here Tyre and Nicaea must be considered as essentially different' in regard to authority and, presumably, procedure.²⁸³

A.H.M. Jones has summarized the conflicting attitudes towards, and evidence concerning, ecclesiastical synods during this period in the following manner:²⁸⁴

The church had a great belief in the value of councils, but here again there were no accepted rules to determine who might summon them and what jurisdiction they possessed. The Council of Nicaea had, as we have seen, put provincial councils on a regular footing and defined their competence. In some areas larger councils were sanctioned by tradition. The bishops of Rome and Alexandria from time to time summoned councils from the Suburbicarian provinces and from Egypt, and the bishop of Antioch from all the diocese of Oriens. Councils of all the African provinces were regularly held under the presidency of the bishop of Carthage. But elsewhere there were no recognized authorities to convene larger councils.

The imperial government often took the initiative. Only the emperor could summon a general council of the whole church: Constantine had established the precedent at Nicaea, and there was in any case no central ecclesiastical authority which could act. But the emperor also often summoned smaller councils to deal with some problem on which a provincial council was incompetent to decide: Constantine again set the precedent by calling the councils of Rome and Arles to deal with the Donatist controversy and those of Caesarea and Tyre to give judgement on Athanasius. Such ad hoc councils were also convoked by leading bishops, but whether they were summoned by imperial or episcopal initiative, their competence was disputable, and their verdict was frequently challenged by defeated parties who, often truly, alleged that they were packed.

At the time of Tyre, synodal practice and procedure was still in the process of development. All may not have agreed concerning imperial participation, but, as S.L. Greenslade has observed, 'the theory of councils was still so rudimentary that

the practice often strengthened the authority of the emperor rather than the freedom of the Church'.²⁸⁵ Furthermore, it is often overlooked that both the Synod of Caesarea and the Synod of Tyre had a particular purpose, that of judging an eminent ecclesiastical figure who had been accused of particular violations of both civil and canon law. During the period surrounding the Synod of Caesarea, two separate forums were established to deal with such matters. We may assume that the bishops were to judge ecclesiastical concerns and that the court of the cen-
sor was to evaluate any civil ramifications. At Tyre these two functions were linked. Although the oversight of the Synod of Tyre was entrusted to an imperial official, in a manner similar to Nicaea, the purpose was different and the control of the emperor in a matter of discipline (as opposed to theology) was more far-reaching.

Again, as A.H.M. Jones has commented, Constantine entrusted 'the case of Athanasius to a hand-picked council presided over by an imperial commissioner. He himself pronounced on Athanasius' appeal from this council'.²⁸⁶ The result of 'such a technique, whereby the emperor chose the bishops who were to make the decision, and through a lay president guided their discussions' was that the imperial government was given 'a considerable de facto influence on ecclesiastical decisions'.²⁸⁷

It seems proper, therefore, to regard the Synod of Tyre as primarily an ecclesiastical trial which operated under imperial authority in the person of Flavius Dionysius. It is possible that, as at Nicaea, there was also a presiding bishop who acted as the ecclesiastical counter-part to Dionysius, although the Egyptian bishops would latter complain that only 'the comes

spoke and all present remained silent or obeyed his instructions'.²⁸⁸ Although the Egyptian bishops stated that Eusebius of Nicomedia controlled the proceedings of the synod through Dionysius,²⁸⁹ it is more likely that Eusebius of Caesarea as the resident metropolitan, or possibly Flacillus of Antioch, would have been given the nominal role of presiding bishop.²⁹⁰

The Eusebians, however, believed the proceedings at Tyre to be primarily ecclesiastical in nature and assumed that their sentence would receive the approval and approbation of Dionysius and, by inference, Constantine.²⁹¹ Athanasius considered Tyre, at least upon reflection, as an ex parte trial which had no ecclesiastical authority and only the limited civil jurisdiction which had been allowed by the emperor.²⁹² As for Constantine himself, the emperor clearly considered it within his power to annul the decisions of the Synod of Tyre and to reexamine any disputed matters after the fact.²⁹³ One may conclude, therefore, that the relative authority of the Synod of Tyre was, from the outset, regarded in a variety of ways by its differing participants.

The procedure which was followed by the Synod of Tyre appears to have included elements of a civil trial as well as the time honoured relatio-sententia ordering of the agenda. The synod began with a letter from Constantine to the assembled bishops in which he sets forward the matter to be discussed (the relatio).²⁹⁴ In this letter he also establishes the jurisdictional oversight of 'Dionysius, a man of consular rank'.²⁹⁵ Furthermore, Constantine reiterates the summons which has been extended to all the interested parties and threatens banishment as a punishment for those who refuse to attend.²⁹⁶ This

combining of the relatio with the question of jurisdiction and a repeat of the summons fits the hybrid nature of the Synod of Tyre. The procedure continued with the trial proper in which the presiding officer called upon the interested parties to present their respective cases. The assembled bishops were then given an opportunity to state their opinions or to dispute evidence. Finally, each in turn, would deliver his sententia or judgement of the matter with the final verdict being placed in the form of a letter. This, in brief, appears to be roughly the process which was followed at Tyre.

2.3 The Proceedings at the Synod of Tyre, July, AD 335

Having left Egypt on 11 July AD 335, Athanasius probably arrived in Phoenicia later in the same month with the proceedings being initiated shortly thereafter. The total number of bishops who attended the synod remains uncertain. Socrates indicates that only sixty bishops were present.²⁹⁷ Hefele accepts this number, but notes that it probably does not include the Egyptian delegation.²⁹⁸ H.M. Gwatkin estimates the number of bishops to have been about 150, inclusive of the Egyptian delegation.²⁹⁹ It is probably correct to place the total number of bishops present at between 110 and 150. It is possible that the Egyptian bishops had not been officially summoned and that their names, therefore, did not appear on the list of judges to which Sozomen had access. Furthermore, many bishops were enroute to Jerusalem for the Tricennalia and may have arrived at this preparatory synod in Tyre after the proceedings had already begun.

Among the gathered bishops Athanasius would have found numerous enemies. John Archaph, one of 'principal accusers' of Athanasius was present,³⁰⁰ along with several other Meletian bishops including, Callinicus of Pelusium, Euplus, Pachomius, Isaac (of Letopolis ?), Achilleus of Cusae, and Harmaeon of Cynopolis.³⁰¹ Among the other hostile bishops present were Eusebius of Nicomedia, Narcissus of Neronias, Maris of Chalcedon, Theognis of Nicaea, Patrophilus of Scythopolis, George of Laodicea, Theodore of Heraclea, Macedonius of Mopsuestia, Ursacius of Singidunum, and Valens of Mursa, all of whom favoured Arius' reinstatement within the church of Alexandria.³⁰² Eusebius of Caesarea and Flacillus of Antioch have

already been mentioned, and were probably not any more well disposed towards Athanasius than those bishops listed above. In addition to his own bishops from Egypt, many of whom may have been excluded from the proceedings of the synod, the bishop of Alexandria was able to number a few friends, such as Maximus of Jerusalem, Marcellus of Ancyra and the venerable bishop of Thessalonica, Alexander.³⁰³ Despite these few supporters, it appears certain that Athanasius and those with him at Tyre were heavily outnumbered by their opponents.

Sozomen appears to have had access to some records or minutes of the proceedings of the Synod of Tyre and provides the most complete account of what actually took place.³⁰⁴ E. Schwartz contended that Sozomen's account made use of Meletian materials which had been gathered by Sabinus in his collection of synodal documents.³⁰⁵ If this contention is correct, when such an account is combined with the Athanasian documents which are contained in Apologia contra Arianos and the other historians, it may be possible to arrive at a somewhat balanced view of the admittedly confused and hectic proceedings at Tyre.

As the bishops assembled, a letter from Constantine was read in which the purpose of the synod was set forward. The bishops were enjoined to heal the divisions of the Church and to act with zeal and in a timely manner.³⁰⁶ Having heard this exhortation from the emperor, the work of the synod began in earnest. From the outset, the Egyptian bishops who had been admitted to the proceedings protested against the leadership and intent of the gathering. Potammon of Heraclea, attacked Eusebius of Caesarea as a leader of the opposition, saying,³⁰⁷

How are you seated there, Eusebius, while the innocent Athanasius is judged by you ... Were you not with me

in prison during the time of persecution? I have lost an eye for the sake of the truth, but you have not suffered in any part of your body. How was it that you escaped from prison if not by deceitful promises or actual deeds?

Another confessor, Paphnutius of Thebes, chided his friend and fellow confessor, Maximus of Jerusalem, for even keeping company with the opposition at Tyre.³⁰⁸ It is possible that Eusebius of Nicomedia's standing within the synod was challenged owing to his earlier translation from Berytus to Nicomedia and his subsequent deposition from that see following Nicaea.³⁰⁹ The Egyptians may well have claimed that Amphion was the true bishop of Nicomedia as was Chrestus in Nicaea, having replaced Theognis after his earlier deposition.³¹⁰ Any such challenges by the Egyptians, however, to the authority or membership of the synod were quickly set aside and the accusations against Athanasius were brought forward.

The first set of charges involved the alleged violent repression of the Meletians in Egypt. The 'presbyter' Ischyras had renounced his earlier pledge of loyalty to Athanasius and, possibly with the promise of being raised to the episcopate, joined himself to the alliance of Eusebians and Meletians.³¹¹ Along with Meletian bishop Callinicus of Pelusiam, Ischyras repeated the charge that Athanasius had ordered the breaking of the chalice and had overthrown an episcopal throne.³¹² Furthermore, they alleged that Athanasius had arranged the earlier arrest and imprisonment of Ischyras, probably in AD 331/332, by Flavius Hyginus the prefect of Egypt on the false charge of desecrating images of the emperor.³¹³

Callinicus, who had been with the Meletian delegation at Psamathia, complained that he had been deposed by Athanasius for

reasons of conscience. The bishop of Pelusiam had been reconciled to the catholics under Alexander, but had again taken up the Meletian cause sometime before the interview at Psamathia. He now claimed, however, that the reason for his deposition was that he had suspended communion with Athanasius until the bishop of Alexandria was cleared of charges related to the case of Ischyras. The result of this action, according to Callinicus, had been his arrest by the military followed by judicial torture while in custody. Athanasius meanwhile had replaced him in Pelusiam with Mark, who Callinicus claimed was a deposed priest.³¹⁴ Five other Meletian bishops, Euplus, Pachomius, Issac, Achilleus, and Harmaeon, added to this indictment of violence and complained that they had been the objects of violent attacks by the Athanasians.³¹⁵

During these initial proceedings which centered upon the claims of Ischyras, the Meletian leader John Archaph remained silent, content to allow the Arian and Eusebian faction at the synod to press the Meletian case on his behalf.³¹⁶ Although Athanasius does not explicitly mention Archaph's status, the Egyptian bishops in AD 338/339 certainly imply that the Meletian leader's position in regard to the catholics had been regularized immediately before the time of Tyre.³¹⁷ Archaph's initial silence was perhaps owing to the consideration of a leadership role in the Egyptian church should Athanasius be deposed as a result of accusations which were being set forth.

Following this first recitation of alleged violence and intimidation, the Meletians put forward what they considered to be the primary cause for the past seven years of unrest in Egypt. Sozomen states that,³¹⁸

They all agreed that [Athanasius] obtained the episcopate by means of the deceit of certain persons, it having been set forth that no one should receive ordination who could not clear himself of crimes brought against him.

Because they believed Athanasius to have been ordained illegally, the Meletians claimed that they separated from him and that the bishop of Alexandria had replied by means of violence and imprisonment.³¹⁹ Here again, it is clear that the Meletians were relying upon the canonical provisions of the Council of Nicaea in order to secure Athanasius' deposition.

The Arsenius affair was then raised once again by the Meletians. Sozomen indicates that Athanasius was surprised that many of his supposed friends became his accusers in regard to the missing bishop of Hypsele.³²⁰ The Meletians certainly claimed popular support for their allegations. A document was presented to the synod which purported to contain public complaints from the people of Alexandria concerning Athanasius' conduct in regard to Arsenius.³²¹

Athanasius and the Egyptian bishops then began the lengthy process of refuting the charges which had been presented.³²² Certain of the accusations were dealt with out of hand, while others were referred to future sessions of the synod.³²³ In a dramatic gesture, Athanasius brought Arsenius out of hiding and presented him alive, with both arms, before the assembled bishops, asking his opponents to explain where they had secured their evidence of the severed limb in the wooden box.³²⁴

Perhaps suspecting that Athanasius would have access to Arsenius, his opponents had already framed their reply. They stated that Athanasius had ordered a suffragan bishop, Plusianus, to burn the house of Arsenius, and to arrest,

imprison and maltreat the bishop of Hypsele. Arsenius, however, had escaped from Plusianus and had gone into hiding. The Meletians concluded that he had been killed on the orders of Athanasius and, because Arsenius was well loved by his fellow bishops and had been a confessor, they had notified the magistrates.³²⁵ The inclusion of Plusianus, who was probably a former Meletian, in their explanation concerning Arsenius, strengthens the argument that much of what had taken place in Tyre was the result of an extended rivalry between those Meletians who had regularized their relationship with Alexandria and those who had remained in a schismatic state.³²⁶

With so many Egyptian bishops present, many of them former Meletians, Athanasius was able to show through the course of several sessions that the majority of the charges which had been brought against him were groundless. The structure of the synod and due regard for proper procedure, however, had already begun to break down. Dionysius, who may have regarded the assembly as little more than an imperial commission, began to use the troops which were present to maintain order and appears to have limited the scope of the debate.³²⁷ As Arsenius was certainly alive and active in accusing his former brethren, and the other issues had been set aside, all that remained was the case of Ischyras. Macarius had remained adamant in his denial of the charge and, presumably, Athanasius had presented the schedule of Meletian clergy from the time of Alexander to the synod, showing that Ischyras had not been ordained by Meletius and, therefore, was not a presbyter in the village of Secontarurus. The logical consequence of this evidence, at least for the Athanasians, was that Ischyras would not have, therefore, been in possession of a

church and altar, much less an episcopal throne, and Macarius could not be accused of sacrilege in the matter of the chalice.

2.4 The Mareotic Commission, August/September AD 335

The Eusebians suggested to Dionysius that a commission of inquiry should be sent to the Mareotis to secure additional evidence. Athanasius considered such an undertaking to be 'superfluous', perhaps because the bishop of the Mareotis, Agathammon (yet another former Meletian) was already present at the synod and was well acquainted with the case.³²⁸ Nevertheless, Athanasius suggested that if such a commission was to be sent, its members should be impartial and, therefore, exclude those bishops who had already shown themselves to be hostile in regard to his own position. Although Athanasius believed that he had persuaded Dionysius to follow this course of action, the commission which was appointed included the very persons Athanasius had suggested should be excluded.³²⁹

Dionysius, rather than selecting the commission himself, had directed the synod to make the appointments by a unanimous vote, probably under the direction of Flacillus of Antioch rather than Eusebius of Caesarea who had already come under attack from the Egyptians.³³⁰ The commission, probably elected by a simple majority vote of the accredited members of the synod (which excluded the greater portion of the Egyptian delegation), consisted of Theognis of Nicaea, Maris of Chalcedon, Theodorus of Heraclea (in Thrace), Macedonius of Mopsuestia (in Cilicia), Ursacius of Singidunum, and Valens of Mursa.³³¹ All of the members were open Arian sympathizers and all were intractably opposed to Athanasius. Although Ischyras, the complainant in the matter, accompanied the commission to Egypt as a material witness, Macarius, the accused party, was left in custody at Tyre. With a military guard at their disposal and a letter

requesting the assistance of the prefect of Egypt in hand, they arrived in the Mareotis in late August, AD 335.³³²

The proceedings of the commission in the Mareotis were of an openly biased and partisan nature. As has been mentioned above, the prefect of Egypt, Philagrius, was no friend to the church in Alexandria. He met the commission from Tyre and may have supplemented their military escort with other soldiers under his direct command.³³³ As the commission began its inquiries, a good number of Alexandrine presbyters and deacons made their way to the Mareotis in order to set forth evidence on behalf of Macarius and to 'claim the right of being present at the investigation' since Athanasius' interests were not represented in its membership.³³⁴ Their presence, however, was not welcomed by the commission and they were turned away. In consequence, the sixteen presbyters and five deacons from Alexandria presented the commission with a written protest concerning their exclusion and, 'so that it would not be kept secret', sent a further copy to the curiosus Flavius Palladius, presumably to be sent on to Constantine.³³⁵

Philagrius and the commissioners set to the task of interrogating witnesses within the region. The catholic presbyters and deacons of the Mareotis attempted to appear before the inquiry with the intention of presenting first-hand accounts of the incident involving Ischyras, but were likewise turned away.³³⁶ As a result of this exclusion, the fifteen presbyters and fifteen deacons presented a written statement to Philagrius, Palladius, and Flavius Antoninus (a biarchus of the praetorian prefects), stating that Ischyras had been invalidly ordained by Colluthius, possessed no church, that no chalice had been

broken, and that the whole story was false and an invention. Furthermore, they swore before Almighty God, Constantine and his sons, that this was the truth of the matter.³³⁷

The commission, however, had begun to use other methods to obtain information. According to Athanasius, they began to make use of duress and violence in order to gain the cooperation of witnesses.³³⁸ Persons who would have had little, if any, knowledge of the affair, including catechumens (excluded from the offering of the oblation), Jews, and those without the Church were persuaded to confirm the allegations against Athanasius and Macarius.³³⁹ Nevertheless, contradictions remained apparent. It was learned that Macarius had visited the village on a weekday when the Eucharist would not have been celebrated.³⁴⁰ Ischyras had not encountered Macarius at the time of the alleged incident, for he had ill and in bed.³⁴¹ Even the witnesses against Athanasius, whom he had been accused of hiding, added information which helped to prove his innocence.³⁴²

The Mareotic clergy, witnessing the proceedings from a distance, wrote yet another letter, this one to the members of the synod in Tyre. In it they complained of 'the conspiracy which has been formed against our bishop Athanasius' and the obvious bias of the commissioners in the Mareotis.³⁴³ After again rehearsing the facts concerning the career of Ischyras and condemning the methods of the commissioners, the letter ended by encouraging the members of the synod to consider that there will also 'be a judgement held by God'.³⁴⁴ The commission itself, having completed its inquiry, began the journey back to Tyre, probably during the latter portion of September AD. 335.³⁴⁵

2.5 The Judgement at Tyre, October AD 335

While the Mareotic commission was holding its enquiry in Egypt, protests against their conduct and the procedures followed by the synod were being mounted in Tyre. Athanasius lodged a complaint with Dionysius concerning the composition of the commission.³⁴⁶ The forty-seven Egyptian bishops at Tyre delivered a petition to the assembled bishops in which they described the Mareotic commission as having been selected 'without our consent',³⁴⁷ and as having sent out couriers in order to bring Meletians into the Mareotis to testify against Athanasius.³⁴⁸ They followed this communication with an almost identical letter to Dionysius and, finally, with a third petition in which they made a formal appeal that the case be referred to the emperor himself.³⁴⁹ When Alexander of Thessalonica had been informed as to the biased actions of the commission, he likewise wrote to Dionysius warning him that a conspiracy had been formed against Athanasius which involved the Arians, the Meletians, and the Colluthians regarding the future of the Egyptian church.³⁵⁰ For his part, Dionysius wrote to the Eusebians and informed them that both Alexander and Athanasius had questioned the procedural conduct of the synod. He also provided them with a copy of the letter from Alexander with the warning that care should be taken not to provide grounds for an appeal by the accused parties.³⁵¹

The majority of the bishops in Tyre had, early in September, made their way to Jerusalem for the dedication of the Church of the Holy Sepulchre and an enlarged synodal gathering which formally readmitted Arius and Euzoius (and others of their party) to the communion of the Church.³⁵² The unity of the

Church, which Constantine had longed for, was now almost completely accomplished. Following a week of celebrations which lasted from 13-20 September AD 335, the bishops reassembled in Tyre to hear the report of the Mareotic commission and to pass judgement on Athanasius. The bishop of Alexandria, however, had already fled. Sozomen indicates that Athanasius had, at some earlier point in time, been forced to withdraw from the public sessions of the synod owing to the unruliness of the proceedings and fears for his safety on the part of the authorities.³⁵³ It is likely that, following the appeal to the emperor which the Egyptian bishops had submitted to Dionysius, Athanasius had decided (or was convinced) to make his way from Tyre to appear before the emperor in Constantinople, probably departing before the synod reconvened to hear the report of the commission.³⁵⁴

In his absence, the synod considered the report of the Mareotic commission. The full report of the commission doubtless contained a large number of irregularities and inconsistencies which were omitted from the formal summary presented to the synod, although Julius, the bishop of Rome, would later make use of these omissions in his defense of Athanasius.³⁵⁵ The particular charge which continued to receive the greatest attention was the destruction of the chalice of Ischyras which was attested to by the leading members of the commission.³⁵⁶ The accusations surrounding the treatment of Arsenius were passed over in silence.³⁵⁷ Athanasius was thereupon condemned by the synod, deposed from his episcopate, and forbidden to return to Alexandria in order that further divisions and disturbances might be avoided.³⁵⁸

Sozomen reports that following this sentence of deposition 'John [Archaph] and his followers were reinstated in fellowship... and each was placed again in his own clerical rank'.³⁵⁹ This, however, would seem to be somewhat of an anomaly as John had earlier been received by the emperor and, perhaps, temporarily by Athanasius. Socrates, while not mentioning John Archaph, states that Arsenius was restored to communion.³⁶⁰ Again, such a report is probably unfounded as Arsenius had already been reconciled to Athanasius before the synodal sessions at Tyre. In both instances the intent of the historians appears to be intertwined with the polemical device of showing the contrast between the reception of Athanasius' accusers while the bishop himself is unjustly condemned. Nevertheless, it is possible that the bishops at Tyre did make a special effort to publicly affirm the validity of the clerical status of the Meletians who were in attendance at the synod.

An account of the proceedings and the subsequent judgement of the assembled bishops was prepared and sent to Constantine.³⁶¹ Further, a similar account of the actions of the synod was included in a circular letter which was sent to 'the bishops of all regions' enjoining them not to receive Athanasius in fellowship or to communicate with him by letter.³⁶² Both of these letters contained and affirmed the multitude of charges that had been brought against Athanasius both before and after his flight from Tyre. Included in the list of accusations was the particular indictment that Athanasius had disobeyed the emperor by his failure to appear at Caesarea the previous year. The inclusion of this charge, which apparently had not been raised during the general sessions of the synod,

appears to have been a blatant attempt on the part of the pro-Arian bishops to contrast Athanasius' disobedience to Constantine's wishes with Arius' recent submission. Sozomen's summary of the synodal letter of condemnation is as follows:³⁶³

They also declared in this letter that they had been forced to bring this condemnation upon him [i.e. Athanasius] because when commanded by the emperor the preceding year to appear before the eastern bishops who were gathered at Caesarea, he disobeyed the summons, kept the bishops waiting for him, and set aside the commands of ruler. They also stated that when the bishops had assembled at Tyre, he went to the city intending to cause disturbances and riots at the synod, bringing with him a large retinue for this purpose; that when there he often refused to reply to the accusations brought against him, insulted individual bishops, and when called before them he sometimes obeyed, and at other times did not allow himself to be judged. In the same letter they specifically stated that he was without doubt guilty of having broken a sacred cup...

The language used in this declaration of guilt was intended to be inflammatory and only two specific items are mentioned. Firstly, and probably most importantly, Athanasius is presented as one who willfully disobeyed Constantine's summons to appear at Caesarea. Secondly, the accusation concerning the chalice of Ischyras is specified. The other portions of the letter are devoted to presenting the bishop of Alexandria as being a disruptive individual within the life of the Church, this being exemplified by his unwillingness to accept the actions of his opponents at the synod. The lack of substance in their verdict and the absence of Athanasius at its pronouncement clearly indicated that the matter of the bishop's ultimate fate was not yet fully decided. Further, in the presence of the Egyptian bishops, Marcellus of Ancyra, and other 'pro-Athanasian' bishops, the verdict, despite Constantine's later assertion to Antony the Hermit, could scarcely have been unanimous.

2.6 The Flight to Constantinople and Exile, November AD 335

The circumstances and manner of Athanasius' flight from Tyre has remained, despite numerous studies, a vexed question. The Egyptian bishops, writing within half a decade after the event, state that, 'the comes threatened him [i.e. Athanasius] with violence and was excited against him; the bishop fled from this violence and went before the most religious emperor' in order to protest against the actions of Dionysius and the synod at Tyre.³⁶⁴ Athanasius himself wrote that the decision to go before the emperor was made after the initial protests by Alexander of Thessalonica and the Egyptian bishops had been presented to Dionysius and had, apparently, been set aside. Athanasius writes that,³⁶⁵

While matters were proceeding in this manner, we withdrew from them, as from a gathering of duplicitous men, for they did whatever they wished, and there is no man in the world who does not know that proceedings favouring a single party cannot be upheld as good.

The placement of this passage precedes Athanasius' recapitulation of the proceedings at Tyre and his narrative of the reception of the Arians in Jerusalem. From the context of his account it has been assumed that Athanasius secretly departed Tyre during the last days of August or the early part of September.³⁶⁶ Although no exact date for his departure has been established, it is known that Athanasius arrived in Constantinople by 30 October AD 335.³⁶⁷ This dating, however, does present some difficulties. It is known that the journey from Tyre to the port of Gaza, which constitutes a similar distance, only took about twenty days. The journey of Athanasius, on the other hand, is roughly approximated as being one of two months.

This inconsistency has encouraged a perhaps overly dramatic reconstruction of events on the part of certain scholars. For example, P. Peeters, building upon the evidence marshalled by E. Schwartz, suggests that the length of the voyage had much to do with Athanasius' mode of transportation. Within the narrative of the Festal Letter Index VIII, Peeters translates the Syriac tophā as 'raft' and opines that Athanasius found 'a timber raft floating ... in the port' and made his way out of the harbour, 'resembling a prisoner making his escape'.³⁶⁸ T.D. Barnes has followed this tradition and evokes an even greater sense of adventure when he states that, 'Athanasius fled from Tyre in an open boat and under the cover of darkness, evading the soldiers who doubtless patrolled the harbor'.³⁶⁹ A. Martin is certainly correct in suggesting that, 'it is perhaps not necessary to dramatize any further the sailing from Tyre of which we do not know the date as much as that of the arrival at Constantinople'.³⁷⁰

In any case, there are certain difficulties with these dramatic reconstructions, as well as other possible explanations which should be brought forward. It is clear from the account of Sozomen that the first withdrawal of Athanasius from the sessions of the Synod of Tyre was at the instigation of 'the officers who had been appointed by the emperor' who were concerned for the safety of the bishop.³⁷¹ In this narrative, Athanasius' flight from Tyre immediately follows his removal from the proceedings by these officers. R.I. Frank, in his study of the scholae palatinae, writes that,³⁷²

When questions of security and order arose it was quite natural for scholares to be used.

Security was most notably a problem at the Council of Tyre, undoubtedly the most disorderly - one

might even say uproarious - of all the councils... Dionysius had at his command a detachment of soldiers. They are variously called 'military guards', 'foreigners' (that is, gentiles), 'an imperial detachment' and 'those whom the emperor had sent to maintain order'. It is clear that they were imperial guards.

Events showed that the guards were needed... The bishops hostile to Athanasius were so incensed ... that they attacked him in a body, and only the intervention of the guards on duty saved the patriarch from a violent death. The officers in charge took him out of the hall by a secret exit and that night sent him away on board a ship in order to avoid further danger.

Is it then possible to postulate that Athanasius' flight from Tyre was not that of an escaping prisoner, but rather one who was sent to Constantinople in some manner of protective custody? Certainly, the adventurous escape on a raft or small open boat becomes even more problematic when Athanasius states that five Egyptian bishops, Adamantius, Anubion, Agathammon, Arbethion, and Peter, all of whom had been at Tyre, were present at Constantinople, having apparently accompanied him on his journey.³⁷³ If the sessions of the synod had, in fact, been suspended to allow the bishops to make their way to the celebrations in Jerusalem (13-20 September) it may be possible to suggest that Athanasius and his companions left Tyre under the protection of Dionysius at about the same time. The length of the journey would thereby be shortened to about forty days or less and would allow for Athanasius' retinue travelling with him.

Admittedly, such a revisioning of these tangled and ill-reported events is hypothetical, but one may note that in the later letter of Constantine II which restored Athanasius to his see, the reason imputed to Constantine for the bishop's exile was one of protection from his enemies.³⁷⁴ Despite later assertions to the contrary, one may, therefore, possibly

question whether or not Athanasius' flight from Tyre was under the protection of imperial authority and may have provided the genesis for this face-saving literary device. If this is allowed as a possibility, the account in the letter of Constantine II may be seen as something other than a polite fiction.

When Athanasius and his companions arrived in Constantinople during the latter portion of October, Constantine was not in the city. The emperor appears to have left the capital for Nicopolis on or about 21 October and returned to Constantinople, according to A. Martin's calculations, on 30 October, whereupon he encountered Athanasius.³⁷⁵ Athanasius was most probably apprised of the time and place of the emperor's return, for as Constantine entered the city on horseback the bishop of Alexandria and his companions blocked the way and approached the emperor in 'the middle of the road'. Athanasius' appearance was such that Constantine did not recognize him in the first instance. It is likely that the bishop had dressed himself in mourning and, although Athanasius later attempted by editing to down play his pitiable condition, it is clear that he presented himself as a wronged and utterly dependant supplicant in the emperor's presence.³⁷⁶

After the emperor's attendants had ascertained the bishop's identity and complaint, however, Constantine refused to grant Athanasius a personal hearing and came close to having the bishop forcibly removed from the roadway. At the last moment, Athanasius declared that he asked only one favour, that he might make his complaint to the emperor in the presence of the bishops from Tyre who had wronged him. Constantine relented, stating that,³⁷⁷

As this appeared to me to be a reasonable request, I commanded this letter to be written to you [i.e. the bishops at Tyre] so that all of you who made up the synod which was held at Tyre, might quickly and without delay come to the court of my clemency, in order to prove by evidence that you have passed an impartial and sound judgement.

Constantine was apparently as yet uncertain as to what had transpired at Tyre and does not seem to have been in possession of the synodal letter of condemnation. By making use of Martin's calculations, it is possible that Athanasius had several days in which to convince Constantine that he had been unjustly dealt with at Tyre. What happened next is uncertain, but it is argued by some, as Peeters and Barnes, that Eusebius of Nicomedia accompanied by Theognis, Patrophilus, Eusebius of Caesarea, Ursacius and Valens arrived in the capital on 6 November, the very day that Constantine was preparing his letter.³⁷⁸ This convenient and dramatic scenario, however, is entirely circumstantial.

The Festal Letter Index VIII informs us that Athanasius arrived in the capital on 30 October, but had to wait eight days before presenting himself before Constantine, that is, until 6 November. The Index also indicates that Athanasius was sent into exile on the following day, 7 November.³⁷⁹ Although G.R. Sievers argued that this date is incorrect and should be amended to 5 February AD 336, the transmitted date of 7 November AD 335 has been well defended by P. Peeters and is consistent with the witness of the Acephale which indicates that the duration of Athanasius' first exile was 28 months and eleven days, a time which corresponds with the bishop's banishment from the capital on this day.³⁸⁰ If Sievers is indeed incorrect, and the circumstantial evidence does seem to indicate that this is the case,

it must be allowed that the Eusebian party was probably already present in the capital on 6/7 November.

A. Martin, however, has argued that 30 October was the date of Athanasius' first meeting with Constantine 'and not the date of his arrival in the capital, as the Index would have us to believe'.³⁸¹ This would allow for a period of several days, during which Athanasius might have met with the emperor and the letter of Constantine could have been prepared for dispatch. Within this first week of November, the Eusebian party from Tyre could also have arrived and learned of what was taking place. Although somewhat less dramatic, such a time sequence does seem somewhat more realistic.

It is slightly less puzzling, therefore, why Athanasius indicates that Eusebius and his confederates had read the letter of Constantine prior to their journey to the capital and prevented any other bishops than themselves from attending upon the emperor.³⁸² Within the context of Athanasius' narrative there is simply a compression of events which lacks chronological accuracy. The subsequent actions of the Eusebians at court would have certainly convinced Athanasius that they had been informed beforehand of the contents of Constantine's letter. Had the Eusebians been in the capital for even a few days, it is difficult to believe that they would not have had access to such information. Such knowledge, however, could only have been obtained after their arrival in Constantinople.

It is entirely likely that T.D. Barnes is correct in his assertion that, by the time of Athanasius' arrival in Constantinople, the six Eusebian bishops were already enroute to the capital bearing the synodal letter of condemnation from Tyre

in order to deliver it in person to the emperor.³⁸³ If, as E. Schwartz suggests, the final session of Tyre took place after the Synod of Jerusalem (13-20 September), Eusebius and his companions could have easily left Tyre during the early portion of October and made the twenty day journey to Constantinople with their arrival falling within the first week of November, that is, a short time after Athanasius' first meeting with Constantine.³⁸⁴ That they carried with them the letter from the Synod of Tyre may be indicated by Athanasius when he specifically states within the context of their arrival in the capital that, 'they no longer said anything about the cup and Arsenius' having perceived that the situation had now changed.³⁸⁵

According to Barnes, the change that had taken place was that the emperor had ordered the bishops from Tyre to reassemble in Constantinople and 'by implication, therefore, Constantine annulled the decisions already made by the council'.³⁸⁶ This view is in contrast to that of K.M. Girardet who contends that Athanasius' exile subsequent to his last interview with Constantine was the emperor's legal 'execution of the judgement of Tyre'.³⁸⁷ Each of these views presupposes that the Synod of Tyre possessed an authority which was substantially more than advisory in its nature. Whatever the true extent of this authority was, however, it is clear from subsequent events that Constantine considered the judgement of the synod to be subject to his review and, as matters transpired, all of the primary sources appear to be in agreement that Athanasius' banishment was based upon an accusation which had not been brought forward at Tyre or included in the synodal letter of condemnation. To this extent it would seem that Barnes is substantially closer to

the truth of the matter in his assertion that Constantine annulled the judgement which had been promulgated by the synod.

Both Socrates and Sozomen, while following the chronologically inaccurate narrative of Athanasius, indicate the consternation of the bishops at Tyre over the setting aside of their judgement by the emperor.³⁸⁸ Socrates indicates that the Eusebians who journeyed to the capital decided not 'to allow any further inquiry ... concerning the broken cup, the overthrown altar, or the killing of Arsenius', that is, those very charges included in the synodal letter of condemnation.³⁸⁹ Sozomen, however, while emphasizing the fear of the bishops at Tyre over the emperor's reversal, claims that the Eusebians who had made their way to Constantinople simply added a further accusation to those which had been advanced at the synod.³⁹⁰

With the original synodal condemnation of Athanasius now, for all intents and purposes, set aside and the emperor requiring the recall of the bishops to a new session in Constantinople, Eusebius of Nicomedia and the other five bishops decided upon a new course of action. In an interview with Constantine, probably on 6 November, at which the pro-Athanasian Egyptian bishops were also present, they accused the bishop of Alexandria of treason.³⁹¹ The substance of the charge was that Athanasius had threatened to prevent the transportation of grain from Egypt to Constantinople.³⁹²

Whether Athanasius was given the opportunity to answer this charge is uncertain. When the bishop of Alexandria related the incident almost twenty years after the event, he stated that, the emperor 'was quickly angered, and instead of allowing me a hearing, he sent me away into Gaul'.³⁹³ In the letter of the

Egyptian bishops, however, written only three years after the confrontation, Athanasius seems to be present when the accusation is made by Eusebius of Nicomedia, for upon hearing the charge he wept and cried out that he was incapable of making such a threat as he was a poor man without such power in his position.³⁹⁴ Eusebius' rejoinder, as recorded in this narrative, was to publicly repeat the charge and state that Athanasius was a rich and powerful man who was able to do anything.³⁹⁵ Epiphanius relates that Athanasius was indeed present and ordered by Constantine to answer this new accusation. In the course of the interview, according to this account, both Constantine and Athanasius, became increasingly angry until, at the last, the bishop of Alexandria invoked divine judgement and stated that God would decide between them.³⁹⁶

Taking these accounts together, it seems likely that Athanasius was present for at least some portion of this final interview with Constantine. When Athanasius states that he was sent into exile without a hearing, it may be that the bishop had requested a formal session before the emperor in which he would have had the opportunity to advance evidence on his behalf in order to disprove the accusation. Clearly, no such formal enquiry took place. It may also be noted that while the letter of the Egyptian bishops included Athanasius' emotional denials, the bishop himself makes no mention of the scene. The description of Epiphanius, while the most dramatic and likely conveying the spirit of the encounter, is without corroboration as to the details presented.

All of the narratives agree as to one point in particular, that being the anger of Constantine. Whether this anger was

owing to exasperation or the provocation of Athanasius or Eusebius will likely remain an unanswered question. What is certain, however, is that Constantine acted decisively. No further trial was held. No further synod was called to consider the matter. Athanasius was not even formally deposed as the bishop of Alexandria, but was banished to Trier in Gaul. On 7 November AD 335, almost immediately after this last interview, Athanasius set sail from Constantinople, possibly making his way to Trier by way of Rome.³⁹⁷

What then was the reason for Athanasius' first exile? All of the narratives agree that the primary cause of Constantine's anger had to do, in one way or another, with the alleged threat of Athanasius concerning the delay of grain shipments from Alexandria to Constantinople. According to Socrates, Constantine had issued a daily allowance of 80,000 measures of grain to the citizens of the capital. He further states that this grain was brought directly from Alexandria.³⁹⁸ The delay or impeding of these shipments would have been a disaster of the first rank for Constantine's fledgling capital. At very nearly the same time as Athanasius' first exile, another incident took place which illustrates the importance Constantine placed upon these regular deliveries from Egypt. Barnes describes the incident as follows:³⁹⁹

Sopater, a pupil of Iamblichus, had frequented the court of Licinius; he came to the court of Constantine after his master's death. Despite Sopater's paganism, the emperor held him in high esteem, conversed long with him, and used him as an adviser when conducting public business. However, one autumn the grain ships were delayed by the weather, and the hungry crowd in the hippodrome evinced its displeasure with the emperor. Sopater's enemies pounced. They accused the philosopher of fettering the winds. Constantine condemned Sopater to be beheaded (perhaps about the same

time as Athanasius' enemies secured his removal by accusing him of threatening the grain supply).

From the account related above, it is perhaps easier to understand what might otherwise appear to be merely a rhetorical remark in the letter of the Egyptian bishops written three years later which states that, 'the grace of God ... moved the pious emperor to mercy for he sentenced him [i.e. Athanasius] to banishment instead of death'.⁴⁰⁰

It is known that Athanasius did have control over some grain supplies in Egypt which Constantine had allocated to the bishops of Egypt and Libya for the support of widows and the poor. The bishop of Alexandria as metropolitan most probably supervised the distribution of this supply. There were past allegations by his enemies that Athanasius had been involved in the illegal sale of this grain, but these accusations had been dismissed.⁴⁰¹ In any case, the amount of grain involved would have been very small in comparison to the shipments bound for the capital. In a slightly different connection, H.G. Opitz opined that Athanasius maintained a particular influence among the sailors and dockworkers of Alexandria.⁴⁰² It is, however, difficult to connect either his control of a charitable stock of grain or his possible popularity in the Alexandrine docks with the ability to prevent the regular shipments from Egypt to the capital.

When considering Athanasius' actual power with regard to his extensive see, it should also be remembered that the bishop, while in Tyre, was unable to influence or to control the activities of the Mareotic commission either in the hinterlands of lower Egypt or in Alexandria itself. Furthermore, it is difficult to believe that after so many interviews with the emperor

in which Athanasius was able to turn the tables on his enemies by persuasion, he would have resorted to threats, such as the one which has been alleged, as a means of bargaining or escape. If, however, the case of Athanasius is compared with that of Sopater, it seems possible that the emperor may only have needed to believe that Athanasius could influence the shipments (or to have claimed such ability) in order to be moved to pronounce a sentence of banishment upon the bishop. In either case, there is no evidence, apart from the Eusebian accusation, that Athanasius actually conspired to cause such delays or threatened to do so. At this particular time, given Athanasius' weakened position, such a course of action seems very unlikely.

There is, however, another possible cause for Constantine's banishment of Athanasius. Socrates states that, 'some affirm that the emperor came to this decision in order to establish unity in the church' which would have been impossible since Athanasius refused to accept the readmission of Arius and his companions.⁴⁰³ Sozomen echoes this assertion, but comments that it is uncertain whether or not the emperor believed any of the accusations or simply imagined that 'unity would be restored among the bishops if Athanasius were removed'.⁴⁰⁴ Considering the crime(s) with which Athanasius was accused, mere banishment to a provincial capital with the retention of his dignity as a bishop was slight punishment. The sentence in itself may argue that Constantine was less convinced of wrongdoing on the part of the bishop and more convinced that Athanasius was an impediment to structural unity within the Church.

Such a view might be strengthened by the fact that the anti-Athanasian Meletian faction also sustained a substantial

defeat subsequent to Tyre. Sozomen reports that following the banishment of Athanasius the Egyptian church became factionalized, with some supporting Athanasius while the Meletians had apparently put forward John Archaph as the de facto bishop of Alexandria. When Constantine became aware of this situation, he immediately exiled the Meletian leader, imposing upon him the same sentence of banishment which had been received by Athanasius. The reason given by the historian was that the emperor was unwilling to receive the requests or petitions of 'any person who was suspected of causing dissension or strife' within the Christian community.⁴⁰⁵ Sozomen, by way of an editorial comment, also relates that the decrees of the Synod of Tyre 'did not bring any benefits' to John Archaph and, by implication, the Meletian community in Egypt.⁴⁰⁶ Such a statement lends greater weight to the view that the decrees of Tyre were never recognized by either Constantine or a good many others within the Church as being binding or conclusive. Furthermore, although Constantine would enjoin Antony the hermit not to 'overlook the decrees of the synod' of Tyre in regard to Athanasius, it is clear that the emperor himself treated them very lightly in practice, if, in fact, he took them into account at all.⁴⁰⁷

Athanasius himself would later contend that Constantine had banished him so that he would be protected from the hostility and hatred of his enemies. It is important, however, to note that he makes this claim firstly in connection with the letter of Constantine II which was written on the occasion of the bishop's return from his first exile, 17 June AD 337, and secondly in connection with his contention that Constantine did not exile

him in order to please the Eusebians, for the emperor did not replace him as the bishop of Alexandria with a candidate of their choice.⁴⁰⁸ In each case the emphasis has been placed upon the decision of the emperor alone over against the so-called judgement of the Synod of Tyre. Moreover, the fact that Constantine did not accede to the wishes of the Eusebian bishops in regard to the vacant see of Alexandria may indicate that the exile of Athanasius was intended by the emperor to be a temporary measure, as stated by Constantine II in his letter.⁴⁰⁹ The possibility remains, as has been stated above, that Athanasius was removed from Tyre for his own protection. In the intense polemical atmosphere which surrounded his return from exile and continued into future years, this concept of protective custody may well have been extended by the bishop and his supporters to cover the whole of the first exile.

The fact remains that the see of Alexandria did remain vacant throughout Athanasius' first exile. In addition to the intrusion of John Archaph, it is possible that Secundus of Ptolemais, following his own restoration, attempted to consecrate Pistus, an Arian presbyter of Alexandria, as bishop in Athanasius' stead.⁴¹⁰ E. Schwartz, however, is of the opinion that Pistus was only made bishop of the Mareotis, although this seems unlikely as Ischyras appears to have been elevated to this 'honour' as a reward for his service at Tyre.⁴¹⁰ In any case, Pistus does not seem to have been recognized by either his fellow clergy or the imperial authorities and soon fades from view. Although banished to 'the ends of the earth' in Trier, Athanasius remained the bishop of Alexandria, notwithstanding the actions of the Synod of Tyre.⁴¹¹

From all of the evidence gathered above, it is not unreasonable to conclude that the banishment of Athanasius by Constantine was not a direct result of the charges brought against him at Tyre much less the synodal letter of condemnation which the bishops at Tyre put forward. The exile of Athanasius, possibly intended to be a temporary measure, was the result of an imperial edict issued in an effort to restore peace within the Christian community. The issue of the validity of the decisions made at the Synod of Tyre, however, would continue to follow Athanasius throughout his remaining episcopal career.

SECTION II
ATHANASIUS AND THE SYNOD OF TYRE
NOTES

- ¹Frances Young, *From Nicaea to Chalcedon*, p. 67
- ²*vide supra*, Section One, fn. 268
- ³Rowan Williams, *Arius. Heresy and Tradition*, p. 76; cf. Socrates, *HE I*, 27 (PG 67, 152B) and Sozomen *HE II*, 18 (Bidez, p. 74, 9-14)
- ⁴Sozomen, *HE II*, 22 (Bidez, p. 79, 5-15)
- ⁵*cf. Apol.* 59, 4-5 (Opitz, p. 139, 20 - p. 140, 10)
- ⁶*Apol.* 60, 1 (Opitz, p. 140, 11-12); *vide supra*, Section One, fn. 268
- ⁷*Festal Letter II*, 7 (Robertson, *LNPF*, Series II, Vol. 4, p. 510)
- ⁸Sozomen, *HE II*, 21 (Bidez, p. 77, 6ff); cf. Epiphanius, *Haer* 68, 6ff (Holl, p. 145, 27ff)
- ⁹*Apol.* 60, 1 (Opitz, p. 140, 13-15)
- ¹⁰Epiphanius, *Haer.* 68, 6ff (Holl, p. 145, 27ff)
- ¹¹Timothy Barnes, *Constantine and Eusebius*, p. 231
- ¹²*ibid.*
- ¹³*Apol.* 60, 2 (Opitz, p. 140, 15-18)
- ¹⁴στύχαρα, *ibid.*; cf. E. Schwartz, *GS III*, p. 193, fn. 2 and K.M. Girardet, *Kaisergericht und Bischofsgericht*, pp. 57, 58
- ¹⁵Timothy Barnes, *The New Empire of Diocletian and Constantine*, London, 1982, p. 78
- ¹⁶*ibid.*, p. 78, fn. 132; Epiphanius, *Haer.* 68, 5-6 (Holl, p. 145, 4ff); cf. Socrates, *HE I*, 27, 8 (PG 67, 152B)
- ¹⁷*Histoire 'Acephale' et Index Syriaque des Lettres Festales d'Athanase d'Alexandrie* (A. Martin with M. Albert, eds.) SC 317, Paris, 1985, p. 229
- ¹⁸Schwartz, *GS IV*, p. 7; cf. V. Peri, 'La cronologia delle lettere festali di Sant' Atanasio e la quaresima', *Aevum* 35 (1961), pp. 45ff

- ¹⁹ L.T. Lefort, 'Les lettres festales de Saint Athanase', *Bulletin de l'Académie Royale de Belgique, Classe des Lettres* (5) 39 (1953), pp. 646ff; An unexplained reference by Athanasius in *Festal Letter III*, 1, remains. Athanasius comments that he is 'under restraint', that is, not at full liberty to write all that he might wish (Robertson, *op. cit.*, p. 512). We know from the existing chronology that Athanasius was not appearing before the emperor at this time (*cf.* Barnes, *The New Empire*, p. 78) and that this letter was written from the Thebaid (*Histoire*, (A. Martin), p. 229). It is possible that he was under a sense of restraint from writing at length owing to the delicacy of dealing with Meletian intrusions within the monastic communities where he was engaged in an episcopal visitation (H. Nordberg, *Athanasius and the Emperor*, p. 22). Without further documentary evidence, however, it is impossible to give an exact explanation of the context and we may only speculate as to the meaning of this oblique reference.
- ²⁰ *Apol.* 60, 3 (Opitz, p. 140, 19-20)
- ²¹ Nordberg, *Athanasius and the Emperor*, p. 22
- ²² *Apol.* 60, 3 (Opitz, p. 140, 19-21)
- ²³ *Apol.* 71, 6 (Opitz, p. 151, 9)
- ²⁴ For a more complete treatment of the extent to which Athanasius made use of a large number of ex-Meletians, *vide supra*, Section One, fn. 270
- ²⁵ *Apol.* 60, 3 (Opitz, p. 140, 20-21)
- ²⁶ *Histoire* (A. Martin), p. 229
- ²⁷ Barnes, *The New Empire*, p. 78
- ²⁸ *Festal Letter IV* (Robertson, *op. cit.*, p. 517)
- ²⁹ *ibid.*
- ³⁰ Alan K. Bowman, *Egypt After the Pharaohs. 332 BC - AD 642, From Alexander to the Arab Conquest*, Oxford, 1986, pp. 93, 183; Socrates, *HE I*, 27, 9 (PG 67, 153A)
- ³¹ *Histoire* (A. Martin), *loc. cit.*
- ³² J. Hefele, *History of the Councils of the Church*, I, p. 228; For a more complete treatment of this aspect of the accusations against Athanasius, *vide supra*, Section One, sub-section 3.2 and following.

- ³³ *Apol.* 60, 4 (Opitz, p. 140, 22-23)
- ³⁴ Socrates, *HE I*, 27, 9 (PG 67, 153A)
- ³⁵ *cf.* Barnes, *Constantine and Eusebius*, p. 386, n. 69
- ³⁶ The phrase κατὰ βασιλέως γενόμενος which is used by Athanasius leaves little doubt as to his understanding of the implications contained within the charge made against him (*Apol.* 60, 4; Opitz, p. 141, 1). Several writers, however, have interpreted the accusation as an Athanasian attempt to bribe an official who was in disgrace, *cf.* H. Lietzmann, *From Constantine to Julian*, London, 1961, p. 129; A.H.M. Jones, *Constantine and the Conversion of Europe*, London, (second edition), 1972, p. 178; and W.H.C. Frend, *The Rise of Christianity*, London, 1984, p. 526. A troubling aspect of this view is what reasoning might stand behind the bribing of an official in disgrace. Certainly, it is difficult to see what advantage might be gained by such an action on the part of Athanasius. If, as Barnes suggests (*Barnes, loc. cit.*), Philumenus was involved in a plot to kill Constantine, there would be far greater reason for Athanasius to fear the charge, understanding it as κατὰ βασιλέως γενόμενος.
- ³⁷ R.P.C. Hanson, 'The Fate of Eustathius of Antioch', *ZKG* 95 (1984), 2, p. 179
- ³⁸ Hilary, *Collectio Antiariana* (Feder, *CSEL* 65) IV, p. 27, 66
- ³⁹ *Hist. Arian.* 4, 1 (Opitz, p. 184, 31 - p. 185, 3)
- ⁴⁰ Barnes, *Constantine and Eusebius*, p. 228
- ⁴¹ The phrase ψυχικὸν τι ἁμάρτημα used within the canon does not appear to have reference only to moral transgressions, but to capital offenses in the civil realm, as well (Hefele, *op. cit.*, p. 379).
- ⁴² *ibid.*, p. 379
- ⁴³ *vide supra*, Section One, subsection 3.2
- ⁴⁴ A.H.M. Jones, *The Late Roman Empire 284-602*, Oxford, 1964, Vol. II, pp. 914-920
- ⁴⁵ V. Twomey, *Apostolikos Thronos*, pp. 348, 349
- ⁴⁶ For further details concerning this charge, *cf.* Girardet, *op. cit.*, pp. 58-60

- ⁴⁷ *Apol.* 59, 3 (Opitz, p. 139, 20)
- ⁴⁸ *Festal Letter IV*, 1 (Robertson, *op. cit.*, p. 515)
- ⁴⁹ *Apol.* 65, 1 (Opitz, p. 144, 3-6)
- ⁵⁰ *Festal Letter IV*, 5 (Robertson, *op. cit.*, p. 517)
- ⁵¹ *ibid.* IV, 1 (Robertson, *op. cit.*, p. 516)
- ⁵² *ibid.* (Robertson, *op. cit.*, p. 517); cf. Barnes, *The New Empire*, p. 104. Flavius Ablavius was the father of the unfortunate Olympias who was betrothed to Constans and was later betrayed by Constantius, cf. *Hist. Arian.* 69, 1 (Opitz, p. 221, 4).
- ⁵³ *Festal Letter IV*, 1 (Robertson, *op. cit.*, p. 516)
- ⁵⁴ J.D. Mansi, *Sacrorum Conciliorum Nova et Amplissima Collectio*, Florence, 1760, Vol. II, pp. 1308-1320. These canons, which are often ascribed to the Synod of Antioch Encaenia, were, more likely, enacted by the Synod of Antioch which was held ca. AD 328 - AD 329, (cf. A.H.M. Jones, *op. cit.*, Vol. II, p. 1084, n. 41). For the date of this earlier Synod of Antioch, cf. T.D. Barnes, 'Emperor and Bishops, AD 324-344: Some Problems', *American Journal of Ancient History* 3 (1978), pp. 53-56. In opposition to the view of Jones and for a traditional dating of the canons, cf. Hefele, *op. cit.*, Vol. 2, pp. 64-66. In favour of Jones, cf. H. Hess, *op. cit.*, Appendix II, pp. 145-150.
- ⁵⁵ A.H.M. Jones, *op. cit.*, Vol. I, p. 96
- ⁵⁶ *ibid.*
- ⁵⁷ Concerning Athanasius' relations with imperial authority, K.M. Setton has stated that the bishop of Alexandria's 'ideal... was an independent Church protected by the God-given Emperor' (K.M. Setton, *Christian Attitude Toward the Emperor in the Fourth Century*, New York, 1941, p. 54). For Athanasius' relationships with hostile imperial authorities, cf. Setton, *op. cit.*, pp. 78ff and Nordberg, *Athanasius and the Emperor*, pp. 43ff. A valuable contribution to this area of study has been made by S. Papadopoulos, *ΑΘΑΝΑΣΙΟΣ Ο ΜΕΤΑΣ ΚΑΙ Η ΘΕΟΛΟΓΙΑ ΤΗΣ ΟΙΚΟΥΜΕΝΙΚΗΣ ΣΥΝΟΔΟΥ*, Athens, 1975. Papadopoulos indicates that Athanasius' flexibility as to 'the placement of the political power in the work of the synod' is central to his view of imperial power (*op. cit.*, p. 183). This is important although 'the judgement of the bishops and the emperor may differ' (*op. cit.*, p. 187). In the view of Papadopoulos, the Athanasian ideal is not to 'mix the empire and the Church' in matters of faith and ecclesiastical order (*op. cit.*, p. 194), but he recognized that varying approaches must be used

with each differing emperor in turn. L.W. Barnard echoes this conclusion in stating that,
 It is then not surprising that Athanasius' attitude towards the Roman State has to be inferred from scattered and incidental references in his writings. He was dealing with the transition of the Empire from paganism to Christianity, not with an established Christian State. There was not one imperial policy with which he had to deal, but the religious policies of several emperors (L.W. Barnard, 'Athanasius and the Roman State', *Latomus* 36, 1977, p. 423).

That Athanasius changed his policy, at least to some extent, with the differing regimes is certainly apparent. Barnard, however, has stated the key issue of Athanasius' policy as follows:

Athanasius claimed the right of the Church to manage its own affairs without imperial interference - indeed the sum total of his (later) charges against Constantius derive from the one premise that the Emperor had infringed ecclesiastical order and mingled Roman sovereignty and the constitution of the Church (*ibid.*, p. 435).

⁵⁸ *ibid.*, pp. 436, 437; cf. W.H.C. Frend, *The Rise of Christianity*, p. 526

⁵⁹ cf. Barnard, *op. cit.*, p. 429

⁶⁰ τὰ τῆς συνόδου δόγματα κυρῶν ἐπεσφραγίζετο, Eusebius, *Vita Constant.*, III, 23 (Heikel, *GCS* 7, pp. 88, 89)

⁶¹ *Festal Letter Index III, Histoire* (A. Martin), p. 229; The reference to Athanasius' appearance before Constantine and his return to Alexandria is misplaced in the *Index* and ought to have been placed under *Index IV* which relates to the *Festal Letter* for AD 332.

⁶² cf. Barnes, *The New Empire*, p. 79; H.M. Gwatkin, *Studies of Arianism*, p. 87, fn. 4

⁶³ cf., Barnes, *loc. cit.*, and T.D. Barnes, 'The Victories of Constantine', *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 20 (1976), pp. 151ff.

⁶⁴ *Apol.* 61, 1 (Opitz, p. 141, 4-5)

⁶⁵ τῶν ἐρεσχηλούντων, *Apol.* 61, 1 (Opitz, p. 141, 10-11)

⁶⁶ φθόνου, *Apol.* 61, 2 (Opitz, p. 141, 12);

τῶν ἀχαρίστων ἐλαττώματα, *Apol.* 61, 2 (Opitz, p. 141, 15)

- ⁶⁷ οὐ γὰρ μωροὶ ἐπὶ τῆς γλώττης κειμένην ἔχουσι τὴν κακίαν,
Apol. 62, 1 (Opitz, p. 141, 29)
- ⁶⁸ Apol. 62, 3 (Opitz, p. 142, 3-6)
- ⁶⁹ ἀναξίτους, *ibid.* (Opitz, p. 142, 4)
- ⁷⁰ ἐκεῖνος πρεσβύτερός ἐστι καὶ ἐκεῖνος παῦς, *ibid.* (Opitz,
p. 142, 4-5)
- ⁷¹ ἡ τιμή, *ibid.*
- ⁷² πειράσομαι, *ibid.* (Opitz, p. 142, 6)
- ⁷³ ἀρχιαιρεσίαν, *ibid.* (Opitz, p. 142, 7)
- ⁷⁴ οὐ πονηροὶ, Apol. 62, 5 (Opitz, p. 142, 12)
- ⁷⁵ Apol. 62, 6 (Opitz, p. 142, 18)
- ⁷⁶ *cf.* Opitz, p. 142, fn. 1. 12
- ⁷⁷ *vide supra*, Section One, fn. 223
- ⁷⁸ J.G. Milne, *A History of Egypt Under Roman Rule*, London, 1898.
Milne suggests that,
This slight upon Alexandria did not tend to improve the
feeling of the inhabitants towards the emperor; and one
Philmenos attempted to raise a rebellion in Egypt, with
the assistance, as it is said, of Athanasius; but his
plans were discovered and crushed before any serious
rising could occur (*op. cit.*, p. 90)
It may be noted that no documentary evidence has been put
forward to support this claim by Milne.
- ⁷⁹ *vide supra*, fn. 70
- ⁸⁰ Hefele, *op. cit.*, I, p. 228;
cf. A.H.M. Jones, *op. cit.*, II, p. 914
- ⁸¹ *cf. supra*, fn. 70
- ⁸² *cf. supra*, fn. 66 and Hefele, *op. cit.*, p. 384, fn. 220
- ⁸³ ἀναξίτους, Apol. 62, 3 (Opitz, p. 142, 4)
- ⁸⁴ Eusebius, *Vita Constant.*, IV, 24 (Heikel, GCS 7, p. 126)

- ⁸⁵ *cf. Apol.* 68, 7 (Opitz, p. 147, 3-4); The contention by some, such as V. Twomey, that this case and subsequent judgements by Constantine were primarily civil in nature is certainly not correct in regard to the judgement under discussion and appears to be based upon a false distinction. It remains somewhat obvious, however, that Athanasius' adversaries hoped for his conviction upon a crime against the State which would result in a capital sentence and/or subsequent deposition from his see (*cf. V. Twomey, op. cit.*, pp. 348, 349).
- ⁸⁶ κρύφα φύλος, *Apol.* 59, 4 (Opitz, p. 139, 20)
- ⁸⁷ *Festal Letter* IV, 5 (Robertson, *op. cit.*, p. 517) mentions only the Meletians as adversaries at court.
- ⁸⁸ *Festal Letter Index* IV, *Histoire* (A. Martin), p. 231
- ⁸⁹ *ibid.*
- ⁹⁰ Williams, *op. cit.*, p. 76
- ⁹¹ Barnes, *Constantine and Eusebius*, p. 232
- ⁹² Nicetas, *Thesaurus*, 5, 7 (PG 139, 1368)
- ⁹³ *cf. the collection of the lists of signatories printed in Mansi, op. cit.*, II, pp. 692ff. That these lists are incomplete may be seen by simple comparison. The fact, therefore, that Sentianos of Boreion is not listed may only mean that he is among the missing signatories, although his presence at Nicaea is uncertain. For further information concerning the lists of the bishops who were present at Nicaea with regard to those from Libya, *cf. the following fundamental studies of E. Honigmann, 'Recherches sur les listes des Pères de Nicée et de Constantinople', Byzantion* 11 (1936), pp. 429-449; 'Sur les listes des évêques participant au concile de Nicée', *ibid.* 12 (1937), pp. 323-347; 'La liste originale des Pères de Nicée', *ibid.*, 14 (1939), pp. 17-76; 'The original lists of the members of the Council of Nicaea', *ibid.* 16 (1942/1943), pp. 20-28; 'Une liste inédite des Pères de Nicée', *ibid.* 20 (1950), pp. 63-71.
- ⁹⁴ *De Decretis* 35, 6 (Opitz, p. 32, 18-19); *ibid.* 36, 5 (Opitz, p. 35, 5-6)
- ⁹⁵ Philostorgius, *HE* 1, 10
- ⁹⁶ O. Seeck, *Geschichte des Untergangs der antiken Welt*, III, (second edition), Stuttgart, 1921, p. 401

- ⁹⁷ *cf. Hist. Arian.* 65, 3 (Opitz, p. 219, 3-6); *ibid.* 71, 4 (Opitz, p. 222, 17); *De Syn.* 12, 3 (Opitz, p. 239, 20); *Ad epis. Aeg. et Lib.* 19 (PG 25, 584B). That Secundus was eventually received by the Eusebians is attested to by Athanasius, but with no hint as to the date or context, *cf. Ad epis. Aeg. et Lib.* 7 (PG 25, 553A).
- ⁹⁸ H. Chadwick, 'Faith and Order at the Council of Nicaea: A Note on the Background of the Sixth Canon', *HTR* 53 (1960), p. 192
- ⁹⁹ *ibid.*, fn. 69; *cf. De Syn.* 21, 3 (Opitz, p. 248, 1) along with Opitz's note on the question of what persons were received (*ibid.*, line 1, footnote).
- ¹⁰⁰ Philostorgius, *HE* 2, 1, 1b
- ¹⁰¹ *Apol.* 24, 1-2 (Opitz, p. 105, 9-15)
- ¹⁰² Williams, *op. cit.*, p. 76
- ¹⁰³ *cf. Chadwick, op. cit.*, pp. 189-192
- ¹⁰⁴ *cf. Williams, op. cit.*, pp. 75, 76
- ¹⁰⁵ Gwatkin, *op. cit.*, p. 90, fn. 2
- ¹⁰⁶ Williams, *op. cit.*, p. 76
- ¹⁰⁷ *Festal Letter III*, 5 (Robertson, *op. cit.*, p. 514)
- ¹⁰⁸ *ibid.*, V, 4 (Robertson, *op. cit.*, p. 519)
- ¹⁰⁹ ὡς ἀνθρώπων ... θεοῦ, *Apol.* 62, 6 (Opitz, p. 142, 18)
- ¹¹⁰ That Arius was in Libya may be inferred by the references in Constantine's reply (*cf. Opitz III*, U34, 20; p. 72, 1-2), and by the fact that the letter was addressed to those in Alexandria, the metropolitan see of the region under canon six of the Council of Nicaea.
- ¹¹¹ Williams, *op. cit.*, p. 77
- ¹¹² *cf. Opitz III*, U34, 11 (p. 70, 18-19); U34, 20 (p. 72, 2); U34, 39 (p. 74, 16ff)
- ¹¹³ *cf. Opitz III*, U34, 20 (p. 72, 2)

- ¹¹⁴Hefele, *op. cit.*, I, p. 388
- ¹¹⁵Williams, *op. cit.*, p. 77
- ¹¹⁶Opitz III, U34, 43 (p. 75, 6); *cf. Apol.* 59, 6 (Opitz, p. 140, 5)
- ¹¹⁷Opitz III, U33 (pp. 66-68)
- ¹¹⁸*ibid.*, U33, 1 (p. 67, 1-3)
- ¹¹⁹*ibid.*, U33, 1-2 (p. 67, 5 - p. 68, 1)
- ¹²⁰*ibid.*, U33, 2 (p. 68, 3-6)
- ¹²¹Opitz III, U34 (pp. 69-75); Barnes, *op. cit.*, p. 233; It is important to note that some have questioned the authenticity and/or the dating of portions of this document. J.-M. Sansterre considers only the closing portion of the letter (Opitz III, U34, 42) to be genuine, placing a date of ca. AD 325 - AD 327 upon the material (*cf. J.-M. Sansterre, 'Eusèbe de Césarée et la naissance de la théorie "Césaropapiste"', Byzantion* 42 (1972), pp. 159-161). H. Kraft, however, considers the greater portion of U34 to be authentic, although he remains uncertain as to the exact dating of the document (*cf. H. Kraft, Kaiser Konstantins religiöse Entwicklung, Tübingen, 1955, pp. 239-242*). R. Williams and T.D. Barnes both accept the letter's authenticity and date the document to ca. AD 333, relying heavily upon the reference to the Egyptian prefect Paterius in U34, 43 (Opitz III, p. 75, 6) as a link to the *Festal Letter Index V*, for AD 333, which also lists Paterius as the prefect in Egypt (*cf. Histoire, A. Martin, p. 231*). This present study accepts the authenticity of U34 as a single document and, owing to the identification of Paterius and the other circumstantial evidence cited in the text, places its writing early in ca. AD 333, most probably before Athanasius' writing of his Easter letter for that year. Minor corrections to Opitz's text of U34 are suggested in H. Chadwick, 'Athanasius, *De Decretis* XL.3', *JTS*, 49 (1948), pp. 168-169.
- ¹²²Κακῆς ἐρμηνεῦς αὐτόχρομα εἰκῶν τε καὶ ἀνδρίας ἐστὶ τοῦ διαβόλου, U34, 1 (Opitz III, p. 69, 1)
- ¹²³U34, 6 (Opitz III, p. 69, 26)
- ¹²⁴U34, 14 (Opitz III, p. 71, 4-6)
- ¹²⁵U34, 19-20 (Opitz III, p. 71, 23 - p. 72, 5)

- 126^{U34, 35 (Opitz III, p. 73, 33 - p. 74, 4)}
- 127^{U34, 39 (Opitz III, p. 74, 16-20)}
- 128^{U34, 42 (Opitz III, p. 74, 32 - p. 75, 4)}
- 129^{Socrates, HE I, 33 (PG 67, 164C - 165A)}
- 130^{R.W. Thomson, ed., *Athanasius, Contra Gentes and De Incarnatione*, Oxford, 1971, p. xi}
- 131^{vide supra, Section One, fn. 270}
- 132^{A. Grillmeier, *Christ in Christian Tradition, Volume One, From the Apostolic Age to Chalcedon (451)*, London, (second edition) 1975, p. 260; cf. Eusebius, *Vita Constant. I, 28 (Heikel, GCS 7, p. 28, 19-20)*, οὐδ' αὖ τις κουνὸς ἐπίσκοπος ἐκ θεοῦ καθεσταμένος}
- 133^{Barnes, *op. cit.*, p. 223}
- 134^{Socrates, HE II, 13 (PG 67, 210A)}
- 135^{Festal Letter V, 2 (Robertson, *op. cit.*, pp. 517, 518)}
- 136^{ibid. V, 4 (Robertson, *op. cit.*, p. 518)}
- 137^{ibid. V, 4 (Robertson, *op. cit.*, p. 519)}
- 138^{Apol. 63, 1 (Opitz, p. 142, 24-25)}
- 139^{Sozomen, HE II, 23, 1 (Bidez, p. 80, 12-13)}
- 140^{Apol. 65, 5 (Opitz, p. 144, 25)}
- 141^{Apol. 63, 4 (Opitz, p. 143, 6-14); Sozomen, HE II, 23, 1 (Bidez, p. 80, 12-16)}
- 142^{Μελιτιανοὶ δὲ τῆς προτέρας ἀποτυχόντες πεύρας ἑτέρας ὕφαινον κατὰ Ἀθανασίου γραφάς ..., Sozomen, HE II, 23, 1 (Bidez, p. 80, 12-13)}
- 143^{Philostorgius, HE II, 11}
- 144^{Hefele, *op. cit.*, I, pp. 414, 415}
- 145^{Barnes, *op. cit.*, p. 253; cf. *ibid.*, pp. 219, 220}

- 146 *Apol.* 12, 1 (Opitz, p. 97, 8-9)
- 147 *Apol.* 85, 7 (Opitz, p. 164, 7)
- 148 *Apol.* 76, 3 (Opitz, p. 156, 6-12)
- 149 *Apol.* 74, 3 (Opitz, p. 153, 36 - p. 154, 2)
- 150 *Apol.* 63, 3 (Opitz, p. 143, 1-6)
- 151 *ibid.*
- 152 *ibid.*
- 153 *Apol.* 64, 1 (Opitz, p. 143, 19-20)
- 154 *Apol.* 83, 1-2 (Opitz, p. 162, 1-11)
- 155 *Apol.* 64, 1-3 (Opitz, p. 143, 15 - p. 144, 2)
- 156 *ἡ ἀκεῖνος περὶ μὲν τοῦ ποτηρίου φθάσας ἢν ἀκούσας αὐτοῦς ...*,
Apol. 65, 1 (Opitz, p. 144, 4-5)
- 157 *Apol.* 63, 5 (Opitz, p. 143, 11-13)
- 158 *Apol.* 64, 1-3 (Opitz, p. 143, 16-24)
- 159 *Apol.* 64, 3 (Opitz, p. 143, 27-28)
- 160 *ibid.* (Opitz, p. 144, 1-2)
- 161 All of the witnesses to the confession of Ischyras had been active during the episcopate of Alexander of Alexandria and are listed in his deposition of Arius, 'Ενὸς σώματος (Opitz III, U4b, pp. 6-11) which Opitz dates at ca. AD 319, but which Rowan Williams places during January/February, AD 325. In either case, it is clear that the Mareotic presbyters and deacons (Boccon of Chenebri being listed as a deacon in U4b, but raised to the presbyterate by the year AD 331/332) were clergy of long standing within the diocese and had given their loyalty to Athanasius following the death of Alexander in AD 328 (for the listing cf. Opitz III, U4b, p. 11, 15-35). The Alexandrine deacons listed as having witnessed the confession of Ischyras may have been permanent members of the archbishop's staff from the time of Alexander (*ibid.*, p. 10, 34 - p. 11, 11). Information concerning the unique parish system in Alexandria, however, is lacking and an exact identification cannot be made.

- 162 It seems unlikely that the Meletians or the Eusebians would have reasserted their accusation concerning Ischyras had they known of his letter which Athanasius must have immediately sent to Constantine. That the charge was repeated at the Synod of Tyre seems to have been occasioned by Ischyras' realignment with the Meletians subsequent to his letter of confession to Athanasius, but before the calling of the synod by Constantine. The inducement for his defection to the Meletians this second time seems to have been owing to Athanasius' censure and the promise of being accepted as a presbyter by the Meletians and Eusebians. There is also evidence presented by Athanasius that Ischyras had been given to understand that he would be rewarded for his defection by an eventual elevation to the episcopate and the building of a church in his village, *cf. Apol. 85, 4* (Opitz, p. 163, 26-28).
- 163 *Apol. 65, 1* (Opitz, p. 144, 6-7)
- 164 *cf. Barnes, The New Empire, p. 105; The research of W. Ensslin, 'Dalmatius censor, der Halbbruder Konstantines I', Rheinisches Museum, nf. 78 (1929), pp. 199-212, shows conclusively that Socrates was mistaken in assigning the title of censor to Constantine's nephew, Caesar Dalmatius, who was actually the son of Flavius Dalmatius, the censor who was involved in this episode concerning Athanasius, cf. Socrates, HE I, 27 (PG 67, 157A).*
- 165 Socrates, *HE I, 27 (PG 67, 157A)*
- 166 *Apol. 65, 2* (Opitz, p. 144, 7-8)
- 167 τριάνοντα μῆνας, Sozomen, *HE II, 25* (Bidez, p. 84, 10)
This follows the suggestion of H.I. Bell that the thirty months mentioned by Sozomen must either be a textual corruption (λ' for κ' ?) or may refer back to an earlier summons. If thirty months are indicated by the text, the Synod of Tyre having begun in August, AD 335, the previous time period would be February, AD 333. If the text has been corrupted and only twenty months are indicated, the date of the summons would be December, AD 333. In the first instance, the date of Athanasius' arrival at Tyre in August, AD 335 appears certain as the *Festal Letter Index VIII* states that he left for Tyre from Egypt on 11 July of that year. Secondly, the text of Sozomen is probably better understood as indicating a thirty month period which would place the summons to Athanasius concerning Arsenius in February, AD 333. The twenty month period, however, designating December, AD 333 would fall very close to the time of Constantine's calling of the Synod of Caesarea for March of AD 334. Surely the letters for this synod must have been sent a full three months before the event itself and, therefore, a twenty month period is also a possibility, but only if the present text is incorrect (*cf. Bell, Jews and Christians, p. 48;*

and *Histoire*, A. Martin, pp. 233, 244). The chronology of Schwartz concerning this period is hopelessly confused and contradictory owing to his placing of the Synod of Caesarea in AD 333, a full year before the gathering actually took place (cf. Schwartz, *GS*, III, pp. 246-247). On balance, it seems best to understand Sozomen as referring to the summons of Dalmatius and to place its date as February/March, AD 333.

- ¹⁶⁸ *Festal Letter* IV, 11 (Robertson, *op. cit.*, p. 522)
- ¹⁶⁹ ἐπειδὴ βασιλεὺς κεκίνητο, *Apol.* 65, 2 (Opitz, p. 144, 9-10)
- ¹⁷⁰ *Apol.* 65, 2 (Opitz, p. 144, 11); Sozomen, *HE* II, 25, 12
- ¹⁷¹ Sozomen, *HE* II, 23, 1 (Bidez, p. 80, 15-16)
- ¹⁷² *Apol.* 65, 2 (Opitz, p. 144, 10-11); *Apol.* 67, 2 (Opitz, p. 145, 20-21)
- ¹⁷³ Sozomen, *HE* II, 23, 4 (Bidez, p. 81, 10-11)
- ¹⁷⁴ Sozomen indicates that his name was Πρόννης although this is counter to the material contained in Athanasius, *HE* II, 23, 2 (Bidez, p. 80, 21; cf. *Apol.* 67, 1 (Opitz, p. 145, 15-17)).
- ¹⁷⁵ *Apol.* 67, 2 (Opitz, p. 145, 21-22)
- ¹⁷⁶ *ibid.*
- ¹⁷⁷ *ibid.* (Opitz, p. 145, 23-24)
- ¹⁷⁸ *Apol.* 67, 3 (Opitz, p. 145, 27-29)
- ¹⁷⁹ Barnes, *Constantine and Eusebius*, p. 234; The text simply states that, οὐκ ἔσχυσα ἀρνήσασθαι, *Apol.* 67, 3 (Opitz, p. 145, 28). It seems unlikely that Pinnes and Elias having been already brought before the *dux* by those who had a somewhat complete knowledge of the affair, would have then been separately tortured to elicit this self-same information. Certainly, the text does not give this indication. Furthermore, if, in fact, they were subjected to judicial torture by the *dux* it seems very unlikely that they would have been given or allowed the liberty to subsequently communicate with John Archaph to provide him with a warning in the manner in which they did somewhat quickly (cf. *Apol.* 67). Concerning judicial use of torture in this period, cf. A.H.M. Jones, *op. cit.*, I, pp. 519, 520.

- 180 Theodoret, *HE I*, 28, 2-4
- 181 Sozomen, *HE II*, 22, 1-2 (Bidez, p. 78, 21 - p. 79, 1)
- 182 Theodoret, *loc. cit.*; Sozomen, *HE II*, 25, 1 (Bidez, p. 84, 7-8)
- 183 Barnes, *op. cit.*, p. 234; Barnes also raises the question of the 'court of the censor' in 'Emperor and Bishops', *op. cit.*, p. 62, but provides little further documentation for his position apart from comparisons with the Synod of Tyre.
- 184 *cf.* Nordberg, *Athanasius and the Emperor*, p. 26
- 185 *Festal Letter Index VI (Histoire, A. Martin, pp. 231, 233)*
- 186 LP 1913, l. 4-6 (Bell, *Jews and Christians*, pp. 49)
- 187 *ibid.*, l. 1-2
- 188 *ibid.*, l. 2-3; This text is also interesting in that it shows the manner in which secular administrative titles had, at this early date, found their way into the structure of the posts in the monastic community. Two particular instances are as follows: In line 14 of LP 1913, mention is made of the appointing of οἰκνομεῖν, a term borrowed from the officials who provided the financial administration of the fifty nomes in Egypt. Their importance began to diminish during the Roman occupation and the title was subsequently taken up by the monastic establishments. The reader of LP 1913 is further informed that Pageus' deputy was empowered to προνοῆσαι καὶ διοικεῖν καὶ οἰκονομεῖν in line 13, which may be a possible reference to the διοικητῆς in the court, the financial administrator under the ruler. It seems probable that as these older terms relating to Ptolemaic Egypt slowly fell from public usage, they were taken up within the Egyptian monastic communities in order to designate officials and functions within the community.
- 189 πρὸς διακρίσιν περ(τ) κ(α)θαρισμοῦ <τοῦ> ἁγίου Χρηστιάνακοῦ (π)λήθους, LP 1913, l. 6-7 (Bell, *Jews and Christians*, p. 49)
- As can be seen by the transcription of the text above, the reading of certain portions of this crucial passage remains somewhat unclear. Bell is correct, however, in pointing out that certain words, such as διακρίσιν and καθαρισμοῦ, although unexpected, do fit in with the sense of the passage (Bell, *op. cit.*, p. 51, fn. 6f). The reading of πλήθους, however, is very uncertain. From an examination of the the papyrus,

a better reading might be γένους which has cognate usage in other literature of the period. Another possibility which fits the line with greater ease is κόσμου, but it suffers from the same lack of cognate usage in the period as πλήθους.

¹⁹⁰ Bell, *loc. cit.*

¹⁹¹ *ibid.*

¹⁹² H.F. Jolowicz, *Historical Introduction to the Study of Roman Law*, Cambridge, 1954, pp. 457-464

¹⁹³ *ibid.*, pp. 441, 466

¹⁹⁴ τὴν τῶν δικαζόντων δυσμένειαν ἐπιστάμενος, οὐχ ἦκεν εἰς τὸ συνέδριον, Theodoret, *HE I*, 26 (28), 2 (PG 82, 981B)

¹⁹⁵ τὸν Ἀθανάσιον ὑφορᾶσθαι τὴν Καισαρέων διὰ τὸν ἐκείνης ἡγούμενον, Theodoret, *HE I*, 26 (28), 4 (PG 82, 981C)

¹⁹⁶ Theodoret, *HE I*, 26 (28), 4 (PG 82, 981C)

¹⁹⁷ Sozomen, *HE II*, 25, 17 (Bidez, p. 86, 26-27)

¹⁹⁸ *Apol.* 67, 4 (Opitz, p. 145, 30 - p. 146, 1)

¹⁹⁹ *Festal Letter Index IV* (*Histoire*, A. Martin, p. 231); T. D. Barnes believes this journey to have taken place almost a full year earlier, stating that, 'When he received Dalmatius' letter, Athanasius withdrew from Alexandria to make himself inaccessible' (Barnes, *Constantine and Eusebius*, p. 234). The *Festal Letter Index IV*, however, appears to indicate the period immediately before the Synod of Caesarea, probably in the winter of AD 333/334, but some time after Athanasius had received word of the inquiry at Antioch from Dalmatius the previous year. When the information contained in the *Index* is combined with the certainty that Athanasius had learned of Arsenius' flight into the region of the Lower Country from Pinnes and Elias, the stated reconstruction of events presented within the text seems likely.

²⁰⁰ Socrates, *HE I*, 27 (PG 67, 157B)

²⁰¹ *Apol.* 65, 3 (Opitz, p. 144, 13-15); Socrates, *HE I*, 29, 2 (PG 67, 160C); From Athanasius' account it would appear as though Arsenius' apprehension took place early in AD 334, rather than shortly before the Synod of Tyre, as in the account of Socrates. In the letter of Constantine to Athanasius, Arsenius' prior arrest and exposure is certainly strongly suggested, *Apol.* 68, 2 (Opitz, p. 146, 14-16).

- ²⁰² L.S. Tillemont, *Histoire de Saint Athanase (Memoires, Tome VIII)*, Paris, 1701, p. 27
- ²⁰³ cf. Lorenz, *Der Zehnte Osterfestbrief*, pp. 30-31
- ²⁰⁴ *op.cit.*, p. 16; *Festal Letter XVII* in Robertson, *op.cit.*, p. 544
- ²⁰⁵ Lorenz, *loc.cit.*
- ²⁰⁶ Robertson, *op.cit.*, p. 544, note I
- ²⁰⁷ See Lorenz, *op.cit.*, pp. 16-19 for this revising of Schwartz.
- ²⁰⁸ Socrates, *HE I*, 27 (PG 67, 157B); *Apol.* 65, 4 (Opitz, p. 144, 17-21); From Athanasius' statement it would appear as though the *cursor's* court (probably held in Antioch) and the Synod of Caesarea were separate events requiring separate notification by the emperor:
 ... ἔπαυσε μὲν τὸ δικαστήριον τοῦ κήνσωρος, ἔγραψε δὲ καταγινώσκων τὴν συκοφαντίαν τῶν καθ' ἡμῶν γενομένων καὶ τοὺς περὶ Εὐσέβιον ἐρχομένους εἰς τὴν Ἀνατολὴν καθ' ἡμῶν ἐκέλευσεν ὑποστρέψαι, *Apol.* 65, 4 (Opitz, p. 144, 19-21).
 Socrates, in his account of the matter, only makes mention of the suppression of the court of the *cursor*:
 Παύει δὲ ὁ βασιλεὺς τὸ ἐπὶ τοῦ κήνσωρος δικαστήριον..., *HE I*, 27 (PG 67, 157B).
- ²⁰⁹ *vide supra* fn. 208; Sozomen, *HE II*, 25, 17 (Bidez, p. 86, 24-26)
- ²¹⁰ *Apol.* 68, 2 (Opitz, p. 146, 12-13)
- ²¹¹ *Apol.* 68, 3 (Opitz, p. 146, 16ff)
- ²¹² *Apol.* 68, 6-7 (Opitz, p. 146, 33 - p. 147, 4)
- ²¹³ That Macarius was in Constantinople during at least some portion of the time in question is confirmed in the letter to Athanasius which was written by Alexander of Thessalonica, *Apol.* 66, 3 (Opitz, p. 145, 9-10). It is possible, although by no means certain, that Macarius was entrusted by Athanasius with the letters and documents which were sent to Constantine to prove his innocence. It is equally possible that Macarius had remained at court during this period as Athanasius' permanent envoy to Constantine.
- ²¹⁴ *Apol.* 65, 5 (Opitz, p. 144, 21-33)

- 215 *Apol.* 66, 1-2 (Opitz, p. 145, 3-8)
- 216 *ibid.*
- 217 *Apol.* 66, 3 (Opitz, p. 145, 10-13)
- 218 *Apol.* 69, 2 (Opitz, p. 147, 11-12); *cf.* Opitz's note on τῶν ποτε ὑπὸ Μελίτιον, *loc. cit.*
- 219 W.H.C. Frend, *The Rise of Christianity*, p. 547, n. 3
- 220 *Apol.* 69, 2 (Opitz, p. 147, 14-15)
- 221 Arsenius is not on the list presented by Meletius to Alexander, *cf.* *Apol.* 71, 6 (Opitz, p. 149, 20 - p. 151, 9).
- 222 *Apol.* 69, 2 (Opitz, p. 147, 17-18)
- 223 *Apol.* 69, 2 (Opitz, p. 147, 18-22)
- 224 *Apol.* 69, 3 (Opitz, p. 147, 23 - p. 148, 3)
- 225 γράμματα εἰρηνικὰ, *Apol.* 69, 2 (Opitz, p. 147, 18)
- 226 ... ἀλλ' εὔκειν πᾶσι τοῖς προτετυπωμένοις κανόσι, *Apol.* 69, 2 (Opitz, p. 147, 20-21)
- 227 *Festal Letter XIX*, 10 (Robertson, *op. cit.*, p. 548)
- 228 *cf.* Opitz, p. 147, fn.
- 229 *Apol.* 78, 7 (Opitz, p. 159, 5, 6)
- 230 *Festal Letter XIX*, *loc. cit.*
- 231 Sozomen, *HE II*, 25, 12 (Bidez, p. 85, 26-29)
- 232 *Apol.* 70, 1 (Opitz, p. 148, 9-12)
- 233 *Apol.* 70, 2 (Opitz, p. 148, 15-17)
- 234 *Apol.* 70, 2 (Opitz, p. 148, 19-20)
- 235 *Apol.* 70, 2 (Opitz, p. 148, 15, 20-24)

- ²³⁶ Nordberg, *Athanasius and the Emperor*, p. 25; It is important to note, however, that Nordberg mistakenly places this interview between John Archaph and Constantine in AD 333, before the Synod of Caesarea.
- ²³⁷ *ibid.*, p. 26
- ²³⁸ Sozomen, *HE* II, 23, 8 (Bidez, p. 81, 29 - p. 82, 2)
- ²³⁹ *Apol.* 71, 1 (Opitz, p. 148, 25-28)
- ²⁴⁰ W.H.C. Frend, *op. cit.*, p. 527
- ²⁴¹ Frend's assertion that, 'Athanasius, however, never questioned the rightness of the presence of the lay element there (i.e., at an ecclesiastical synod), even when the case went against him', may be disputed as will be seen in the text below (Frend, *loc. cit.*).
- ²⁴² *cf.* Girardet, *op. cit.*, pp. 66ff.
- ²⁴³ *Apol.* 77, 9 (Opitz, p. 157, 27-28); *cf.* *Apol.* 78, 5 (Opitz, p. 158, 23-25) and *Apol.* 80, 3 (Opitz, p. 160, 27-28) concerning the cooperation between the Arians, the Meletians, and the Colluthians.
- ²⁴⁴ ἐπαμύναι τοῖς χρήζουσιν ἐπικουρίας, τοὺς ἀδελφοὺς ἰάσασθαι κινδυνεύοντας, εἰς ὁμόνοιαν ἐπαναγαγεῖν τὰ διεστῶτα τῶν μελῶν, διορθώσασθαι τὰ πλημμελούμενα, ἕως καιρὸς ἐπιτρέπει, ἵνα ταῖς τοσαύταις ἐπαρχίαις τὴν πρέπουσαν ἀποδώτε συμφωνίαν ... , Eusebius, *Vita Constant.*, IV, 42, 1 (Heikel, *GCS* 7, p. 134, 11-14)
- ²⁴⁵ *ibid.*, IV, 42, 3; *Apol.* 71, 2 (Opitz, p. 149, 2)
- ²⁴⁶ ... ὁμογνώμονι κρίσει, μήτε πρὸς ἀπεχθείαν μήτε πρὸς χάριν, ἀκολούθως δὲ τῷ ἐκκλησιαστικῷ καὶ ἀποστολικῷ κανόνι, τοῖς πλημμεληθεῖσιν ... Eusebius, *Vita Constant.*, IV, 42, 5 (Heikel, *GCS* 7, p. 135, 5-7)
- ²⁴⁷ *Apol.* 72, 3 (Opitz, p. 151, 17-18)
- ²⁴⁸ *Apol.* 71, 2 (Opitz, p. 149, 3)
- ²⁴⁹ *Apol.* 71, 2 (Opitz, p. 149, 3-4)
- ²⁵⁰ *ibid.*; κόμης γὰρ ἦν ὁ ἀναγκάζων καὶ στρατιῶται εἶλκον ἡμᾶς, *Apol.* 72, 1 (Opitz, p. 151, 4)

²⁵¹Bell, *op. cit.*, p. 60, ll. 38ff; London Papyrus 1914 has been examined at length in Section One, 3.3, of the present work. It is perhaps sufficient to comment at this juncture that the supposed 'first-hand' reporting of events just previous to the Synod of Tyre which LP 1914 is alleged to contain is far from certain. As has been stated in the text, the dating of the papyrus is entirely circumstantial and, as has been shown, raises considerable difficulties in any attempt to interpret the contents of the letter. Furthermore, as Athanasius was aware of John Archaph's petition to the emperor and his subsequent appearance at court, it seems unlikely that he would have engaged in a policy of wholesale violence against the Meletians in Egypt at exactly the same time. The reports of Athanasius' departure contained within the letter, as well as the disturbances within the Meletian community, seem more suited to the period before the Synod of Caesarea a year earlier. At that time there was a great deal of inter-Meletian rivalry, a frantic search was under way to discover the whereabouts of Arsenius, and Athanasius had, at some point during the year, travelled into the Meletian stronghold of the Lower Country, no doubt disturbing the regular routine of the Meletian monastic communities. There also remains the possibility that LP 1914 is, in fact, a fraudulent report designed to show that Athanasius was both engaged in violence (through his followers) and was unwilling to obey the imperial orders to make his way to the synod, whether at Caesarea or Tyre. Such a report, whether true or not, would have been welcomed and used by Athanasius' opponents at either synod. There is yet a further possibility that this letter relates events which are wholly unconnected with either the Synod of Tyre or the Synod of Caesarea and, as has been suggested above, is relating an incident of inter-nicene rivalry between two competing schismatic groups in Egypt.

²⁵²*Festal Letter Index VIII (Histoire, A. Martin, p. 233)*; This information is incorrectly placed under *Festal Letter Index VIII*, but refers to events in the year AD 335. Its proper placement, therefore, should be under *Festal Letter Index VII*.

²⁵³*Apol. 71, 4 (Opitz, p. 149, 6-7)*; cf. *Ad Afros 10 (PG 26, 1045C)*

²⁵⁴*Apol. 78, 1 (Opitz, p. 158, 1-2)*; H. Nordberg contends that the forty-seven persons mentioned as signing the letter to Dionysius were not all bishops, but offers no positive proof for this assertion (Nordberg, *Athanasius and the Emperor*, p. 27). It is true that a person named Macarius is listed, but it is by no means certain that it is the former Meletian presbyter and court envoy of Athanasius. Opitz mistakenly lists forty-eight bishops (Opitz, p. 159, 1-48), but lines 2-3 are better read as Ἰσχυρόμωυ, who is listed in *Apol. 49, 3 (Opitz, p. 128, 152)*.

²⁵⁵ *vide supra*, Section One, fn. 270

²⁵⁶ *ibid.*

²⁵⁷ *ibid.*

²⁵⁸ *Apol.* 71, 6 (Opitz, p. 151, 36)

²⁵⁹ Opitz III, U4a, p. 6, 9

²⁶⁰ Sozomen, *HE* II, 25, 10 (Bidez, p. 85, 17-23)

²⁶¹ H.F. Jolowicz, *op. cit.*, p. 431

²⁶² *ibid.*

²⁶³ *ibid.*

²⁶⁴ *Apol.* 72, 1 (Opitz, p. 151, 10-12); *Apol.* 28, 6 (Opitz, p. 108, 17-24)

²⁶⁵ *Apol.* 17, 1 (Opitz, p. 99, 25-26); *Apol.* 28, 7 (Opitz, p. 108, 24-26)

²⁶⁶ Socrates, *HE* I, 28 (PG 67, 160A); Sozomen, *HE* II, 25, 1 (Bidez, p. 84, 10-11)

²⁶⁷ In addition to the civil action which was instituted under the jurisdiction of the court of the *ensor* in Antioch in early AD 334, K. Girardet contends that an earlier action was proposed in Antioch following the initial accusations in Psamathia. According to Girardet, Eusebius of Nicomedia and Theognis were sent to act as the *consilium* (along with other unidentified bishops) of the *iudex delegatus* in Antioch who was to issue a judgement concerning those charges which had been raised (Girardet, *op. cit.*, pp. 63-65). Although such an action might have been possible, further documentary evidence would be needed to substantiate such a claim. Certainly, Athanasius makes no mention of the alleged proceedings.

²⁶⁸ *cf.* Schwartz, *GS* III, p. 246; *Epistola Encyclica*, 3 (PG 25, 228B)

²⁶⁹ *Festal Letter* VII, 4 (Robertson, *op. cit.*, p. 525)

²⁷⁰ The basic parameters of this argument are set forth in P. Batiffol, 'Origines de règlement des conciles', *Études de liturgie et d'archéologie chrétienne*. Paris,

1919, pp. 88-96

- 271 N.H. Baynes, *Constantine the Great and the Christian Church*, second edition, London, 1972, p. 88
- 272 cf. P.R. Amidon, 'The Procedure of St. Cyprian's Synods', *Vig. Chr.* 37, 1983, pp. 328-339
- 273 *ibid.*, p. 329
- 274 *ibid.*, p. 334
- 275 cf. H. Hess, *The Canons of the Council of Sardica*, pp. 38-39; Hess' conviction concerning the links between ecclesiastical synods and the model of Roman senatorial practice is clear in the following statement:
 It is reasonable to suppose that the adoption of particular types of civil records for ecclesiastical use was determined by the function which the records themselves customarily performed. By the time of Diocletian and Constantine the *senatus-consultum* was regarded simply as a counsel of advice. It is therefore not surprising that the synodical canon was patterned after the *senatus-consultum* before the conscious acceptance of an ecclesiastical rule of law; for a limited degree of authority, parallel to that of the *senatus-consultum*, seems to have been accorded to the canon until at least the late fourth century in the East and the late fifth century in the West. The emergence of the concept of the canon as an expression of juridical authority is closely associated with the later growth of an ecclesiastical corpus parallel in structure to the corpus of civil law. (Hess, *loc. cit.*)
 Despite Hess' insistence on the advisory nature of the canons put forth by the Synod of Sardica, it seems probable that it was not the intent of the bishops either there, or at Nicaea, or Antioch, or, indeed, at Tyre merely to put forward suggestive proscriptions. If the Church at large was hesitant to accept the decrees and canons of synods, it was probably owing to factors other than jurisdictional intentions of the participants.
- 276 *ibid.*; cf. F. Dvornik, *Early Christian and Byzantine Political Philosophy*, Washington, D.C., 1966; and Amidon, *op. cit.*, p. 336
- 277 Baynes, *loc. cit.*; cf. C. Luibheid, *The Council of Nicaea*, p. 81
- 278 E. Caspar, *Geschichte des Papsttums*, I, p. 141
- 279 K. Girardet, *op. cit.*, pp. 66-75

- 280 *ibid.*, p. 68
- 281 *ibid.*, p. 71
- 282 V. Twomey, *op. cit.*, p. 355, fn. 46
- 283 *ibid.*
- 284 A.H.M. Jones, *op. cit.*, II, pp. 886-887
- 285 S.L. Greenslade, *Church and State from Constantine to Theodosius*, London, 1954, p. 20
- 286 A.H.M. Jones, *op. cit.*, II, p. 936
- 287 *ibid.*
- 288 *Apol.* 8, 3 (Opitz, p. 94, 12-13)
- 289 *ibid.* (Opitz, p. 94, 15-16)
- 290 Although K. Girardet claims that Eusebius of Caesarea was not present at the Synod of Tyre, the letter of the Egyptian bishops who were at Tyre, *Apol.* 77, 10 (Opitz, p. 157, 34), certainly implies his presence (Girardet, *op. cit.*, p. 69, fn. 130); *cf.* *Apol.* 81, 1 (Opitz, p. 161, 6)
- 291 Girardet, *op. cit.*, p. 71, fn. 151
- 292 *Apol.* 82, 1 (Opitz, p. 161, 17-19)
- 293 *Apol.* 86, 2ff (Opitz, p. 164, 16ff)
- 294 Eusebius, *Vita Constant.* IV, 42
- 295 *ibid.*
- 296 *ibid.*
- 297 Socrates, *HE* I, 28 (PG 67, 160A)
- 298 Hefele, *op. cit.*, II, 17
- 299 Gwatkin, *Studies in Arianism*, second edition, London, 1900, p. 89, fn. 2

- ³⁰⁰ Socrates, *HE I*, 30 (PG 67, 161C)
- ³⁰¹ Sozomen, *HE II*, 25, 3-4 (Bidez, p. 84, 18-25)
- ³⁰² cf. *Apol.* 77, 1; 13, 2; 78, 1; and Sozomen, *HE II*, 25, 19
- ³⁰³ Sozomen, *HE II*, 25, 20 (Bidez, p. 87, 11-12); *Apol.* 80, 1 (Opitz, p. 160, 19)
- ³⁰⁴ Sozomen, *HE II*, 25, 1ff (Bidez, pp. 84-87)
- ³⁰⁵ Schwartz, *GS III*, pp. 248, 249
- ³⁰⁶ Eusebius, *Vita Constant.* IV, 42
- ³⁰⁷ Epiphanius, *Haer.* 68, 8, 3 (PG 42, 197A); cf. *Apol.* 8, 3 (Opitz, p. 94, 8-9)
- ³⁰⁸ Rufinus, *HE I*, 17 (PL 21, 489B); Sozomen, *HE II*, 25, 20 (Bidez, p. 87, 10-11)
- ³⁰⁹ *Apol.* 6, 6 - 7, 3 (Opitz, p. 92, 27 - p. 93, 26)
- ³¹⁰ *Apol.* 7, 1-2 (Opitz, p. 93, 16-21)
- ³¹¹ cf. *Apol.* 85, 7 (Opitz, p. 164, 5-11)
- ³¹² Sozomen, *HE II*, 25, 3 (Bidez, p. 84, 13-15)
- ³¹³ *ibid.* (Bidez, p. 84, 16-17); cf. Barnes, *The New Empire*, pp. 151, 152
- ³¹⁴ Sozomen, *HE II*, 25, 4 (Bidez, p. 84, 18-23)
- ³¹⁵ Sozomen, *HE II*, 25, 5 (Bidez, p. 84, 23-25)
- ³¹⁶ *Apol.* 17, 3 (Opitz, p. 99, 31 - p. 100, 3)
- ³¹⁷ *ibid.*; There is, however, a seeming contradiction between the implication of the Egyptian bishops and the account of the Synod of Tyre given by Sozomen concerning the status of John Archaph. For although the *Letter of the Egyptian Bishops AD 338/339* indicates that Archaph had been reconciled before the Synod of Tyre, Sozomen states that 'John (Archaph) and his followers' were restored only at the conclusion of the synod, Sozomen, *HE II*, 25, 15 (Bidez, p. 86, 17-19). There appears to have been a policy, however,

of recognizing such restorations in the public life of the Church, as in a synod, although the restoration may have been effected at an earlier time. A similar case is presented in the persons of Arius and Euzoius at the Synod of Jerusalem which followed immediately after the main sessions of the Synod of Tyre.

- ³¹⁸ ... κοινῇ δὲ πάντες, ὡς δι' ἐπιτορκίας τινῶν εἰς τὴν ἐπισκοπὴν παρῆλθεν, συνθεμένων πάντων μηδένα χειροτονεῖν, πρὶν τὰ ἐν αὐτοῖς ἐγκλήματα διαλύσωσιν ... , Sozomen, *HE II*, 26, 6 (Bidez, p. 84, 25-27); cf. Section One, 3.2, of this present study for a more in-depth discussion of the controversy concerning Athanasius' consecration and the involvement of the Meletians.
- ³¹⁹ Sozomen, *HE II*, 25, 6 (Bidez, p. 84, 27-29)
- ³²⁰ *ibid.* 25, 7 (Bidez, p. 85, 1-2)
- ³²¹ *ibid.* 25, 7 (Bidez, p. 85, 3-4)
- ³²² *ibid.* 25, 8ff, Sozomen includes a charge of fornication which seems to be apocryphal and was not included in the acts of synod which he made use of (*ibid.* 25, 11). In making use of this story there appears to be a dependence upon Rufinus (*HE I*, 17), who may well have copied the the information from Gelasius, cf. Gwatkin, *op. cit.*, p. 89, fn. 3.
- ³²³ Sozomen, *HE II*, 25, 8 (Bidez, p. 85, 5-7)
- ³²⁴ *ibid.* 25, 10 (Bidez, p. 85, 17-23)
- ³²⁵ *ibid.* 25, 12 (Bidez, p. 85, 26 - p. 86, 4)
- ³²⁶ *Apol.* 69, 2 (Opitz, p. 147, 21)
- ³²⁷ *Apol.* 8, 3 (Opitz, p. 94, 11-13); Because of the letters which are exchanged between Comes Dionysius and the members of the Synod of Tyre, K. Girardet has made the assumption that Dionysius was not actually present at the deliberations of the assembly in Tyre (Girardet, *op. cit.*, p. 68). This approach must be regarded as incorrect in the light of the statements issued by the Egyptian bishops who were only three years distant from the event at the time of their encyclical letter in AD 338/339 which has been cited above.
- ³²⁸ *Apol.* 72, 3 (Opitz, p. 151, 20-22)
- ³²⁹ *Apol.* 72, 4 (Opitz, p. 151, 24-26)
- ³³⁰ *Apol.* 81, 1-2 (Opitz, p. 161, 5-16)

- 331 *Apol.* 72, 4 (Opitz, p. 151, 25-26)
- 332 *Apol.* 72, 4-5 (Opitz, p. 151, 25 - p. 152, 1); The letter from the clergy of the Mareotis affirming their loyalty to Athanasius which was sent to Dionysius was dated 8 September AD 335. By the time the letter was sent, the Mareotic commission had already arrived in Egypt and was pursuing its investigation, *cf.* *Apol.* 76, 5 (Opitz, p. 156, 18)
- 333 *Apol.* 83, 3 (Opitz, p. 162, 17)
- 334 ἐπειδὴ δὲ οὔτε Μακάριον ἡγάγετε οὔτε ὁ αἰδεσιμώτατος ἡμῶν ἐπίσκοπος Ἀθανάσιος μεθ' ὑμῶν εἰσῆλθεν, ἤξιώσαμεν καὶ αὐτοῦ παρεῖναι ἐν τῇ κρίσει, ἵνα παρόντων ἡμῶν ἀσφαλῆς ἡ ἐξέτασις γένηται καὶ πεισθῶμεν καὶ ἡμεῖς. , *Apol.* 73, 2 (Opitz, p. 152, 15-18)
- 335 *Apol.* 72, 4 (Opitz, p. 152, 23 - p. 153, 1)
- 336 *Apol.* 74, 3 (Opitz, p. 154, 27-28)
- 337 *Apol.* 76, 1-5 (Opitz, p. 155, 34 - p. 156, 18)
- 338 *Apol.* 83, 3 (Opitz, p. 162, 16-18)
- 339 *Apol.* 72, 6 (Opitz, p. 152, 5-6); *Apol.* 31, 1 (Opitz, p. 110, 9)
- 340 *Apol.* 11, 5 (Opitz, p. 96, 24-25)
- 341 *Apol.* 83, 2 (Opitz, p. 162, 8-9)
- 342 *Apol.* 83, 3 (Opitz, p. 162, 13-16)
- 343 ... μάλιστα ὅτι ἀναγκαῖαν ἡμῶν ἐποίησεν εἶναι τὴν μαρτυρίαν ἢ γενομένη συσκευὴ κατὰ τοῦ ἐπισκόπου Ἀθανασίου. , *Apol.* 74, 2 (Opitz, p. 153, 31-32)
- 344 *Apol.* 75, 5 (Opitz, p. 154, 36)
- 345 Athanasius implies that before returning to Tyre, the commission first went to Alexandria as guests of the prefect Philagrius: Καὶ τίνα τὰ παρ' αὐτῶν εἰς τὴν Ἀλεξάνδρειαν τολμηθέντα, νομίζομεν ὑμᾶς μὴ ἀγνοεῖν, πανταχοῦ γὰρ διαδέδοται. , *Apol.* 15, 1 (Opitz, p. 98, 19-20). In Athanasius' description of the 'outrages' which were committed, the bishop of Alexandria indicates that the crowds were used by Philagrius and the bishops as an instrument of intimidation against the catholics in the city, especially against the ἀγίων παρθένων καὶ τῶν ἀδελφῶν. This account is ignored by T.D. Barnes in his

- description of the events surrounding the Synod of Tyre (Barnes, *Constantine and Eusebius*, pp. 236 - 239) despite its importance for understanding the later flight of Athanasius to appear before the emperor in Constantinople. For a full account of the incidents in Alexandria, cf. *Apol.* 15, 1ff (Opitz, p. 98, 29 - p. 99, 9).
- ³⁴⁶ *Apol.* 81, 1 (Opitz, p. 161, 6-8)
- ³⁴⁷ *Apol.* 77, 6 (Opitz, p. 157, 20-21)
- ³⁴⁸ *Apol.* 77, 5 (Opitz, p. 157, 10-12)
- ³⁴⁹ cf. *Apol.* 78, 1ff (Opitz, p. 158, 1 - p. 159, 48); καὶ γὰρ εὐλογον ἀποσταλέντα σε παρὰ τῆς βασιλείας αὐτοῦ καὶ ἡμῶν ἐπικαλεσαμένων τὴν εὐσέβειαν αὐτοῦ αὐτῶ τηρῆσαι τὸ πρᾶγμα., *Apol.* 79, 2 (Opitz, p. 160, 8-9)
- ³⁵⁰ *Apol.* 80, 1ff (Opitz, p. 160, 21 - p. 161, 4)
- ³⁵¹ *Apol.* 81, 1ff (Opitz, p. 161, 5-16)
- ³⁵² Sozomen, *HE* II, 27, 1ff (Bidez, p. 88, 4 - p. 91, 2); For further elaboration on the reception of Arius and Euzoius at the Synod of Jerusalem, cf. R. Williams, *Arius*, p. 79. cf. Schwartz, *GS* III, *op. cit.*, pp. 247 ff.
- ³⁵³ Sozomen, *HE* II, 25, 13 (Bidez, p. 86, 6-12)
- ³⁵⁴ Τούτων οὕτω πραττομένων ἀνεχωρήσαμεν ἀπ' αὐτῶν ὡς "ἀπὸ συνόδου τῶν ἀθετούντων". ἃ γὰρ ἐβούλοντο, ταῦτα καὶ ἔπραττον. ὅτι μὲν οὖν τὰ πραττόμενα κατὰ μονομέρειαν οὐδεμίαν ἔχει δύναμιν, οὐδεὶς ἐστίν, ὅστις ἀγνοεῖ τῶν πάντων ἀνθρώπων., *Apol.* 82, 1 (Opitz, p. 161, 17-19)
- ³⁵⁵ cf. *Apol.* 27, 3ff (Opitz, p. 107, 13-27); 83, 4 (Opitz, p. 162, 18ff)
- ³⁵⁶ Sozomen, *HE* II, 25, 19 (Bidez, p. 87, 2)
- ³⁵⁷ Socrates, *HE* I, 32 (PG 67, 164B)
- ³⁵⁸ Sozomen, *HE* II, 25, 15 (Bidez, p. 86, 14-17)
- ³⁵⁹ Sozomen, *HE* II, 25, 15 (Bidez, p. 86, 17-19)
- ³⁶⁰ Socrates, *HE* I, 32 (PG 67, 164B)
- ³⁶¹ Sozomen, *HE* II, 25, 16 (Bidez, p. 86, 19-22)
- ³⁶² *ibid*

- 363 Sozomen, *HE II*, 25, 17-19a (Bidez, p. 86, 23 - p. 87, 3)
- 364 *Apol.* 9, 2 (Opitz, p. 95, 4-8)
- 365 *Apol.* 82, 1 (Opitz, p. 161, 17-19)
- 366 cf. P. Peeters, 'Comment S. Athanase s'enfuit de Tyr en 335', *Bull. Acad. Roy de Belgique, Classe des Lettres* (5) 30 (1944), pp. 148ff; and 'L'épilogue du Synode de Tyr en 335', *Analecta Bollandiana* 63 (1945), pp. 133-134; Epiphanius, *Haer.* 68, 9, 4
- 367 *Festal Letter Index VIII* (*Histoire*, A. Martin, p. 233)
- 368 *ibid.*; Peeters, 'L'épilogue', *op. cit.*, pp. 134-135
- 369 Barnes, *Constantine and Eusebius*, p. 239
- 370 *Histoire*, ed. A. Martin, p. 284
- 371 Sozomen, *HE II*, 25, 13 (Bidez, p. 86, 5-12)
- 372 R.I. Frank, *Scholae Palatinae. The Palace Guards of the Later Roman Empire* (*Papers and Monographs of the American Academy in Rome*, Vol. XXIII) Rome, 1969, pp. 116-117
- 373 *Apol.* 87, 2 (Opitz, p. 166, 4-6); For the presence of these bishops in Tyre before accompanying Athanasius on the journey to Constantinople cf. *Apol.* 78, 7 (Opitz, p. 159, 1, 4, 13, 17 and 22)
- 374 *Apol.* 87, 4-7 (Opitz, p. 166, 11-29)
- 375 *Festal Letter Index VIII* (*Histoire*, A. Martin, pp. 234-235); T.D. Barnes, however, holds to the traditional interpretation of the Index and contends that Athanasius arrived in the capital of 30 October AD 335 and did not see the emperor until 7 November, with the Eusebian party from Tyre arriving within hours of this initial interview (Barnes, *The New Empire*, p. 79 and *Constantine and Eusebius*, p. 240).
- 376 Athanasius' editing of Constantine's description of the encounter is evident when *Apol.* 86, 6 (Opitz, p. 165, 5-8) is compared with the record preserved in Gelasius, *HE III*, 18, 4. The two accounts are as follows:

... ἐπιβαλνοντί μοι λοιπὸν τῆς ἐπωνύμου ἡμῶν καὶ πανευδαίμονος πατρίδος τῆς Κωνσταντινουπόλεως (συνέβαινε δὲ τὴν καῦτα ἐφ' ἧπου ὀχεῖσθαι) ἐξαίφως Ἀθανάσιος ὁ ἐπίσκοπος ἐν μέσῃ τῇ λεωφόρῳ μετὰ ἐτέρων τιμῶν, οὓς περὶ αὐτῶν εἶχεν ... (*Apol.* 86, 6)

... εἰσιόντι μοι ἀπὸ προκέσσου ἐπὶ τὴν ἐπώνυμον
 ἡμῶν καὶ πανευδαίμονα Κωνσταντινούπολιν πρόσσεισι
 ἐν μέσῳ τῆς λεωφόρου ... (Gelasius, *HE* III, 18, 4)

For further comments on these passages, cf. N.H. Baynes, 'Athanasiana', *JEA* 11 (1925), pp. 61ff.

³⁷⁷ *Apol.* 86, 9 (Opitz, p. 165, 16-20)

³⁷⁸ Barnes, *Constantine and Eusebius*, p. 240; Peeters, 'L'épilogue', *op. cit.*, p. 137

³⁷⁹ *Festal Letter Index VIII (Histoire, A. Martin, p. 233)*

³⁸⁰ G.R. Sievers, 'Athanasii Vita Acephala: Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des Athanasius', *Zeitschrift für historische Theologie* 38 (1868), p. 98; cf. Peeters, 'Comment', *op. cit.*, pp. 166ff and *Histoire, A. Martin, p. 285, note 24*

³⁸¹ *Histoire, A. Martin, p. 285, note 22b*

³⁸² *Apol.* 87, 1 (Opitz, p. 165, 36 - p. 166, 2)

³⁸³ Barnes, *Constantine and Eusebius*, p. 239

³⁸⁴ Schwartz, *GS* III, pp. 247ff

³⁸⁵ *Apol.* 87, 1, *loc. cit.*

³⁸⁶ Barnes, *op. cit.*, p. 240

³⁸⁷ K.M. Girardet, *Kaisergericht und Bischofsgericht*, p. 73

³⁸⁸ Socrates, *HE* I, 35, 1 (PG 67, 169C); Sozomen, *HE* II, 28, 13 (Bidez, p. 93, 5-8)

³⁸⁹ Socrates, *loc. cit.*

³⁹⁰ Sozomen, *HE* II, 28, 13 (Bidez, p. 93, 5-10)

³⁹¹ *Apol.* 87, 1-2 (Opitz, p. 165, 36 - p. 166, 6)

³⁹² *ibid.*; *Apol.* 9, 4 (Opitz, p. 95, 14-20)

³⁹³ *Apol.* 87, 2 (Opitz, p. 166, 6-8)

³⁹⁴ ... ἂν γὰρ ἰδιώτης ἄνθρωπος καὶ πένης τηλικαῦτα δύναιτο,
Apol. 9, 4 (Opitz p. 95, 15-16)

- 395 ... πλούσιον καὶ δυνατὸν καὶ ἰκανὸν πρὸς πάντα,
Apol. 9, 4 (Opitz, p. 95, 17)
- 396 Epiphanius, *Haer.* 68, 9, 5 (PG 42, 197D)
- 397 cf. C. Pietri, 'La question d'Athanase vue de Rome',
Politique et Théologie, p. 96
- 398 Socrates, *HE II*, 13, 5 (PG 67, 209A)
- 399 Barnes, *op. cit.*, p. 253
- 400 *Apol.* 9, 4 (Opitz, p. 95, 18-20)
- 401 *Apol.* 18, 1-2 (Opitz, p. 100, 25-32)
- 402 *Ep. encycl.* 5, 5 (Opitz, p. 175, note to line 5)
- 403 Socrates, *HE I*, 35, 1 (PG 67, 171A)
- 404 Sozomen, *HE II*, 28, 14 (Bidez, p. 93, 11-13)
- 405 Sozomen, *HE II*, 31, 4-5 (Bidez, p. 96, 20-29)
- 406 ... καὶ οὐδὲν ᾤνησεν Ἰωάννην τὰ δεδογμένα τοῖς ἐν Τύρῳ
 συνεληλυθόσι, Sozomen, *HE II*, 31, 5 (Bidez, p. 96, 26-27)
- 407 Sozomen, *HE II*, 31, 3 (Bidez, p. 96, 14-18)
- 408 *Apol.* 88, 1-3 (Opitz, p. 167, 1-10); *Hist. arian.* 50, 2
 (Opitz, p. 212, 4-9)
- 409 *Apol.* 87, 6 (Opitz, p. 166, 20-25)
- 410 Schwartz, *GS III*, p. 98; *Apol.* 85, 3-7 (Opitz, p. 163, 19 -
 p. 164, 3)
- 411 *Festal Letter X*, 1

CONCLUSION

CONCLUSION

And yet one would not 'willing let die' the words in which so many writers have felt constrained to do homage to such a life and such a soul. If Gregory Nazianzen's eulogy is too rhetorically gorgeous for modern taste, Hooker's will live while English is spoken: and Gibbon's admiration for Athanasius as a born ruler of men is the more significant as coming from one who could have no tenderness for Church heroes... his character may be thought specifically worthy of recollection ... the deep religiousness ... the unwearied persistency ... the many-sidedness, and harmonious 'combination of excellences' ... the affectionateness which made him so tender and generous ... endowed the great theologian and Church-ruler with the capacities and opportunities peculiar to a truly loveable man.¹

In Alexandria itself, he maintained the popular support which he enjoyed from the outset and buttressed his position by organizing an ecclesiastical mafia. In later years, if he so desired, he could instigate a riot or prevent the orderly administration of the city. Athanasius possessed a power independent of the emperor which he built up and perpetuated by violence... Like a modern gangster, he evoked widespread mistrust, proclaimed total innocence - and usually succeeded in evading conviction on specific charges.²

These irreconcilable views of Athanasius are extreme expressions of two schools of thought. To the first have belonged nearly all of the historians of Athanasius previous to the early twentieth century, as well as a small group of modern authors. The majority of these, however, it should be remembered, were (or are) themselves connected with religious traditions which have looked with reverence upon the person of Athanasius. To the second has subscribed, to greater or lesser degrees, the

vast majority of modern Church historians. The supporters of the first argue that Athanasius, even with minor character flaws, was a robust exponent of the faith of the Church and a champion of the Nicene definition. While admitting that he was often rash and impetuous or imprecise in his theological terminology, they believe that his qualities as a writer and churchman far outweigh any defects of thought or character which he may have possessed. In short, many, especially among the writers of the nineteenth century, took too uncritical a view of Athanasius, who, it must be admitted, is not at first sight a wholly attractive personality. Intrigue seems to have surrounded him from the earliest days of his episcopate. As a young and relatively powerful bishop, he may have done less than was called for in the reconciliation of the Meletian community in Egypt. He shared many of the aggressive qualities of his age. Too often Egyptian ecclesiastical disputes dissolved into fratricidal violence, with the possibility of outrages being committed by all involved. I would argue, however, that much of the evidence provided by Athanasius himself has often been discounted and greater weight given to material from sources which upon thoughtful investigation do not always present the clear picture of misconduct on the part of Athanasius in the early years of his episcopate that is often claimed. Furthermore, as has been stated earlier in this present study, the application of modern standards of conduct upon fourth century personalities is sometimes less than helpful in an enquiry of this sort.

The second school of thought maintains that Athanasius was wholly driven by a 'will to power', entirely consumed by greed and ambition, and consistently prone to resort to violence,

especially in the early years of his episcopate. Concerned only with self-aggrandizement, he was too short-sighted to look to the true interests of the church as an international and cosmopolitan entity. This view, however, ignores the serious manner with which Athanasius approached his responsibilities as he perceived them. Very few can question the support which Athanasius enjoyed within the Egyptian church almost from the outset, or the large number of Meletian clergy who supported him, even against their former co-religionists. In synodal gatherings and in the presence of the emperor, Athanasius time and time again frustrated the attempts of his enemies to remove him by means of demonstrable evidence which proved the false nature of their accusations. His means of defense in such situations was often pragmatic, and although unpopular with his opponents, proved to be convincing with regard to the emperor, the western bishops, the Egyptian monastic communities, his own clergy, and even some of those who had once brought charges against him. It may be reasonably argued that Athanasius went to extreme lengths to maintain his position and that his basic motivation was, therefore, selfish; but the consistency with which he proclaimed his innocence and marshalled documents and witnesses to support his claims does suggest some degree of confidence on his part which goes beyond mere bravado or a gangster-like mentality. The survival of the Church as he perceived it lay at the heart of his struggle. This, even in the early years of his episcopate, he knew well. He also knew, having seen the deposition of Eustathius and the other activities of Eusebius of Nicomedia, how ruthless his enemies could be in achieving their ends. It seems reasonable to argue,

therefore, that he would not have lightly taken a position or undertaken an extremely provocative action which could have been subsequently used to remove him; it is arguable from the investigations undertaken in this study that he never did so.

In fact both views of Athanasius have often oversimplified what is admittedly a complex sequence of events within which equally complex personalities are found. One is too partisan, the other too critical. Both, and this is where I believe they share a fundamental failing, credit Athanasius in the early years of his episcopate with more efficiency and power, more influence and ambition (whether for good or ill) than he actually possessed. Both views also credit the bishop with less local pastoral concern than that which he obviously exercised in the maintaining of his support within Egypt and which is clearly demonstrated in so many of his extant writings.³ This distortion of history is excusable, for the near contemporaries of Athanasius, as Gregory and the historians, may themselves have exaggerated the influence and power of the bishop in the interests of hagiography or their own immediate doctrinal and ecclesiastical concerns.

In a similar manner, the circumstances surrounding the Synod of Tyre and Athanasius' banishment by Constantine have also been oversimplified. By the year AD 338, the Eusebians appear to have begun a campaign to have the deposition of Athanasius at Tyre recognized by the Western bishops (especially Julius of Rome) and the new secular authority which had been vested in Constantine II, Constans and Constantius II, following the death of Constantine the Great on 22 May AD 337 and their proclamation as augusti on 9 September of that same year.⁴ An

answer to the letters of the Eusebians to the three emperors was undertaken by the Synod of Alexandria in AD 338/339. The Egyptian bishops specifically answered the charges which led to the Synod of Tyre and the subsequent actions of that gathering with regard to the innocence of Athanasius with the strong assertion that the bishops at Tyre lacked the authority and the means to depose the bishop of Alexandria.⁵ They appear to maintain Athanasius' own claim that he had been exiled by imperial authority alone and could, therefore, rightly and legally be returned to his see city by a subsequent imperial decree, this time issued by the eldest of Constantine's sons, Constantine II, on 17 June AD 337.⁶

It seems reasonable to assume that this action had the initial consent of Constantius, as he had been appointed Caesar of the entire East, including Egypt and Libya.⁷ Moreover, Athanasius probably had at least one meeting with Constantius at Viminacium, either before the bishop's triumphal entry into Alexandria on 23 November AD 337, or very soon thereafter.⁸ It also appears that at least two of the augusti were convinced, or chose to believe as a matter of expediency, that Athanasius' first exile was the result of an exercise of imperial authority and not the execution of a synodal sentence. The Eusebian claim to the contrary would provide the background for both the second exile of Athanasius and the Synod of Sardica where the charges from Tyre would be revived. Nevertheless, it is important to note that it was not until Athanasius' reinstatement at the hands of the augusti that the issue of Tyre's authority became central. Furthermore, it was only after Athanasius' return and the translation of Eusebius from Nicomedia to Constantinople

that the authority of Tyre became a point of contention between the Eastern and Western bishops. To claim, therefore, that the judgement of the Synod of Tyre was universally recognized from the beginning is to dismiss those circumstances which actually surrounded the synod and to view its proceedings only from the Eusebian vantage point of the later synods at Antioch and Sardica. Such an outlook runs the risk, as stated above, of oversimplification and, perhaps, the acceptance of a Eusebian interpretation of events which was already anachronistic by the time of Sardica.⁹

A study of the early episcopate of Athanasius does, however, reveal inherent contradictions. As the bishop of Alexandria he possessed an established and seemingly highly organized ecclesiastical structure. The unique position of the Alexandrine church as a pivot point between East and West cannot be questioned. Yet, Arius arose out of Alexandria, Libya often sought a semi-independent status, the monastic communities were unruly, schismatic groups as the Colluthians and Meletians held sway in some rural regions, and from the time of mid-third century the attitude of both Eastern and Western bishops toward Alexandria may only be described as ambiguous. Much of what Athanasius was in his early years as a bishop was the result of this environment. That Athanasius was a controversial figure, even in the early years of his episcopate, cannot be denied. That many of the controversies were inherited must also be accepted.

The question of Athanasius' character in these early years, however, remains. As this thesis was being completed, the long awaited study of the fourth century doctrinal controversies by the late R.P.C. Hanson, The Search for the Christian Doctrine of

God, was published.¹⁰ Although it is not possible to do full justice to the material put forward by Hanson in this conclusion, some mention must be made of those points which are particularly germane to the issues which have been raised in the main body of this thesis. Firstly, in what is a masterful compilation of materials and sources, Hanson rightly perceives the character of Athanasius in the early years of his episcopate as being crucial to our understanding of the period.¹¹ Unfortunately, Hanson has accepted, albeit with some reservations, the estimates of Athanasius by Schwartz, Barnes, and Klein.¹² Furthermore, the accounts of Philostorgius, whom Hanson recognizes as 'an extreme Arian', are considered to be 'moderate' and 'consequently all the more worth considering'.¹³ Concerning Athanasius' election to the see of Alexandria, Hanson writes that, the bishop 'was indeed elected, but not by an immediate and unanimous acclamation, and not without suspicion of sharp practice'.¹⁴ He does accept, however, that the Meletian bishops were probably excluded from the election, although this situation is not connected with the resurgence of the schism.¹⁵

Although much more could be said about the particulars of Hanson's estimate of Athanasius and the circumstances surrounding the Synod of Tyre, he has himself provided a synopsis of the material which is instructive:¹⁶

When therefore we try to reconstruct the events which concerned Athanasius from his election in 328 until the Council of Tyre in the summer of 335, we must bear in mind that our main informant (Athanasius himself) is determined to conceal his violent behaviour by alleging that all was invented by people who were dangerous heretics, and that most of the rest of the sources, and most writers since, have taken this plea at face value.

Hanson, however, believed that one piece of evidence, 'the significance of [which] has not yet sunk in everywhere', must cause us to accept the thesis that, 'Athanasius' first efforts at gangsterism in his diocese had nothing to do with difference of opinion about the subject of the Arian Controversy, but were directed against the Meletians'.¹⁷

The evidence which Hanson brings forward is LP 1914. He introduces his case for the acceptance of this document as follows:¹⁸

We might dismiss the accusations against Athanasius retailed by Sozomenus and Epiphanius as the product of sheer partisanship and not worthy of credence, as, for instance, Gwatkin does, and many a church historian before and after him who was willing to take Athanasius' protestations of his innocence at their face value. We might believe the direct denial that Athanasius ever hurt or imprisoned anyone, made by the Egyptian bishops in 338. We might dismiss the allegations of the Council of Tyre, and treat the accusations made against Athanasius by the Eastern bishops, at Serdica in 343, with the same skepticism as we read the defence of him made at the same moment by the Western bishops, or with even more. All these are statements made for propaganda purposes by very much interested parties, though even in those circumstances it would be unwise to refuse all credit to them. But, accidentally or providentially, we have available to us contemporary evidence which we cannot possibly dismiss as invention or exaggeration or propaganda, to decide this point.

The evidence consists of papyrus letters discovered by British archeologists and published by H.I. Bell in his book Jews and Christians in Egypt.

Hanson accepts LP 1914 as published, without any critical evaluation of the papyrus save for that of the letter's distinguished editor. For Hanson, the letter shows 'Athanasius behaving like an employer of thugs hired to intimidate his enemies'.¹⁸ One may note, however, almost in contradiction to his earlier statement, that Hanson comments in a footnote that, 'it should be pointed out that these papyri are by no means the only

evidence for the case against Athanasius'.¹⁹ Yet, even Hanson has admitted in the statement above that there is little clear evidence that is not contradicted by other sources to make such certain claims against the bishop of Alexandria. At this point, I believe, Hanson has followed a traditional approach to LP 1914 which, as has been shown in this present study, is less than helpful in an evaluation of the events which it claims to report upon. Many questions, both contextual and textual, remain unanswered in regard to LP 1914. In addition to those issues which have been considered within this thesis, other concerns may be raised. As E.A. Judge has wondered 'what kind of solitaries' the persecuted Meletian monks who lived in Alexandria were, a further question might be, 'what sort of Egyptian monastic community in AD 334 is placed by the eastern gate of the old city wall, well to the west of the hippodrome', that is, effectively within the city itself? Furthermore, did H.I. Bell notice such an inconsistency when he chose to translate $\mu\omicron\nu\tilde{\eta}$ in LP 1914 as 'hostel' rather than 'monastery', as he did in LP 1913?²¹ Clearly, as has been shown within this thesis, these papyri pose more questions than they answer with any degree of certainty. Hanson's overdependence upon these documents must place many of his conclusions concerning Athanasius' character and behaviour during the early years of his episcopate in some doubt.

Hanson's treatment of the Synod of Tyre is somewhat more even handed, although he provides a very brief account of the proceedings.²² He acknowledges that,²³

Ecclesiastical councils were, and long continued to be, intensely unsatisfactory organs of justice, without forms or standing orders or presidents who could control them or even counting of votes.

Once more, however, he accepts the testimony of Athanasius' enemies with little regard for context, and states that the bishop of Alexandria's supporters 'behaved during the session of Council in a disturbing and threatening manner' and that, 'His encouragement over several years to his supporters to behave like hooligans was now recoiling on his own head'.²³ Although Hanson allows that there was 'an air of nemesis' about the Synod of Tyre with regard to its proceedings, an impression is given that there was (and is) little doubt about Athanasius' guilt.²⁴ Hanson summarizes the actions of the synod as follows:²⁵

Nobody can pretend that the proceedings at Tyre were a model of just dealing. The difficulty facing the bishops gathered there was that they could only condemn on specific, not on general, charges, and it was difficult to obtain evidence on specific charges. But they had given Athanasius an opportunity to defend himself. The behaviour of his supporters during the trial was menacing and exasperating and suggested that he was more concerned with coercion than with justice. It must have been clear to everybody that he had been for some time using indefensible violence in the administration of his see, even though it was not very easy to bring him to book on exact charges.

Yet, Hanson fails to mention the attacks upon the person of Athanasius, the interference of Dionysius, the protests of bishops from outside of Egypt, the false charge of murder and only considers the violence of the Mareotic commission in an aside. The argument presented is one based upon silence and presuppositions concerning the character of the bishop of Alexandria.

In concluding his evaluation of the behaviour of Athanasius, Hanson alleges that the 'misconduct' of the bishop of Alexandria was the most serious cause of the breach between

the East and West that became apparent at Sardica. He characterizes Athanasius' behaviour as follows:²⁶

Even if some of the proceedings of the Council of Tyre were high-handed, it was beyond doubt that Athanasius had behaved with violence against the Meletians and evinced in his general conduct an authoritarian character determined to exploit the influence of his see.

Despite Hanson's assertions to the contrary, such an indictment of Athanasius differs very little from those of O. Seeck and E. Schwartz. For Hanson, Athanasius, while a genuine theologian, remained 'an unscrupulous politician'.²⁷

The picture of Athanasius which has emerged in the course of the research presented in this thesis is, admittedly, far different from that which has been outlined above. I believe that certain assertions concerning Athanasius may be made on the basis of this research. Preeminent among these assertions is the conclusion that there is far less evidence for the violent and duplicitous character of Athanasius than might be supposed from a cursory reading of Hanson, Barnes, or the other current critics. Many of the contemporary views concerning Athanasius have less to do with documentary evidence than with an historical literary tradition that grew out of the first attempts of O. Seeck to prove the bishop of Alexandria to be a forger.²⁸ The change from the nineteenth century view of Athanasius has been influenced more by a climate of criticism than with new documentary sources. Such a process may be plainly seen in the controversy surrounding Athanasius' election and consecration as bishop of Alexandria. The Philostorgian material has been well known for many years, but its value was measured over against more reliable sources and its inherent contradictions and interpolations caused it to be considered, I believe rightly, as

being of little help in reconstructing the events of AD 328. Yet the work of W. Rusch endeavours to convince the reader that this material must be considered as being of equal importance along with other well established sources.²⁹

The question of the Meletians and LP 1914 is somewhat different. In this case, very little critical textual or contextual evaluation has taken place. This has led to a blind acceptance of a document which must be considered enigmatic, to say the very least. On the basis of the research undertaken thus far, LP 1914 appears to be out of place with regard to context, and inexact (if not wholly suspect) in regard to its content.³⁰ In connection with this document, however, it is clear that the major controversy in Egypt from AD 328 to AD 335 was almost completely concerned with the Meletians and, perhaps, lesser schismatic groups such as the Colluthians, rather than the Arian party whose alliance with the schismatic groups was gradual and probably unknown to Athanasius until AD 334/335.³¹ It is also certain that Athanasius enjoyed far greater support from Meletians who had reconciled themselves to the see of Alexandria than has been previously thought. This support continued through to the Synod of Tyre and may well have been instrumental in his winning over of the Egyptian monastic communities, many of which had Meletian leanings.³² Furthermore, there is very little evidence, apart from the accusations of his opponents, that Athanasius engaged in widespread or systematic violence within his see. Certainly, the oration of Gregory Nazianzen provides no such suggestion, even beneath the veil of his expansive rhetoric.³³ It is, however, likely that a good deal of violence between various factions of the Egyptian church may

have taken place during the course of this turbulent period, but the evidence indicates that no particular party was exclusively responsible, much less any single individual.³⁴

Finally, some evaluation must be made of those events and circumstances which led to the Synod of Tyre and the first exile of Athanasius. It is the contention of this thesis that those events and circumstances which led to the Synod of Tyre must be considered as important as the gathering itself and, therefore, provide the necessary background for understanding what took place in the summer and autumn of AD 335. Any historical narrative is more than its constituent elements; it is more than information about places, dates and situations: it is a chronological account of actions by persons with motives, these actions and motives coming together in particular events. To understand the motives and their outcome certainly requires knowledge about the persons involved, chronology, institutions and documents, but unless a synthesis is made of these elements with each other and with the element of time, we are left without a true historical narrative. Tyre, therefore, cannot be viewed in isolation.

To this end I have attempted to place the Synod of Tyre within the context of the many earlier accusations of Athanasius before the emperor, the Meletian schism in Egypt, the evolution of canon law, synodal procedures and authority, and the earlier, but similar, deposition of Eustathius of Antioch. To these varied contextual elements, mention has also been made concerning imperial authority and its relationship with synodal decrees. It is clear that the calling of the Synod of Tyre was concerned less with Athanasius' alleged misconduct in Egypt and more with

the Eusebian party's desire to rid itself of its opponents and secure the readmission of Arius and his fellows within the Egyptian church. It also seems probable, as has been stated above, that Athanasius was unaware of the Arian influence upon the machinations of the Meletians and that the Arian party within Egypt posed no real threat in the early years of his episcopate, although the situation in Libya may have been different. I would contend that these hypotheses are supported by not only the internal documentary sources, but are also consonant with those external sources which surround this controversy. In the end, Athanasius' banishment was the result of an imperial decree on the basis of an accusation which had not even been raised at Tyre and which seems to have been improbable with regard to its content.

The many accusations made against Athanasius, before, during and after Tyre, have often been considered as evidence that some truth must stand behind the charges, even if particular indictments cannot be proved.³⁵ It must be said, however, that even a minute survey of the accusations against Athanasius provides little consistent evidence which might indicate guilt on the part of the bishop. On the contrary, the inconsistency of the accusations made by his opponents, should cause one to question the veracity of such charges and the motives of his accusers. If the internal evidence of the indictments is unproductive, so too is the search for material evidence of guilt, for apart from the disputed claims of LP 1914 and the confused accounts of Philostorgius, little else emerges. On the contrary, Meletian and monastic support of Athanasius appears to grow within the very period of time during which Athanasius is

supposed to be the most active in his alleged persecutions. The increasingly civil and secular nature of the charges made against Athanasius through the years, however, and indeed the civil quality of the final accusation made against him in Constantinople in AD 335, would indicate an attempt to play upon the deep-seated concerns of Constantine, especially concerning the unity of the empire and the economic health of his capital.

If the many accusations against Athanasius are essentially unproven and the actions of the Synod of Tyre so suspect that Constantine was convinced to recall the gathering to Constantinople, the motivation of the emperor in exiling the bishop of Alexandria, as well as John Archaph, must be considered. The most immediate and obvious motive was a desire for unity within the Eastern church. However, while this may remain the prime reason for Constantine's actions, it does not exclude the possibility that there were other minor factors, possibly political and economic, which were of some importance. The combination of imperial respect and frustration with Athanasius which culminated in his banishment, while difficult for the modern reader to understand, does seem to have been a consistent trait of Constantine which was exercised in his relationship with a wide variety of church leaders. T.D. Barnes has commented upon this facet of Constantine's character as follows:³⁶

Official pronouncements by any autocrat deserve to be treated with a certain skepticism. But Constantine's letters to bishops, priests, and churches, fall into so consistent a pattern of respect tempered with frustration that it is difficult to regard them as mere products of tact, diplomacy, or policy. The emperor's personal attitudes and convictions constantly obtrude, and he speaks as one conversant with philosophy and theology who nevertheless believes the conversion of the Roman Empire to worship of the Christian God far more important than a precise (and

potentially exclusive) definition of the intellectual content of Christianity.

For the emperor, the exile of Athanasius, as well as that of John Archaph, probably had little to do with the with the decrees of Tyre. Instead, it may be opined that both Athanasius and the schismatics in Egypt were impediments to the unity of the Eastern church and the quality of inclusiveness which the emperor desired. Although he may have hoped that the Synod of Tyre would settle the issue of Egypt, when it failed to do so he took matters into his own hands. Yet, it remains significant that Constantine apparently refused to depose Athanasius who remained 'technically bishop of Alexandria' though exiled to Trier.³⁷ Banished by imperial decree, apart from the judgement of the Synod of Tyre, Athanasius would also return from exile to Alexandria under the patronage of imperial authority.

If the many accusations against Athanasius during the early years of his episcopate cannot be dismissed out of hand, they must at least be considered unproven. The persistent nature of these charges and, indeed, the fiasco of the Synod of Tyre may be explained in terms of factors external to the Egyptian church, rather than through any of its internal failings or the misconduct of its bishop. The internal dissension in Egypt, especially among the Meletian and Colluthian schismatics was undoubtedly a contributing factor, but the evidence shows that these discontented schismatics were encouraged and assisted by the Eusebians as part of a larger plan to have Arius readmitted within the Egyptian church. Recourse to the emperor was first employed by this alliance, where time after time the charges against Athanasius were refuted. The desire to have Athanasius appear before a synod, in a manner reminiscent of Eustathius,

was but another part of this same process. The calling of the Synods of Caesarea and Tyre, therefore, cannot be viewed in the conventional sense of tests of guilt or innocence, but as tragic show trials, so familiar to our own century, the verdicts of which had been decided far in advance of their meeting.

In closing this study of the early episcopal career of Athanasius of Alexandria, I cannot help but confess that there is still much to learn concerning this vitally important period of the bishop's life and career. Perhaps, new sources will come to light or further investigation of present sources may yield new insights. Yet, I cannot but feel that the bishop deserves a better fate than to serve continually to future generations as an example of a fourth century gangster or an unscrupulous church politician of the late Constantinian epoch. For although there may have been times during which Athanasius was rash or his movements ill-judged, there is little solid evidence from the early years of his episcopate that he behaved in the manner which has been suggested by so many studies over the past three generations. It rather seems to me that the comment of Harnack, although slightly overstated, as was the manner of his own time, may yet prove to be a more accurate epitaph for Athanasius than the vilification of many contemporary critics:³⁸

If we measure him by the standards of his time, we can discover nothing ignoble or weak about him.

CONCLUSION

NOTES

- ¹W. Bright, *The Orations of St. Athanasius Against the Arians*, second edition, Oxford, 1884, pp. c - ci
- ²T.D. Barnes, *Constantine and Eusebius*, London, 1981, p. 230
- ³This pastoral concern of Athanasius has recently been highlighted in C. Kannengiesser, *Athanase d'Alexandrie Évêque et Écrivain, (Théologie Historique 70)*, Paris, 1983 and in C. Kannengiesser, 'St. Athanasius of Alexandria Rediscovered: His Political and Pastoral Achievement', *Coptic Church Review* Vol. 9, No. 3 (Fall 1988), pp. 68 - 74
- ⁴*cf.* *Apol.* 3: 5-7 (Opitz, p. 89, 19 - p. 90, 15) and *Hist. Arian.* 9, 1 (Opitz, p. 188, 3-5)
- ⁵*cf.* *Apol.* 7, 2 - 8, 5 (Opitz, p. 93, 18 - p. 94, 30)
- ⁶For this decree *cf.* *Apol.* 87, 4-7 (Opitz, p. 166, 11-29)
- ⁷Schwartz, *GS* III, p. 268
- ⁸*cf.* *Ad Const.* 5 (Szymusiak, *SC* 56, p. 93); Although the evidence for Athanasius' return to Alexandria in November AD 337, rather than November AD 338, is circumstantial, the arguments of A. Martin, *Histoire*, pp. 75, 78 - 89 are convincing. The earlier argument of Baynes, 'Athanasiana', *JEA* Vol. 2 (1925), pp. 58-69, is largely based upon the time which Athanasius would have needed to commit the many outrages of AD 337 which were alleged by the Eusebians at Sardica and his assumptions concerning the writing of the *Festal Letter* for AD 338. The first contention might appear to be a matter of presuppositions influencing the dating of events, while the second argument has been effectively answered by Martin. We have, therefore, rejected Baynes claim that Athanasius returned in November AD 338.
- ⁹How this Eusebian view concerning Tyre and the guilt of Athanasius effected subsequent events at Sardica is developed by H. Hess, *The Canons of the Council of Sardica*, Oxford, 1958, pp. 9ff
- ¹⁰R.P.C. Hanson, *The Search for the Christian Doctrine of God*, Edinburgh, 1988
- ¹¹Hanson, *op. cit.*, pp. 239 - 273
- ¹²*ibid*, pp. 240 - 246; Hanson, however, mitigates the evaluation of Schwartz in his estimate of Athanasius as a theologian, *ibid*, pp. 421 - 422.

- ¹³ Hanson, *op. cit.*, p. 241
- ¹⁴ *ibid*, p. 249
- ¹⁵ *loc. cit.*
- ¹⁶ *ibid*, p. 255
- ¹⁷ *ibid*, p. xx; p. 254
- ¹⁸ *ibid*, p. 254
- ¹⁹ *ibid*, p. 252, footnote 63. In response to the present author's communication at the Tenth International Conference on Patristic Studies held in Oxford in August 1987, Hanson has provided the following response in his study: the 'arguments were well presented, but were all hypothetical and tentative'. The material presented at Oxford in 1987, however, was concerned only with the textual difficulties in LP 1914, of which Hanson makes no mention, and were set forward without the contextual material presented in this thesis.
- ²⁰ E.A. Judge, 'The Earliest Use of Monachos for 'Monk' (P. Coll. Youtie 77) and the Origins of Monasticism', *Jahrbuch für Antike und Christentum* 20 (1977), pp. 84. This mystery is compounded when one considers the geography described in LP 1914. Not only is the monastic establishment described as being near to the 'Gate of the Sun' (LP 1914, ll. 15-16), the eastern gate of the old Roman wall of Alexandria, but the reader is asked to believe that the attackers, already in a drunken state (LP 1914, l. 9), covered 10 - 14 kilometers, from the Nicopolis to the wall and back again, in about three hours. During this time they are also alleged to have committed at least two beatings and have carried away five prisoners. Although such a scenario is not impossible, it does strain credulity.
- ²¹ LP 1914, l. 16 and LP 1913, l. 2; The translations are provided, respectively, Bell, *Jews and Christians*, p. 62 and p. 50.
- ²² Hanson, *op. cit.*, pp. 259 - 262
- ²³ *ibid*, p. 260
- ²⁴ *ibid*, p. 262
- ²⁵ *ibid*
- ²⁶ *ibid*, p. 272; Hanson also accepts the claim of M. Simonetti, *La Crisi Ariana nel Quarto Secolo*, Rome, 1979, p. 153, that

'Athanasius was a person to be held at arm's length as much as possible' (Hanson's translation) as far as the Eastern bishops were concerned. Such a view, however, is more appropriate to the situation following Sardica. Previous to that time Athanasius had enjoyed the support of a number of Eastern bishops, including Alexander of Thessalonica and Marcellus of Ancyra. The depositions in the east, along with the changing political situation cut away much of the support which Athanasius had previously enjoyed.

²⁷ Hanson, *op. cit.*, p. 422

²⁸ *vide supra*, pp. 25 - 29

²⁹ *vide supra*, pp. 39ff

³⁰ *vide supra*, pp. 79ff and Appendix A

³¹ *vide supra*, pp. 186ff

³² *vide supra*, pp. 97ff

³³ *vide supra*, pp. 111 - 117

³⁴ *vide supra*, p. 103

³⁵ Hanson, *op. cit.*, p. 262

³⁶ Barnes, *Constantine and Eusebius*, p. 242

³⁷ *ibid*, p. 240

³⁸ A. von Harnack, *History of Dogma* (English trans.), Vol. III, third edition, Edinburgh, 1898, p. 62

APPENDIX A
LONDON PAPYRUS 1914

APPENDIX A

LONDON PAPYRUS 1914

- 1 Τῷ ἀγαπητῷ ἀδελφῷ ἅπα Παιηοῦ καὶ Παταβεῖτ πρεσβυτέροις Κάλ-
 λιστος ἐν
 2 κ(υρί)ῳ θ(ε)ῷ χαίρειν. Γινόσκιν ὑμᾶς θέλομεν τὰ πραχθέντα
 ἐνταῦθα
 3 πράγματα· ἐξάφινα γὰρ ἠκούσατε τὰ ἐπάθαμεν ἐν τῇ νυκτὶ ἐκίνη ἐν τῇ
 οἰκίᾳ Ἑρα-
 4 κλέου τοῦ κο(μ)μενταρησίου. Εἰσὶν γὰρ καὶ τινες ἀδελφοὶ ἐκ τῶν ἐλ-
 [θ]όντων πρὸς ὑμᾶς
 5 μεθ' ἡμῶν ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ καὶ δύνονται καὶ αὐτοὶ τὰ πραχθέντα [ύ]μῖν
 ἀναγ(γ)ίλαι. Μετὰ
 6 γὰρ τὴν ἡμέραν ἐκίνη(ν) ἐν τῇ τ(ρ)ετράδι καὶ εἰκάδι τοῦ Παχ(ῶ)ν
 μηνὸς Ἰσὰκ
 7 ὁ ἐπίσκοπος ἀπὸ Δητοῦς ἦλθεν πρὸς Ἑραεῖσκον ἐν Ἀλεξάνδρῳ, καὶ
 ἠθέλησεν
 8 γεύσασθαι μετὰ τοῦ ἐπισκόπου ἐν τῇ παρεμβολῇ. Ἀκούσαν[τε]ς οὖν οἱ
 διαφέρον-
 9 τες Ἀθανασίου καὶ ἦλθασιν φέροντες μεθ' ἑαυτῶν στρατιότας τοῦ δουκὸς
 καὶ τῆς
 10 παρεμβολῆς, οἰνόμενοι ἦλθασιν ὥρα ἐνάτη συνκλίσαντες τὴν [π]αρεμβολὴν
 βουλόμε(νοι)
 11 καὶ αὐτὸν καὶ τοὺς ἀδελφούς πιάσαι. Ἀκούσαντες οὖν τινὲς στρατιῶται
 [ο]ὶ ἐν τῇ παρεμβολῇ καὶ
 12 φόβον θεοῦ ἔχοντες ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ ἤρκαν αὐτοὺς καὶ ἔκρυψαν ἐν ταῖς
 κέλλαις ἐν τῇ παρεμβολῇ·
 13 καὶ ἐκίνων μὴ εὐρεθέντων ἐγβάντων αὐτῶν εὗραν τέσσαρες ἀδελφούς
 ἐρχομένους ἐν τῇ πα-
 14 ρεμβολῇ, καὶ κατακόψαντες αὐτοὺς καὶ ἐμαρώεις ποιησάμενοι ὥστε αὐτοὺς
 κινδυνεῦσαι καὶ ἐξέβαλαν
 15 αὐτοὺς ἔξω τῆς Νικοπόλεως. Καὶ μετὰ (τὸ) τούτους ἐγβαλὶν ἀπήλθασιν
 πάλιν ἐπὶ τὴν πύλην τοῦ
 16 Ἑλίου ἐν τῇ μονῇ ἐν ἣ ἦσιν ἐπιξενούμενοι οἱ ἀδελφοὶ καὶ πιάσαντες
 ἄλλους πέντη ἐκὶ εἰ(ρ)ξαν
 17 αὐτοὺς ἐν τῇ παρεμβολῇ ὄψίας, καὶ συνκλίσαντες αὐτοὺς μέχρι τοῦ
 τ[ὸ]ν πραιπόσιτον προερθῖν
 18 ἐν τοῖς σίγνοις τὸ πρὸς προεῖ καὶ λαβὼν αὐτοὺς ὁ πραιπόσιτος καὶ ὁ
 σκρίβας καὶ αὐτοὺς ἐκέλευ-
 19 σεν ἐγβληθῆναι ἐκτὸς τῆς Νικοπόλεως· καὶ τὸν μονάριν Ἑρακλίδην
 δύ[σα]ντες καὶ ὑβρίσαντες
 20 ἐνέτιλαν τῷ αὐτῷ ἐπαπιλούμενοι, ὅτι “κατὰ ποῖαν ἔτιαν τοὺς μ[ο]ναχοὺς
 τῶν Μελιτιανῶν

- 21 ἦσας ἐν τῇ μωνῇ;" καὶ ἄλλον ἀδελφὸν Ἀμμωνα ὄντα ἐν τῇ παρεμ-
β[ο]λῇ [καὶ αὐτὸν ὑποδεχόμενον
22 τοὺς ἀδελφούς συνέκλισαν ἐν τῇ παρεμβολῇ, παρή(γ)ιλαν δὲ αὐτοῦ ὥστε
μὴ ὑποδέχασθαι αὐ-
23 τὸν μοναχὸς ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ αὐτοῦ. Ἄλλος γὰρ ἀδελφὸς οὐκ ἔστιν ἢ μὴ
οὔ[τοι οἱ] δύο ὑποδέχομενοι τοὺς
24 ἀδελφούς· ἐποίησαν αὐτοὺς διλανθῆναι. Θλιβόμεθα οὖν πάνυ διεργόμενοι
ὑπὸ αὐτῶν κατὰ τό-
25 πον. Ἐπιλοιπούμεθα οὖν {ουν} ὅτι οὐκ ἐπιτρέπουσιν ἡμῖν πρὸς τὸν
πάπαν Ἑραείσκον ἀπελθῖν
26 καὶ ἐπισκέψασθαι αὐτόν. Ἐν τῇ νυκτὶ γὰρ ἐν ἣ ὑβρίσθησαν οἱ ἀδελφοὶ
ὁ πραι[π]όσιτος τῶν στρατιοτῶν ἔπεμ-
27 σεν φάσιν τῷ ἐπισκόπῳ λέγων ὅτι "ἡμάρτησα καὶ ἐπαρυνήθην ἐν τῇ
νυκτὶ ὅτι τοὺς ἀδελφούς
28 ὕβρισα". Ἐποίησεν δὲ καὶ ἀγάπην ἐν ἐκίῃ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ Ἑλλην ὧν διὰ
τὸ ἁμάρτημα ὁ ἐποίησεν.

In the left margin, from top to bottom of the papyrus:

- 29 Ἀθανάσιος δὲ μεγάλως ἀθυμῖ καὶ αὐτὸς παρέχει ἡμῖν κάματον διὰ τὰ
γραφώμενα καὶ τὰς
30 φάσις τὰς ἐρχόμενας αὐτ[ῷ] ἀπὸ ἕξωθεν, ἐπιδὴ ὁ β[ι]σιλεύς Μακάριον
εὐρῶν ἕξω ἐν τῷ
31 κομιδᾶ[τῷ]]υρῷ γράψας [.]. ανυους ὅτι δήσας
αὐτὸν καὶ ἐπι
32 . α ἀπο . [.]α ἵνα αὐ[τ]ο] . εσται. Ἀπελθόντων
οὖν Ἀρχελά-
33 ου τοῦ [. καὶ] . μετὰ Ἀθαν[α]σίου τοῦ υἱοῦ Καπίτωνος,

Verso:

- 34 βουλόμενοι ἀποσπάσε Μακάριον, ἢ φάσις οὖν ἀπελθῆν πρὸς ἅπα Ἰωάννην
ἐν Ἀντιοχίᾳ·
35 ἦλθεν καὶ πιάσας αὐτοὺς κατέσχευ αὐτούς, ἐπιδὴ ἐπὶ συκοφαντία καὶ
δινὰ ἦσαν γράψαν-
36 τες κατὰ Ἑραείσκου, καὶ αὐτὸς Ἀρχέλαος τὰ γ(ρ)άμματα ἦρκεν ἕξω.
Ὁ θεὸς οὖν ἐποίησεν
37 καὶ τοὺς τρεῖς ἕξω καὶ ἔχι ἕξω. Τοῦτ' οὖν ἤκουσεν Ἀθανάσιος ὅτι
Ἀρχέλαος
38 συνεσχέθη, πάνυ ἀθυμῖ Ἀθανάσιος. Πολλαχῶς οὖν ἦλθαν ἐπὶ
39 αὐτὸν καὶ μέχρις νῦν οὐκ ἀπεδήμησεν· ἐνεβάλοτο δ[ὲ] τὰ σκεύη αὐτοῦ
ἐν τῇ θα-
40 λάσσει ὡς αὐτοῦ ἀπωδημοῦντος, καὶ πάλιν εἰς δεύτερον ἤνε(γ)κεν τὰ σκεύη
41 ἀπὸ τοῦ πλοίου, μὴ βουλόμενος ἀ[π]οδημῆ[σ]α[ι] ψαι . .
ἔργ[α] ψα εἶνα
42 γνωίται ἐν ποίᾳ θλίψει ἐσμέν· ἤνε(γ)κεν γὰρ ἐπίσκοπον τῆς κάτω χώρας
43 καὶ συνέκλισεν αὐτὸν ἐν τῷ μακέλλῳ, καὶ πρεσβύτερον τῶν αὐτῶν μερῶν
44 συνέκλισεν καὶ αὐτὸν ἐν τῷ ἀπλικίτῳ καὶ διάκωνα ἐν τῇ μεγίστῃ
φοιλακῇ, καὶ μέχρις

- 45 τῆς ὀγδόης καὶ εἰκάδος τοῦ Παχῶν μηνὸς καὶ Ἑραεῖσκος συνεκκλισμέ-
 46 νος ἐστὶν ἐν τῇ παρεμβολῇ—εὐχαριστῶ μὲν τῷ δεσπότῃ θεῷ ὅτι
 ἐπαύθησαν ἐ πλη-
 47 γαί ἄς εἶχεν—καὶ ἐπὶ τῇ ἐνδόμῃ καὶ εἰκάδι ἐποίησεν ἐπισκόπους ἑπτα ἀποδη-
 48 μῆσαι· Ἐμῖς καὶ Πέτρος εἰς αὐτοὺς ἐστίν, υἱὸς Τουβέστις. Μὴ ἀμε-
 λήσῃται οὖν
 49 περὶ ἡμῶν, ἀδελφοί, ἐπιδοῦν τὰ ψωμῖα ἀφήκαν ὀπίσω, ἵνα διὰ τὸν ἐπί-
 σκοπον μή-
 50 πωσ ἔξω ἀρθῇ ἵνα τυρῇ αὐτὰ μετ' αὐτοῦ. Ἐγὼ γὰρ ἀγοράζων ἄρτους
 εἰς δια-
 51 τροφὴν ἠγόρασα ἀρτάβην σίτου (ταλάντων) ἰδ. Ἐπὰν οὖν εὔρηται
 εἰδήμωνα ἀπο-
 52 στίλατέ μοι ὀλίγα ψωμῖα. Ἀσπάζομε τὸν πατέρα μου Πραυσοῦν καὶ
 πάντας τοὺς
 53 ἀδελφοὺς τοὺς ὄντας μετ' αὐτοῦ καὶ Θεόνα τὸν διάκωνα καὶ Σαπρίωνα
 καὶ Ὠρίωνα
 54 καὶ Παπνούτιν καὶ ἄπα Σαρμάτην καὶ Παώμιν καὶ Πιδρ καὶ Εὐδαίμωνα
 καὶ ἄπα Τρύφωνα
 55 καὶ Γερόντιον καὶ ἄπα Ἰέρακαν καὶ ἄπα Ἑλεῖαν καὶ ἄπα Ἀρροῦν καὶ
 ἄπα Πιάμ καὶ Κορνήλιον
 56 καὶ Πισάτιν καὶ Κολλοῦθον καὶ Ἰωσήπ καὶ τὰ παιδιά αὐτοῦ καὶ Φίνες.
 Μὴ ἀμελήσῃς οὖν,
 57 πατήρ, ἀποστίλαι πρὸς Ψαεῖν ἀπὸ Τερδοῦ ἕνεκεν τῆς ἀρτάβης τοῦ σίτου,
 καὶ ποιήσου
 58 Τουᾶν ἀπὸ Ταμούρω ἵνα καὶ αὐτὸς ἀπέλθῃ εἰς Ταμούρω ἕνεκεν τῆς
 ἀρτάβης τοῦ σίτου·
 59 ἡ ἡμέραι γὰρ εἰσὶν τοῦ λαβῖν αὐτοὺς αὐτάς. Ἀσπάζομε Παῦλον τὸν
 ἀναγνώστην καὶ ἄπα
 60 Ἡλί(α)ν καὶ Ἀνουβᾶν μέγαν καὶ Ἀγουβᾶν μικρὸν καὶ Παμούτιν καὶ
 Τιτούνην καὶ τὰ παιδιά αὐτοῦ καὶ Ὀρ
 61 ἀπὸ Τουμνακῶν καὶ πάντας τοὺς ἀδελφοὺς αὐτοῦ τοὺς μετ' αὐτοῦ καὶ
 Παπνούτιν καὶ Λεο-
 62 νίδην τὸν ἀδελφὸν ἀ[ύ]τ[ου] καὶ τὸν ἀδελφὸν τὸν ἄλλον τὸν μετ' αὐτῶν.

At the foot, the opposite way up:

63 Ἄπα Παιηοῦ καὶ Παταβεῖτ]

[π(αρά)] Κα(λ)λίστου.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

ABBREVIATIONS

Standard abbreviations are used for modern works of reference and for articles in scholarly periodicals which should be easily recognized. For those abbreviations which are used in citing Athanasius and other ancient writers, see the bibliographic listing of primary sources. Additional abbreviations for dictionaries and lexicons are also listed separately. For clarification of any abbreviations apart from these listings, or those cited below, see the *Lexicon für Theologie und Kirche*, second edition, Band I, Freiburg, pp. 16-48, which has been used as a standard reference.

<i>AnalBoll</i>	<i>Analecta Bollandiana</i>
<i>AJAH</i>	<i>American Journal of Ancient History</i>
<i>BLE</i>	<i>Bulletin de Littérature ecclésiastique</i>
<i>Byz</i>	<i>Byzantion</i>
<i>ByZ</i>	<i>Byzantinische Zeitschrift</i>
<i>ChH</i>	<i>Church History</i> (The American Society of Church History)
<i>CRAI</i>	<i>Comptes rendus des séances de l'Académie des inscriptions et belles Lettres</i> (Paris)
<i>GCS</i>	<i>Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten (drei) Jahrhunderte</i> . Leipzig and Berlin, 1898 -
<i>GS III - IV</i>	E. Schwartz, <i>Gesammelte Schriften</i> , Bände III and IV, Berlin, 1959-1960
<i>HT(h)R</i>	<i>Harvard Theological Review</i>
<i>JACE</i>	<i>Jahrbuch für Antike und Christentum. Ergänzungsband</i>
<i>JEA</i>	<i>Journal of Egyptian Archaeology</i>
<i>JEH</i>	<i>Journal of Ecclesiastical History</i>

- JJP *Journal of Juristic Papyrology*
- JThS *Journal of Theological Studies*, 1899-1949
- JThS, NS *Journal of Theological Studies*, new series, 1950 -
- LNPF *A Select Library of Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church*, edited by P. Schaff and H. Wace, New York, 1899-1900; reprinted, Grand Rapids, Michigan, 1952-1974.
- NAKG *Nederlands archief voor kerkgeschiednis*
- NedThT *Nederlands theologisch tijdschrift*
- NGG *Nachrichten von der Königlichen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen*
- NTS *New Testament Studies*, Cambridge
- Opitz *Athanasius Werke*. hrsg. im Auftrage der Kirchenväter-Kommission der Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften. Band II, 1, 1-280: *Die Apologien*. edited by H.G. Opitz. Berlin, 1935.
- Opitz, III, (Urkunden) *Athanasius Werke*. hrsg. in Auftrage der Kirchenväter-Kommission der Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften. Band III, 1, 1-76: *Urkunden zur Geschichte des arianischen Streites 318 - 328*. edited by H.G. Opitz. Berlin, 1934.
- OrChP *Orientalia Christiana Periodica*
- PG *Patrologia Graeca*, J.P. Migne
- PL *Patrologia Latina*, J.P. Migne
- PO *Patrologia Orientalis*
- RHE *Revue d'histoire ecclésiastique*
- RHPR *Revue d'histoire et de philosophie religieuses*
- RSLR *Rivista di storia e letteratura religiosa*
- RSR *Recherches de science religieuse*
- RevSR *Revue des sciences religieuses*
- SC *Sources Chrétiennes*. edited by H. de Lubac and J. Daniélou. Paris, 1941 -

<i>StP</i> <i>(Stud. Pat.)</i>	<i>Studia Patristica. Papers presented to the International Conference on Patristic Studies held at Christ Church, Oxford</i>
<i>TP</i>	<i>Theologie und Philosophie</i>
<i>TU</i>	<i>Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur</i>
<i>ThLZ</i>	<i>Theologische Literaturzeitung</i>
<i>ThQ</i>	<i>Theologische Quartalschrift (Tübingen)</i>
<i>ThSt</i>	<i>Theological Studies</i>
<i>ThStKr</i>	<i>Theologische Studien und Kritiken</i>
<i>ThZ</i>	<i>Theologische Zeitschrift (Basle)</i>
<i>VC (VigChr)</i>	<i>Vigiliae Christianae</i>
<i>ZKG</i>	<i>Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte</i>
<i>ZNW</i>	<i>Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche</i>

DICTIONARIES AND LEXICONS

- Smith, *Lexicon* *A Concise Coptic - English Lexicon*, edited by R. Smith, Grand Rapids, Michigan, 1983
- DACL *Dictionnaire d'archéologie chrétienne et de liturgie*. Paris, 1903-1953
- DCB *A Dictionary of Christian Biography, Literature, Sects and Doctrines*, edited by W. Smith and H. Wace, London, 1877-1887
- DHGE *Dictionnaire d'histoire et de géographie ecclésiastiques*, edited by A. Baudrillart, Paris, 1912 -
- Lampe, *Lexicon* *A Patristic Greek Lexicon*, edited by G.W.H. Lampe, Oxford, 1961
- Liddel-Scott *A Greek - English Lexicon*, ninth edition, Oxford, 1940
- LThK (first) *Lexicon für Theologie und Kirche*, edited by M. Buchberger, Freiburg, 1930-1938
- LThK (second) *Lexicon für Theologie und Kirche*, edited by J. Höfer and K. Rahner, Freiburg, 1957 -
- Müller, *Lexicon* *Lexicon Athanasianum*, edited by G. Müller, Berlin, 1952
- ODCC *The Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church*, edited by F.L. Cross and E.A. Livingstone, second edition, London, 1974
- RAC *Reallexicon für Antike und Christentum*, edited by T. Klauser, Stuttgart, 1950 -
- RE *Realencyklopädie für protestantische Theologie und Kirche*, third edition, edited by A. Hauck, Leipzig, 1896-1913

PRIMARY SOURCES

EDITIONS AND TRANSLATIONS
BIBLIOGRAPHIES

Athanasius of Alexandria

ΑΠΑΝΤΑ ΜΕΓΑΛΟΥ ΑΘΑΝΑΣΙΟΥ, ΑΠΑΝΤΑ ΤΩΝ ΑΓΙΩΝ ΠΑΤΕΡΩΝ, volumes
1-12, Athens, 1974-1977

Apologie à l'Empereur Constance et Apologie pour sa fuite.
Introduction, texte critique, traduction et notes par
J.M. Szymusiak, SJ, *Sources Chrétiennes* no. 56, Paris, 1958

*The Armenian Version of the Letters of Athanasius to Bishop
Serapion Concerning the Holy Spirit.* Edited and translated
by G.A. Egan. *Studies and Documents.* Salt Lake City,
1968

Atanasio. Lettere a Serapione lo Spirito Santo. Translation,
introduction and notes by E. Cattaneo, Rome, 1986

Athanasiana Syriaca. Four volumes edited and translated by
R.W. Thomson. *CSCO* 257-258, 272-273, 324-325, 386-387.
Louvain, 1965-1977

Athanasius' Orations Against the Arians, Book I. Translated and
edited by W.G. Rusch. *Sources of Early Christian Thought.*
Philadelphia, 1980

Ausgewählte Schriften des heiligen Athanasius. translated by
J. Fisch. *Bibliothek der Kirchenväter.* Kempten, 1872-1875

Contra Gentes and De Incarnatione. Edited and translated by
R.W. Thomson. *Oxford Early Christian Texts.* Oxford, 1971

*Des heiligen Athanasius ausgewählte Schriften aus dem Griechischen
Übersetzt.* Edited and translated by J. Lippl, A. Stegmann,
and H. Mertel. *Bibliothek der Kirchenväter* (second series)
Volumes 13 and 31, Kempten, 1913-1917

*Die Fest-Briefe des Heiligen Athanasius Bischofs von Alexandria
aus dem Syrischen Übersetzt und durch Anmerkungen erläutert.*
edited and translated by F. Larsow, Leipzig, 1852

Discours contre les païens. Edited and translated by P.T.
Camelot. *Sources Chrétiennes* no. 18, (second edition)
Paris, 1977

The Incarnation of the Word of God (De Incarnatione). Translated
by a religious of CSMV. London, 1953

The Letters of Saint Athanasius concerning the Holy Spirit.

Translated by C.R.B. Shapland. London, 1951

The Life of Anthony and the Letter to Marcellinus. Translated

by R.C. Gregg. *The Classics of Western Spirituality.*

New York, 1980

The Life of Saint Anthony. Translated by R.T. Meyer. *Ancient*

Christian Writers no. 10, Westminster, Maryland, 1950

ΜΕΓΑΛΕ ΑΘΑΝΑΣΙΟΥΣ. ΒΕΝΕΣ volumes 30-37. Athens, 1962-1968

Opera omnia quae exstant. Edited by B. de Montfaucon (J.P.

Migne). *Patrologia Graeca* volumes 25-28, Paris, 1884-

1887

Osterfestbriefe des Apa Athanasius aus dem Koptischen Übersetzt

und erläutert. Edited and translated by P. Merendino,

Düsseldorf, 1965

Orations Against the Arians. Book III, 26-41. In *The*

Christological Controversy. Translated and edited by

R.A. Norris. *Sources of Early Christian Thought.*

Philadelphia, 1980

The Orations of St. Athanasius. *The Ancient and Modern Library*

of Theological Literature. London, no date given

St. Athanasius' Orations Against the Arians. Introduction,

edited and translated by W. Bright, Oxford, 1884

Select Writings and Letters of Athanasius, Bishop of

Alexandria. edited by A. Robertson. *A Select Library of*

Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church,

second series, Vol. IV, reprinted edition, Grand Rapids,

Michigan, 1974

Sur l'Incarnation du Verbe. Texte critique, traduction,

introduction, notes et index par C. Kannengiesser.

Sources Chrétiennes no. 199, Paris, 1972

Werke. hrsg. im Auftrage der Kirchenväter-Kommission der

Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften. edited by

H.G. Opitz. Band II, 1, 1-280: *Die Apologien.* Berlin,

1935

La 10^e lettre festale d'Athanase d'Alexandrie. (M. Albert, Traduction et

interpretation.) In *Parole de l'Orient* 6-7, *Mélanges*

offerts au R.P. Francois Graffin, SJ. Paris, 1976

Athanasius of Alexandria (spurious)

The Canons of Athanasius. edited and translated by W. Reidel

and W.R. Crum. London, 1904

Five Homilies; Exposito fide; sermo major. edited by
H. Nordberg. *Societas Scientiarum Fennica. Commentationes
Humanarum Literarum* no. 30, 2. Helsinki, 1962

Other Ancient Sources

Ammianus Marcellinus

Ammiani Marcellini Rerum Gestorum. ed. by C.U. Clark.
Vols. I and II, Berlin, 1963

Epiphanius

Adversus Octoginta Haereses. PG Vols. 41 and 42,
Paris, 1864

Ancoratus und Panarion. ed. by K. Holl. GCS 25,
Leipzig, 1915; GCS 31, Leipzig, 1922; and
GCS 37, Leipzig, 1933

Eusebius of Caesarea

*Church History, Life of Constantine and Oration in
Praise of Constantine.* trans. by A.C. McGiffert and
E.C. Richardson. *LNPF Second Series, Vol. 1,*
reprinted, Grand Rapids, Michigan, 1974

Ecclesiastical History. (With Greek text) trans. and
ed. by K. Lake and J.E.L. Oulton. (*The Loeb Classics
Library*) Vols. I and II, London and New York, 1926 -
1932

*Eusebius Bishop of Caesarea: The Ecclesiastical History
and the Martyrs of Palestine.* trans., introduction and
notes by H.J. Lawlor and J.E.L. Oulton. Vols. I and II,
London, 1927 - 1928

The History of the Church from Christ to Constantine.
trans. by G. Williamson. New York, 1966

Historia Ecclesiastica. ed. by E Schwartz. GCS 9,
Eusebius Werke 2, 1 and 2. Leipzig, 1903 - 1908

Historia Ecclesiastica. PG Vol. 20, Paris, 1864

*In Praise of Constantine: A Historical Study and New
Translation of Eusebius' Tricennial Orations.* trans.,
introduction and notes by H.A. Drake. Berkley,
California, 1976

Laudes Constantini. PG Vol. 20, Paris, 1864

Laus Constantini. ed. by I. Heikel. GCS 7,
Eusebius Werke 1. Leipzig, 1902

Vita Constantini. PG Vol. 20, Paris, 1864

Vita Constantini. ed. by F. Winkelmann. GCS 7,
Eusebius Werke 1, 1. Berlin, 1975

Hilary of Poitiers

S. Hilarii Episcopi Pictaviensis Opera, Pars Quarta.
(Including *Fragmenta historica*) ed. by A. Feder.
Vienna-Leipzig, 1916

Palladius

Palladius: The Lausiac History. trans. by R.T. Meyer.
Ancient Christian Writers Series, No. 34,
Westminster, Maryland, 1965

Philostorgius

Philostorgius Kirchengeschichte. ed. by J. Bidez.
(GCS) second edition revised by F. Winkelmann,
Berlin, 1972

Severus of El-Eschmounein

*The History of the Patriarchs of the Coptic Church
of Alexandria.* ed., trans. and annotated by B. Evetts.
POr I, Facs. 3 and 4

Socrates

Ecclesiastica Historia. PG Vol. 67, Paris, 1864

Socrates Scholasticus, Ecclesiastica Historia. ed. by
R. Hussey. Vols. I - III, Oxford, 1853

The Ecclesiastical History of Socrates Scholasticus.
trans. and annotated by A.C. Zenos. LNPF Second
Series, Vol. II, reprinted, Grand Rapids, Michigan,
1974

Sozomen

Ecclesiastica Historia. PG Vol. 67, Paris, 1864

Sozomenus Kirchengeschichte. ed. and trans. by J. Bidez
and G.C. Hansen. GCS 50, Berlin, 1960

Histoire ecclésiastique. Vols. 1 and 2. Texte grec de
l'édition J. Bidez. Introduction B. Grillet and
G. Sabbah. trans. A.J. Festugière. annotation G.
Sabbah. SC 306. Paris, 1983

*The Ecclesiastical History of Sozomen Comprising a History
of the Church from AD 323 to AD 425.* trans. by
C.D. Hartranft. LNPF Second Series, Vol. II,
reprinted, Grand Rapids, Michigan, 1974

Sulpicius Severus

Chronicorum libri duo. ed. by C. Halm.
CSEL I, Vienna, 1866

Theodoret

Historia ecclesiastica. PG 82, Paris, 1864

Historia ecclesiastica. ed. by L. Parmentier.
GCS 14, second edition revised by F.
Scheidweiler, Berlin, 1954

Collections of Ancient Source Documents

Conciliorum Oecumenicorum Decreta. edidit Instituto
per le Scienze Religiose. Third edition,
Bologna, 1973

Sacrorum conciliorum nova et amplissima collectio.
ed. by J.D. Mansi. Vol.II. Florence, 1762

Athanasius Werke. hrsg. in Auftrage der Kirchenväter-
Kommission der Preussischen Akademie der Wissen-
schaften. Band III, 1, 1-76: *Urkunden zur Geschichte
des arianischen Streites 318 - 328.* edited by
H.G. Opitz. Berlin, 1934

Bibliographies

Bibliographie de la Revue d'histoire ecclésiastique.
Louvain.

Bibliographia Patristica. Vols. 1-29, ed. by W.
Schneemelcher, Berlin, 1959 -

*Clavis Patrum Graecorum. Vol. II: Ab Athanasio ad
Chrysostomun.* ed. by M. Geerard. Brepols-
Turnhout, 1974

SECONDARY SOURCES

Currently there exists no extensive bibliography in print which is devoted to the subject of Athanasius of Alexandria. Certain works of bibliographic reference, however, have been listed in the previous section. In addition to these purely bibliographic resources two other works have been of great help in the preparation of this study. The Athanasian references listed in J. Quasten, *Patrology*, Vol. III, Westminster, Maryland, 1975, pp. 20 - 79, have been extremely helpful. More current listings which were most helpful were found in the bibliographical sections of Frances Young, *From Nicaea to Chalcedon*, SCM Press, 1983. With these works as foundations, I have constructed the following listing of secondary sources. All of these sources have been consulted in the research connected with my study of Athanasius.

- L. Abramowski. 'Die Synode von Antiochen 324/25 und ihr Symbol.' *ZKG* 86 (1975), 356-366.
- L. Abramowski. 'Dionys von Rom (†268) und Dionys von Alexandrien (†264/5) in den arianischen Streitigkeiten des 4. Jahrhunderts.' *ZKG* 93 (1982), 240-272.
- P.R. Ackroyd and C.F. Evans, eds. *Cambridge History of the Bible*. Vol. 1. Cambridge 1970.
- D. Ahrens. His remarks on 'Geometric Patterns of "Athanasian" Origin on Early Coptic Textiles: A Recent Acquisition of the Trierer Museum.' *Bulletin de la Société d'Archéologie Copte* 25 (1983), 77-81.
- M. Albertz. 'Zur Geschichte der jung-arianischen Kirchengemeinschaft.' *ThStKr* 82 (1909), 205-278.
- A. d'Ales. 'Pour le texte de Saint Athanase (*de Decretis* 27).' *RSR* (1924), 61.
- B. Altaner. *Patrologie: Leben, Schriften und Lehre der Kirchenväter*. Freiburg 1951.

- P.R. Amidon. 'The Procedure of St. Cyprian's Synods.' *VC* 37 (1983), 328-339.
- P. Ariès and G. Duby, gen. eds. *A History of Private Life*. 2 vols. London 1987. Vol. 1: *From Pagan Rome to Byzantium*. P. Veyne, ed., trans. A. Goldhammer.
- C.B. Armstrong. 'The Synod of Alexandria and the Schism at Antioch in AD 362.' *JThS* 22 (1921), 206-221, 347-355.
- R. Arnou. 'Arius et la doctrine des relations trinitaires.' *Gregorianum* 14 (1933), 269-272.
- L. Atzberger. *Die Logoslehre des Athanasius*. Munchen 1880.
- M. Aubineau. 'Une homélie pascale attribuée à S. Athanase d'Alexandrie dans le Sinaïticus gr. 492.' *Zetesis. Album amicorum Prof. Dr. E. de Strycker*. Utrecht 1973, 668-678.
- Auf der Maur. H. *Die Osterhomilien des Asterios Sophistes*. *Trierer Theologische Studien* 19, 1967.
- M. Azkoul. 'Sacerdotium et imperium: The Constantinian Renovatio according to the Greek Fathers.' *ThSt* 32 (1971), 431-464.
- I. Backes. 'Das trinitarische Glaubensverständnis beim hl. Athanasius dem Grossen.' *Trierer Theologische Zeitschrift* 82 (1973), 129-140.
- O. Bardenhewer. *Patrology*. 2nd ed. Trans. T.J. Shahan. Freiburg 1908.
- _____. *Geschichte der altkirchlichen Literatur*, Bd.2. 2nd ed. Freiburg 1914.
- G. Bardy. 'Athanase d'Alexandrie (Saint).' *DHGE* 4, col. 1313-1340.
- _____. *Saint Athanase (296-373)*. 2nd ed. Paris 1914.
- _____. 'Saint Alexandre d'Alexandrie a-t-il connu la "Thalie" d'Arius?' *RSR* 6 (1926), 527-532.
- _____. 'La politique religieuse de Constantin après le concile de Nicée.' *RSR* 8 (1928), 516-551.
- _____. 'L'héritage littéraire d'Aetius.' *RHE* 24 (1928), 809-827.
- _____. 'Aux origines de l'Ecole d'Alexandrie.' *RSR* 27 (1932), 65-90.
- _____. 'Sur la Réitération du Concile de Nicée.' *RSR* 23 (1933), 430-450.
- _____. *Recherches sur Saint Lucien d'Antioche et son Ecole*. Paris 1936.
- _____. 'Athanase.' *Dictionnaire de Spiritualité*. Vol. 1. Paris 1937, 1047-1052.

- G. Bardy. 'The Arian Crisis.' In *The Church in the Christian Roman Empire*. Vol. 1. J.R. Palanque et al. London 1949.
- _____. 'La crise arienne.' In *Histoire de l'Eglise*. Vol. 3, 69f. A. Fliche and V. Martin, gen. eds. Paris 1950.
- _____. 'Alexandrie, Antioche, Constantinople (325-451).' In *L'Eglise et les Eglises*. Tome 1, 183-207. O. Rousseau, ed. Chevetogne 1954.
- L.W. Barnard. 'The Antecedents of Arius.' *VC* 24 (1970), 172-188.
- _____. 'What was Arius' Philosophy?' *ThZ* 28 (1972), 110-117.
- _____. 'Athanasie et les empereurs (Constantin et Constance).' In *Politique et Théologie*, 127-143. C. Kannengiesser, ed. Paris 1974.
- _____. 'The Date of S. Athanasius' *Vita Antonii*.' *VC* 28 (1974), 169-175.
- _____. 'Athanasius and the Meletian Schism in Egypt.' *JEA* 59 (1975), 183-189.
- _____. 'Some Notes on the Meletian Schism in Egypt.' *StP* 12, *TU* 115 (1975), 399-405.
- _____. 'The Figure of "Trumpets" in Syriac Tradition, An Egyptian Parallel.' *Le Muséon*, Tome 88 (1975), 327-329.
- _____. 'Some Liturgical Elements in Athanasius' Festal Epistles.' *StP* 13 (1975), 337-342.
- _____. 'Two Notes on Athanasius. 1. Athanasius' Election as Archbishop of Alexandria. 2. The Circumstances surrounding the Encyclical Letter of the Egyptian Bishops (Apol. c. Ar. 3.1-19.5).' *OrChP* 41 (1975), 344-356. Reprinted in *Studies in Church History and Patristics*. ANAÆKTA BAATAAΩN 26. Thessaloniki (1978), 329-340.
- _____. 'Athanasius and the Roman State.' *Latomus* 36 (1977), 422-437. Reprinted in *Studies in Church History and Patristics*. ANAÆKTA BAATAAΩN 26. Thessaloniki (1978), 312-328.
- _____. 'The Site of the Council of Sardica.' *StP* 17/1 (1982), 9-13.
- _____. 'Edward Gibbon on Athanasius.' In *Arianism*, 361-369. R.C. Gregg, ed. Philadelphia 1985.
- J.W.B. Barnard and H. Chadwick. 'A Letter Ascribed to Peter of Alexandria.' *JThS* NS 24 (1973), 443-455.

- T.D. Barnes. 'Emperor and Bishops, A.D. 324-344: Some Problems.' *AJAHist* 3 (1978), 53-75.
- _____. *Constantine and Eusebius*. Cambridge, Mass. 1981.
- _____. *The New Empire of Diocletian and Constantine*. Cambridge, Mass. 1982.
- _____. *Early Christianity and the Roman Empire*. London 1984.
- _____. 'Angel of Light or Mystic Initiate? The Problem of the *Life of Antony*.' *JThS* NS 37 (1986), 353-368.
- W.E. Barnes. 'Arius and Arianism.' *Expository Times* 46 (1934), 18-24.
- G. Bartelink. 'Observations de critique textuelle sur la plus ancienne version latine de la Vie de S. Antoine par S. Athanase.' *Revue Bénédictine* 81 (1971), 92-95.
- _____. 'Die literarische Gattung der Vita Antonii: Struktur und Motive.' *VC* 36 (1982), 38-62.
- P. Batiffol. 'Le περί παρθενίας du Pseudo-Athanase.' *Römische Quartalschrift für christliche Altertumskunde und für Kirchengeschichte* 7 (1893), 275ff.
- _____. 'Le Synodikon de S. Athanase.' *ByZ* 10 (1901), 128-143.
- _____. 'Les sources de l'histoire du concile de Niceé.' *Echos d'Orient* 28 (1925), 385-402; 30 (1927), 5-17.
- W. Bauer. *Orthodoxy and Heresy in Earliest Christianity*. Philadelphia 1971.
- K. Baus. 'Meletius of Lycopolis.' *LThK*, Vol. 7, n.d.
- N.H. Baynes. 'Athanasiana.' *JEA* 11 (1925), 58-69.
- _____. 'Eusebius and the Christian Empire.' *Mélanges Bidez* (1934), 13-18.
- _____. 'Athanasius.' Review of *The Study of St. Athanasius* by F.L. Cross. Oxford 1945. *Journal of Roman Studies* 35 (1945), 121-124.
- _____. 'Sozomen, Ecclesiastica Historia I.15.' *JThS* 49 (1948), 165-168.
- _____. 'St. Anthony and the Demons.' *JEA* 40 (1954), 7-10.
- _____. *Byzantine Studies and Other Essays*. London 1955.

- N.H. Baynes. *Constantine the Great and the Christian Church*.
The British Academy Raleigh Lecture on History, 1929. 2nd ed.
Preface by H. Chadwick. London 1972.
- G. Bebawi. 'St. Athanasios: the dynamics of salvation.'
Sobornost 8, no. 2 (1986), 24-41.
- H.I. Bell. 'New Lights on St. Athanasius.' *The Adelphi* (1924),
1006-1009.
- _____. 'Athanasius: A Chapter in Church History.' *Congregational
Quarterly* 2 (1925), 158-176.
- _____. *Egypt from Alexander the Great to the Arab Conquest, A
Study in the Diffusion and Decay of Hellenism*. Oxford 1948.
- _____. 'The Problems of Translation.' In *Literature and Life,
Addresses to the English Association*. H.I. Bell, G. Boas et al.
London 1948.
- _____. 'The Gospel Fragments P. Egerton 2.' *HThR* 42 (1949),
53-63.
- _____. *Cults and Creeds in Graeco-Roman Egypt*. London 1953.
- _____. 'Bibliography of Sir Harold Idris Bell.' *JEA* 40 (1954),
3-6.
- _____, ed. *Jews and Christians in Egypt*. Oxford 1924.
- E. Bellini. *Alessandro e Ario: Un esempio di conflitto tra fede
e ideologia. Documenti della prima controversia ariana*.
Milan 1974.
- J.B. Berchem. 'L'Incarnation dans le plan divin d'après saint
Athanasie.' *Echos d'Orient* 33 (1934), 316-330.
- _____. 'Le rôle du Verbe dans l'oeuvre de la création et de la
sanctification d'après saint Athanasie.' *Angelicum* 15 (1938),
201-232, 515-558.
- H. Berkhof. *Die Theologie des Eusebius von Caesarea*. Amsterdam 1939.
- _____. *Kirche und Kaiser*. Trans. G.W. Lorcher. Zürich 1947.
- R. Bernard. 'L'Image de Dieu d'après saint Athanasie.' *Théologie* 25
(1952).
- P. Beskow. *Rex Gloriam: The Kingship of Christ in the Early Church*.
Trans. E.J. Sharpe. Uppsala 1962.
- W. Bienert. 'Neue Fragmente des Dionysius und des Petrus von
Alexandrien aus Cod. Vatop. 236.' *Kleronomia* 5 (1973), 308-314.

- W. Bienert. *Dionysius von Alexandrien. Zur Frage des Origenismus im dritten Jahrhundert*. Berlin 1978.
- _____. 'The Significance of Athanasius.' *Irish Theological Quarterly* 48 (1981), 181-195.
- A. Blane and T.E. Bird, eds. *The Ecumenical World of Orthodox Civilization: Russia and Orthodoxy, 3. Essays in honour of Georges Florovsky*. Den Haag 1974.
- C.F.A. Borchardt. *Hilary of Poitiers' Role in the Arian Struggle*. The Hague 1966.
- K. Bornhaeuser. *Die Vergottungslehre des Athanasius und Johannes Damascenus*. Gutersloh 1903.
- B. Botte. 'L'Euchologe de Sérapion est-il authentique?' *Oriens Christianus* 48 (1964), 50-56.
- E. Bouларанд. 'Les débuts d'Arius.' *BLE* 65 (1964), 175-203.
- _____. 'Denys d'Alexandrie et Arius.' *BLE* 67 (1966), 162-169.
- _____. 'Aux sources de la doctrine d'Arius.' *BLE* 68 (1967), 241-272.
- _____. *L'hérésie d'Arius et la 'Foi' de Nicée*. 2 vols. Paris 1972.
- L. Bouyer. *L'Incarnation et l'Eglise-Corps du Christ dans la théologie de saint Athanase*. Paris 1943.
- _____. *La Vie de S. Antoine*. Wandrille 1950.
- A.K. Bowman. *Egypt after the Pharaohs, 332 B.C. - A.D. 642*. Los Angeles 1986.
- H. Brakmann. 'Alexandreia und die Kanones des Hippolyt.' *Jahrbuch für Antike und Christentum* 22 (1979), 139-149.
- J. Breckenridge. 'Julian and Athanasius; Two Approaches to Creation and Salvation.' *Theology* 76 (1973), 73-81.
- B.R. Brennan. 'Dating Athanasius' *Vita Antonii*.' *VC* 30 (1976), 52-54.
- H.C. Brennecke. *Hilarius von Poitiers und die Bischofsopposition gegen Konstanus II: Untersuchungen zur dritten Phase des arianischen Streites (337-361)*. Patristische Texte und Studien 26. Berlin 1984.
- W. Bright. 'Athanasius.' In *Dictionary of Christian Biography, I*. 179-203.

- W. Bright. *Lessons From the Lives of Three Greek Fathers*. London 1891.
- _____. *The Roman See in the Early Church*. London 1896.
- _____. *The Age of the Fathers*. 2 vols. London 1903.
- S. Brock. 'A Baptismal Address attributed to Athanasius.' *Oriens Christianus* 61 (1977), 92-102.
- E.W. Brooks. 'The Ordination of the Early Bishops of Alexandria.' *JThS* 2 (1901), 612-613.
- _____. *The Sixth Book of the Select Letters of Severus Patriarch of Antioch in the Syrian Version of Athanasius of Nisibis*. Vol.2. London 1903.
- P. Brown. *The World of Late Antiquity A.D. 150-750*. London 1971.
- _____. 'The Rise and Function of the Holy Man in Late Antiquity.' In *Society and the Holy in Late Antiquity*, 103-152. Berkeley, California 1982.
- E.A.W. Budge. *The Paradise of the Holy Fathers*. 2 vols. London 1907.
- _____, ed. *Coptic Homilies in the Dialect of Upper Egypt*. London 1910.
- A.E. Burn. *The Council of Nicaea*. London 1925.
- P.C. Burns. *The Christology in Hilary of Poitiers' Commentary on Matthew*. Rome 1981.
- _____. 'Hilary of Poitiers' Confrontation with Arianism in 356 and 357.' In *Arianism*, 287-301. R.C. Gregg, ed. Philadelphia 1985.
- J.B. Bury. *History of the Later Roman Empire*. 2 vols. New York 1958.
- R.W. Bush. *St. Athanasius: His Life and Times*. The Fathers for English Readers series. London 1888.
- E.L. Butcher. *The Story of the Church of Egypt*. 2 vols. London 1887.
- P. Camelot. *Le Concile et les Conciles*. B. Botte et al., eds. Paris 1960.
- T.C. Campbell. 'The Doctrine of the Holy Spirit in the Theology of Athanasius.' *Scottish Journal of Theology* 27 (1974), 408-440.
- H. von Campenhausen. *The Fathers of the Greek Church*. Trans. S. Godman. New York 1959.
- _____. *Tradition and Life in the Church*. Trans. A.V. Littledale. Philadelphia 1968.

- H. von Campenhausen. *Ecclesiastical Authority and Spiritual Power in the Church of the first three centuries*. London 1969.
- _____. 'Das Bekenntnis des Eusebius v. Caesarea (Nicaea 325)' *ZNW* 67 (1976), 123-139.
- P. Carrington. *The Early Christian Church*. 2 vols. Cambridge 1957.
- R.A. Case. 'Will the Real Athanasius Please Stand Up?' *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 19 (1976), 283-295.
- R.P. Casey. 'The Athens Text of Athanasius' *Contra Gentes* and *De Incarnatione*.' *HThR* 23 (1930), 51-89.
- _____. 'Greek Manuscripts of Athanasian Corpora.' *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft*, t.30 (1931), 49-70.
- _____. 'An Armenian Version of Athanasius' Letter to Epictetus.' *HThR* 26 (1933), 127-150.
- _____. 'A Syriac Corpus of Athanasian Writings.' *JThS* 35 (1934), 66-67.
- _____. 'Armenian Manuscripts of St. Athanasius of Alexandria.' *HThR* 24 (1936), 43-59.
- _____. *The De Incarnatione of Athanasius. Part 2. The Short Recension*. Studies and Documents series, 14. London 1946.
- E. Caspar. *Geschichte des Papsttums von den Anfängen bis zur Höhe der Weltherrschaft*, Band I. Tübingen 1930.
- E. Cataneo. 'Il tema della grazia in S. Atanasio d'Alessandria.' In *Una Hostia, Studi in Onore del Card. Corrado Ursi*, 163-186. S. Muratore and A. Rolla, eds. Naples 1983.
- F. Cavallera. *Le Schisme d'Antioche*. Paris 1905.
- _____. *Saint Athanase*. Paris 1908.
- W. Cave. *Ecclesiastici: or, the History of the Lives, Acts, Death and Writings of the Most Eminent Fathers of the Church*. London 1683.
- R. Ceillier. 'Saint Athanase, archevêque d'Alexandrie, docteur de l'Eglise et confesseur.' In *Histoire des auteurs sacrés et ecclésiastiques*, Vol.4, 89-233. Paris, 1860.
- J. Ceska. 'Die politischen Hintergründe der Homoousioslehre des Athanasius.' In *Die Kirche angesichts der konstantinischen Wende*, 297-321. G. Ruhbach, ed. Darmstadt 1976.

- H. Chadwick. 'The Fall of Eustathius of Antioch.' *JThS* 49 (1948), 27-35.
- _____. 'Athanasius, De decretis 40,3.' *JThS* 49 (1948), 168-169.
- _____. 'Ossius of Cordova and the Presidency of the Council of Antioch 325.' *JThS* NS 9 (1958), 292-298.
- _____. 'Faith and Order at the Council of Nicaea: A Note on the Background of the Sixth Canon.' *HThR* 53 (1960), 171-195.
- _____. 'The Origin of the title "Oecumenical Council".' *JThS* 23 (1972), 132-135.
- _____. *The Early Church*. Pelican History of the Church series, Vol. 1. New York 1976.
- _____. *The Role of the Christian Bishop in Ancient Society*. Colloquy 35 of the Center for Hermeneutical Studies in Hellenistic and Modern Culture. Berkeley 1980.
- _____. *History and Thought of the Early Church*. London 1982.
- G.F. Chesnut. 'Kairos and Cosmic Sympathy in the Church Historian Socrates Scholasticus.' *ChH* 44 (1975), 161-66.
- _____. *The First Christian Histories*. Paris 1977.
- D. Chitty. *The Desert a City*. Oxford 1966.
- P. Christou. 'Uncreated and created, unbegotten and begotten in the theology of Athanasius of Alexandria.' *Augustinianum* 13 (1973), 399-409.
- F.S. Clarke. 'Lost and Found: Athanasius' Doctrine of Predestination.' *Scottish Journal of Theology* 29 (1976), 435-450.
- A. Clayton. 'The Orthodox Recovery of a Heretical Proof Text: Athanasius of Alexandria's Exegesis of Proverbs 8.22f in Conflict with the Arians.' Ph.D. dissertation, Perkins School of Theology, 1987.
- V.C. de Clerq. *Ossius of Cordova. A Contribution to the History of the Constantinian Period*. CUA Studies in Christian Antiquity, 13. Washington 1954.
- H. Coiderakis. 'Τὸ διδάσκει ο Μ. Ἀθανάσιος περὶ Ἀρείου καὶ Ἀρειανισμοῦ;' *Ekklesiastikos Pharos* 29 (1930), 496-516.
- P.R. Coleman-Norton. *Roman State and Christian Church*. Vol. 1. London 1966.
- Y. Congar. *Diversity and Communion*. Trans. J. Bowden. London 1984.

- R.H. Connolly. *The So-Called Egyptian Church Order and Derived Documents*. Cambridge 1916.
- M. Constantinides. 'Ο ΜΕΤΑΣ ΑΘΑΝΑΣΙΟΣ ΚΑΙ Η ΕΠΟΧΗ ΑΥΤΟΥ. Athens 1937.
- F.C. Conybeare. 'On the Sources of the Text of S. Athanasius.' *Journal of Philology* 24 (1896), 285-300.
- S.A. Cook, F.E. Adcock and M.P. Charlesworth, eds. *Cambridge Ancient History*. Vol. 1. 2nd ed. Cambridge 1954.
- L. Coulange. 'Métamorphose du consubstantiel: Athanase et Hilaire.' *Revue d'histoire et de littérature religieuses* (1922), 168-214.
- P. Cox. *Biography in Late Antiquity: a Quest for the Holy Man*. Berkeley 1983.
- F.E. Cranz. 'Kingdom and Polity in Eusebius of Caesarea.' *HThR* 45 (1952), 47-66.
- V. Cremers. *De Verlossingsidee by Athanasius den Grooten*. Turnhout 1921.
- F.L. Cross. 'Council of Antioch in 325 A.D.' *Church Quarterly Review* 128 (1938), 49-76.
- _____. *The Study of Athanasius*. Oxford 1945.
- _____. Review of 'The De Incarnatione of Athanasius. Part 2. The short recension', by R.P. Casey. *JThS* 49 (1948), 88-95.
- D. Cummings, ed. and trans. *The Rudder*. Chicago 1957.
- A. Cunningham. *The Bishop in The Church. Patristic Texts on the Role of the Episkopos*. Theology and Life Series, 13. Wilmington, Delaware 1985.
- G. Curti. 'Il linguaggio relativo al Padre e al Filio in alcuni passi dei "Commentarii in Psalmos" de Eusebio di Cesarea.' *Augustinianum* 13 (1973), 483-506.
- J. Daniélou and H. Marrou. *The First Six Hundred Years*. Vol. 1 of *The Christian Centuries: A New History of the Catholic Church*. L.J. Rogier et al., eds. Trans. V. Cronin. London 1964.
- J. Daniélou. *Gospel and Hellenistic Culture*. Vol. 2 of *A History of Early Christian Doctrine before the Council of Nicaea*. J.A. Baker, ed. and trans. London 1973.
- L.D. Davis. *The First Seven Ecumenical Councils (325-787). Their History and Theology*. Theology and Life Series, 21. Wilmington, Delaware 1987.

- H. Delhougne. 'Autorité et Participation chez les Pères du cénobitisme.' *Revue d'Ascétique et de Mystique* 45 (1969), 369-394.
- A. Dempf. *Eusebius als Historiker*. Munich 1964.
- P. Devos. 'Une passion grecque inédite de Saint Pierre d'Alexandrie et sa traduction par Anastase le Bibliothécaire.' *AnalBoll* 85 (1965), 157-187.
- Dictionary of National Biography*, 8th supplement, 1981 ed.
S.v. 'Sir Harold Idris Bell.'
- D. Dimitrijevic. 'Die Christologie des hl. Athanasius und ihre Bedeutung für die Auffassung der Eucharistie.' *Kyrios* 14 (1974), 61-84.
- G. Dix. *The Apostolic Tradition*. London 1968.
- _____. *Jurisdiction in the Early Church*. London 1975.
- I.A. Dorner. *History of the Development of the Doctrine of the Person of Christ*. 3 vols. Trans. P. Simon. Edinburgh 1897.
- H. Dörries. 'Die Vita Antonii als Geschichtsquelle.' *Nachrichten der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen. Philologisch-historische Klasse* 1949, 357-410.
- G. Downey. 'The Perspective of the Early Church Historians.' *Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies* 6 (1965), 57-70.
- G.D. Dragas. 'He Became Man.' *Studia Patristica* 16 (1975), 281-294.
- _____. 'The Two Treatises of St. Athanasius "Contra Apollinarem". Second thoughts on the research of the critics.' *Abba Salama* 6 (1975), 84-96.
- _____. 'Holy Spirit and Tradition: The Writings of St. Athanasius.' *Sobornost* 1.1 (1979), 51-72.
- _____. 'A Note Concerning Athanasius' soteriology.' *Ekklesiastikos Pharos* 61 (1979), 210-220.
- _____. 'The Eternal Son, An Essay in Christology with Special Reference to St. Athanasius.' *Abba Salama* 9 (1979), 18-54.
- _____. 'Conscience and Tradition: Newman and Athanasius in the Orthodox Church.' *Internationale Cardinal Newman Studien*. Nürnberg 1980.
- _____. 'Nature and Grace According to St. Athanasius.' *Church and Theology* 1 (1980), 513-554.

- G.D. Dragas. *Athanasiana*. Vol. 1. London 1980.
- _____. *The Meaning of Theology*. Darlington 1980.
- _____. 'The Homousion in Athanasius' *Contra Apollinarem I.*'
In *Arianism*, 233-241. R.C. Gregg, ed. Philadelphia 1985.
- _____. 'St. Athanasius Contra Apollinarem.' *Church and
Theology* 6 (1985).
- L. Duchesne. *Histoire Ancienne de l'Eglise*. Tome 2. 5th ed.
Paris 1911.
- _____. *The Early History of the Christian Church from its
Foundation to the End of the Fifth Century*. 3 vols. New York 1922.
- Y.M. Duval. 'La problématique de la "Lettre aux Vierges" d'Athanase.'
Le Muséon 88 (1975), 405-433.
- R.Y. Ebied and L.R. Wickman. 'A Note on the Syriac Version of
Athanasius Ad Epictetum in Ms. BM add. 14557.' *JThS* NS 23 (1972),
144-154.
- H. Echternach. *Kirchenväter Ketzer und Konzilien*. Göttingen 1962.
- G. Egan. 'A Treatise attributed to Athanasius.' *Le Muséon* 80
(1967), 139-151.
- _____. *The Armenian Version of the Letters of Athanasius to
Bishop Serapion concerning the Holy Spirit*. Studies and
Documents 37. Salt Lake City 1968.
- B.D. Ehrman. 'The New Testament Canon of Didymus the Blind.'
VC 37 (1983), 1-21.
- A. Eichhorn. 'Athanasii de vita ascetica testimonia collecta.'
Dissertation theologica, Halle 1886.
- W. Elert. *Eucharist and Church Fellowship in the First Four
Centuries*. Trans. N. Nagel. St. Louis 1966.
- W. Elliger. 'Bemerkungen zur Theologie des Arius.' *ThStKr* 103
(1931), 244-251.
- S. Eustratiades. ΑΘΑΝΑΣΙΟΣ Ο ΜΕΓΑΣ, ΠΑΤΡΙΑΙΧΗΣ ΑΛΕΞΑΝΔΡΕΙΑΣ.
Romanos 1 (1932-33), 55-58.
- E.R. Fairweather and E.R. Hardy. *The Voice of the Church. The
Ecumenical Councils*, Greenwich, CT. 1962.
- F.W. Farrar. *Lives of the Fathers, Sketches of Church History in
Biography*. 2 vols. Edinburgh 1889.

- V. Feidas. Τό Κολλουθιανόν Σχίσμα καί αἱ ἀρχαί τοῦ Ἀρειανισμοῦ. Athens 1973.
- E. Ferguson. 'Attitudes to Schism at the Council of Nicaea.' In *Schism, heresy and religious protest*, 57-63. D. Baker, ed. Cambridge 1972.
- _____. 'Athanasius, Epistola ad Marcellinum in interpretationem psalmorum.' *Ekklesiastikos Pharos* (1978), 378-403.
- _____. 'Athanasius, Epistola ad Marcellinum in interpretationem psalmorum' *StP* 16 (1985), 295-308.
- G. Fernandez. 'Athanasius of Alexandria and Liberius of Rome: Analysis of the Letter Pro deifico timore of Liberius in the light of the Edict of Arles of 358.' In *Arianism*, 303-311. R.C. Gregg, ed. Philadelphia 1985.
- E. Fialon. *Saint Athanase. Etude littéraire suivie de l'Apologie à l'Empereur Constance et de l'Apologie de sa fuite traduites. en français.* Paris 1877.
- E. Flesseman-van Leer. *Tradition and Scripture in the Early Church.* Assen 1954.
- A. Fliche and V. Martin, gen. eds. *Histoire de l'Eglise.* 21 vols. Paris 1950. Vol. 3: *De la Paix Constantinienne à la Mort de Théodose*, by J.R. Palanque, G. Bardy, P. de LaBriolle.
- G. Florovsky. *The Eastern Fathers of the Fourth Century.* Paris 1931.
- _____. 'The Concept of Creation in Saint Athanasius.' *StP* 6 (1962), 36-57.
- _____. 'The Function of Tradition in the Early Church.' *Greek Orthodox Theological Review* 9.2 (1963), 73-125.
- _____. 'The Authority of the Ancient Councils and the Tradition of the Fathers.' In *Glaube, Geist, Geschichte: Festschrift für Ernst Benz.* Leiden 1967.
- _____. 'The Fourth Century. An Introduction.' *Sobornost* 7 (1977), 241-252.
- F.J. Foakes-Jackson. *Eusebius Pamphili. Bishop of Caesarea and First Christian Historian. A Study of the Man and His Writings.* Cambridge 1933.
- M. Fouyas. *The Person of Christ in the Decisions of the Ecumenical Councils.* Addis Ababa 1976.
- R.L. Fox. *Pagans and Christians.* New York 1986.

- P.M. Fraser. *Ptolemaic Alexandria*. 2 vols. Oxford 1972.
- W.H.C. Frend. 'Athanasius as an Egyptian Christian leader in the fourth century.' Reprinted in his *Religion Popular and Unpopular in the Early Christian Centuries*, 20-37. London 1976.
- _____. *The Rise of Christianity*. Philadelphia 1984.
- H. Fromen. 'Athanasii historia acephala.' D.Phil. dissertation, Munster 1915.
- P. Gallay. *La Vie de Saint Gregoire de Naziance*. Paris and Lyon 1943.
- P. Galtier. 'Saint Athanase et l'âme humaine du Christ.' *Gregorianum* 36 (1955), 553-589.
- G. Garitte. *Un témoin important du texte de la vie de S. Antoine par S. Athanase*. Etudes de philologie, d'archéologie et d'histoire ancienne publiées par l'Institut historique belge de Rome, III. Bruxelles 1939.
- A. Gaudel. 'La date des trois discours contre les Ariens.' *RSR* 9 (1929), 524-539.
- _____. 'La théologie du Λόγος chez Saint Athanase.' *RSR* 11 (1931), 1-26.
- J. Gaudemet. *L'Eglise dans L'Empire Roman, IV^e - V^e siècles*. Paris 1958.
- _____. *Conciles Gaulois du IV^e Siècle*. SCH 241. Paris 1977.
- W. Gericke. *Marcell von Ancyra: Der Logos-Christologe und Biblizist*. Halle 1940.
- S. Gero. 'The True Image of Christ: Eusebius' Letter to Constantia Reconsidered.' *JThS* NS 32 (1981), 460-470.
- W. Gessel. 'Das primatiale Bewusstsein Julius I. im Lichte der Interaktionen zwischen der Cathedra Petri und den zeitgenössischen Synoden.' In *Konzil und Papst: Festgabe für Hermann Tüchle*, 63-74. G. Schwaiger, ed. Munich Paderborn-Vienna 1975.
- J. de Ghellinck. 'Qui sont les ὡς τινες λέγουσι de la lettre d'Arius?' *Miscellanea Mercati* 1 (1946), 127-144.
- F. Giardini. 'Doctrina espiritual en la Vita Antonii de San Atanasio.' *Teologia espiritual* 4 (1960), 377-412; 7 (1963), 681-701.
- F.D. Gilliard. 'The Social Origins of Bishops in the Fourth Century.' Ph.D. dissertation, University of California at Berkeley, 1966.

- I. Gillman. 'Eschatology in the Reign of Constantine.' *Reformed Theological Review* 24 (1965), 40-51.
- K.M. Girardet. 'Appellatio. Ein Kapitel kirchlicher Rechtsgeschichte in den Kanones des vierten Jahrhunderts.' *Historia* 23 (1974), 98-127.
- _____. 'Constance II, Athanase et l'édit d'Arles (353): A propos de la politique religieuse de l'empereur Constance II.' In *Politique et Théologie*, 65-91. C. Kannengiesser, ed. Paris 1974.
- _____. *Kaisergericht und Bischofsgericht. Studien zu den Anfängen des Donatistenstreites (313-315) und zum Prozess des Athanasius von Alexandrien (328-346)*. Bonn 1975.
- M.A. Giuriceo. 'The Church Fathers and the Kingly Office.' Ph.D. dissertation, Cornell, 1955.
- J.E. Goering. 'Pachomius' Vision of Heresy: The Development of a Pachomian Tradition.' *Le Muséon* 95 (1982), 241-262.
- M. Goermans. 'L'exil du Pape Libère.' In *Mélanges offerts à Mademoiselle Christine Mohrmann*, 181-189. Utrecht 1963.
- E. von der Goltz. *De Virginitate, eine echte Schrift des Athanasius*. TU 29, 2a. Leipzig 1905.
- C. Gore. 'On the Ordination of the Early Bishops of Alexandria.' *JThS* 3 (1902), 279-280.
- R.M. Grant. 'The Apostolic Fathers' First Thousand Years.' *ChH* 31 (1962), 421-429.
- _____. *The Early Christian Doctrine of God*. Charlottesville, Virginia 1966.
- _____. 'Early Alexandrian Christianity.' *ChH* 40 (1971), 133-144.
- _____. 'Eusebius and Church History.' In *Understanding the Sacred Text: Essays in Honour of M.S. Enslin on the Hebrew Bible and Christian Beginnings*, 233-247. J. Reumann, ed. Valley Forge 1972.
- _____. 'Religion and Politics at the Council of Nicaea.' *JR* 55 (1975), 1-12.
- _____. 'The Case against Eusebius or, Did the Father of Church History write History?' *StP* 115 (1975), 413-421.
- _____. *Eusebius as Church Historian*. Oxford and New York 1980.
- S.L. Greenslade. *Church and State from Constantine to Theodosius*. London 1954.
- _____. *Schism in the Early Church*. London 1953.

- R.C. Gregg, ed. *Arianism, Historical and Theological Reassessments. Papers from the Ninth International Conference on Patristic Studies, September 5-10, 1983. Oxford, England. Patristic Monograph Series, no. 11. Philadelphia 1985.*
- R.C. Gregg and D.E. Groh. 'The Centrality of Soteriology in Early Arianism.' *Anglican Theological Review* 59 (1977), 260-278. Reprinted in *StP* 15 (1984), 305-316.
- R.C. Gregg and D.E. Groh. *Early Arianism: A View of Salvation. Philadelphia 1981.*
- T.E. Gregory. *Vox Populi. Popular Opinion and Violence in the Religious Controversies of the Fifth Century A.D. Columbus, Ohio 1979.*
- J.G. Griffiths. 'Egyptian Influences on Athanasius.' In *Studien zu Sprache und Religion Aegyptens (Festschrift W. Westendorf) Bd. 2, 1023-1037. Göttingen 1984.*
- C.W. Griggs. 'History of Christianity in Egypt to 451 A.D.' Ph.D. dissertation, University of California, 1979.
- A. Grillmeier. 'Die Stellung des Tomus von Alexandrien 362 in der Christologie des hl. Athanasios.' In *Das Konzil von Chalkedon. Geschichte und Gegenwart, vol. 1, 91-99. Freiburg 1954.*
- _____. 'Konzil und Rezeption.' In A. Grillmeier SJ, *Mit ihm und in ihm. Christologische Forschungen und Perspektiven, 303-412. Freiburg-Basel-Vienna 1975.*
- _____. *Christ in Christian Tradition. 2nd ed. Trans. J. Bowden. London and Oxford 1975.*
- D.E. Groh. 'New Directions in Arian Research.' *Anglican Theological Review* 68, no. 4 (1987), 347-355.
- R. Gryson. *Scolies Ariennes sur le Concile d'Aquilée. Sources Chrétiennes 267. Paris 1980.*
- J. Gummerus. *Die homöusianische Partei bis zum Tode des Konstantius. Leipzig 1900.*
- B. Gustafsson. 'Eusebius' Principles in Handling his Sources, as found in his Church History Books I-VIII.' *StP* 4 (1961), 429-441.
- H.M. Gwatkin. *The Arian Controversy. London 1898.*
- _____. *Studies of Arianism. 2nd ed. Cambridge 1900.*
- _____. *The Knowledge of God and its Historical Development. 2 vols. Edinburgh 1906.*
- A. van Haarlem. *Incarnatie en verlossing bij Athanasius. Wageningen 1961.*

- D. Hagedorn, ed. *Der Hiobkommentar des Arianers Julian*. Berlin 1973.
- K.F. Hagel. *Kirche und Kaisertum in Lehre und Leben des Athanasius*. Borna-Leipzig 1933.
- S.G. Hall. Review of Gregg and Groh. *King's Theological Review* 5 (1982), 28.
- _____. 'The Thalia of Arius in Athanasius' Accounts.' In *Arianism*, 37-57. R.C. Gregg, ed. Philadelphia 1985.
- A. Hamilton. 'Narrative in the Theology of St. Athanasius.' *Colloquium* 10 (1977), 6-13.
- _____. 'Athanasius and the Simile of the Mirror.' *VC* 34 (1980), 14-18.
- M. Handspicker. 'Athanasius on Tradition and Scripture.' *Andover Newton Quarterly* 3.1 (1962), 13-29.
- R.P.C. Hanson. *Tradition in the Early Church*. London 1962.
- _____. 'The Doctrine of the Trinity Achieved in 381.' *Scottish Journal of Theology* 36 (1983), 41-57.
- _____. 'The Fate of Eustathius of Antioch.' *ZKG* 95 (1984), 171-179.
- _____. 'Who Taught ΕΕ ΟΥΚ ΟΝΤΩΝ?' In *Arianism*, 79-83. R.C. Gregg, ed. Philadelphia 1985.
- _____. 'The Arian Doctrine of the Incarnation.' In *Arianism*, 181-211. R.C. Gregg, ed. Philadelphia 1985.
- E.R. Hardy. *Christian Egypt: Church and People*. Oxford 1962.
- A. von Harnack. *Lehrbuch der Dogmengeschichte*. 3 vols. 3rd ed. Freiburg/Leipzig 1894-1897.
- _____. *History of Dogma*. Vols. 3 and 4. Trans. E.B. Speirs and J. Millar. London, Edinburgh and Oxford 1897-1898.
- _____. *Die Chronologie der altkirchlichen Literatur bis Eusebius*. 2 vols. Leipzig 1904.
- J.R. Harris. *The Apology of Aristides*. Vol. 1 of *Texts and Studies* series, R.J. Armitage, ed. Cambridge 1983.
- H. Hauben. 'On the Meletians in P. London VI., The Problem of Papas Heraiscus.' In *Bibliography Papyrologi. Proceedings of the XVI International Congress of Papyrology*, 447-456. Chicago 1981.
- W.P. Haugaard. 'Arius: Twice a heretic?' *ChH* 29 (1960), 251-263.

- C. Hauret. 'Comment le "défenseur de Nicée" a-t-il compris le dogme de Nicée?' Ph.D. dissertation, Rome 1936.
- M.M. Hauser-Meury. *Prosopographie zu den Schriften Gregors von Nazianze*. Bonn 1960.
- M.A.G. Haykin. '"The Spirit of God": The Exegesis of I Cor. 2: 10-12 by Origen and Athanasius.' *Scottish Journal of Theology* 35 (1982), 513-528.
- C.J. Hefele. *Conciliengeschichte*. Bd. 1. Freiburg 1855.
- _____. *A History of the Christian Councils*. 2 vols. Trans. W.R. Clark. Edinburgh 1871.
- _____. *Histoire des Conciles d'après les documents originaux*. Vol. 1, parts I and II. Trans. L. Leclercq. Paris 1907.
- P. Henry. 'Why is Contemporary Scholarship so Enamoured of Ancient Heretics?' *StP* 17.1 (1982), 123-126.
- G.F. Hernández. 'El cisma meleciano en la Iglesia egipcia.' *Gerión* 2 (1984), 155-180.
- _____. 'Problemas históricos en torno a la muerte de Arrio.' *Erytheia: Revista de estudios byzantinos y neogriegos* 5 (1984), 95-103.
- A. Heron. 'Zur Theologie der "Tropici" in den Serapionbriefen des Athanasius.' *Kyrios* 14 (1974), 3-24.
- _____. ' "Logos, Image, Son": Some Models and Paradigms in Early Christology.' In *Creation, Christ and Culture. Studies in Honour of T.F. Torrance*, 43-62. R.W.A. McKinney, ed. Edinburgh 1976.
- _____. 'The Pseudo-Athanasian Works *De Trinitate et Spiritu Sancto* and *De incarnatione et contra Arianos*: A Comparison.' In *Aksum Thyateira. A Festschrift for Archbishop Methodios of Thyateira and Great Britain*, 281-298. G.D. Dragas, ed. London 1985.
- J. Herrmann. 'Ein Streitgespräch mit verfahrensrechtlichen Argumenten zwischen Kaiser Konstantius und Bischof Liberius.' In *Festschrift für Hans Lietzmann*, hrsg. V.K. Obermayer u. H.R. Hagemann, 77-86. Erlangen 1964.
- L. von Hertling. *Antonius der Einsiedler. Forschungen zur Geschichte des innerkirchlichen Lebens*, 1. Heft. Innsbruck 1929.
- _____. *Communio. Church and Papacy in Early Christianity*. Trans. J. Wicks. Chicago 1972.
- H. Hess. *The Canons of the Council of Sardica A.D. 343. A Landmark in the Early Development of Canon Law*. Oxford 1958.

- M.J. Higgins. 'Two Notes: 1. Athanasius and Eusebius on the Council of Nicaea; 2. The Pope's Right to try Patriarch on Disciplinary Charge.' In *Polychronion. Festschrift Franz Dölger*, 238-243. Heidelberg 1966.
- K. Holl. 'Die Bedeutung der neuveröffentlichten melitianischen Urkunden für die Kirchengeschichte.' *Sitzungsberichte der preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften. Philosophisch-historische Klasse* 1925, 18-31. Reprinted in his *Gesammelte Aufsätze* 2 (1928), 283-297.
- D.L. Holland. 'The Creeds of Nicaea and Constantinople Revisited.' *ChH* 38 (1969) 248-261.
- _____. 'Die Synode von Antiochen (324/25) und ihre Bedeutung für Eusebius von Caesarea und das Konzil von Nizäa.' *ZKG* 81 (1970) 163-181.
- J.A.B. Holland. 'The Development of the Trinitarian Theology of Athanasius in his Conflict with Contemporary Heresies.' Ph.D. dissertation, University of Edinburgh, 1963.
- _____. 'Athanasius versus Arius: What now?' *Reformed Theological Review* 28 (1969), 16-27.
- _____. 'Athanasius and Arius II: Why the Impulse to Reduce?' *Reformed Theological Review* 30 (1971), 33-47.
- _____. 'III. The Solution of Athanasius.' *Reformed Theological Review* 30 (1971), 69-78.
- _____. 'The Implications of Athanasius for us.' *Reformed Theological Review* 31 (1972), 1-9.
- E. Honigmann. 'La liste originale des Pères de Nicée.' *ByZ* 14 (1939), 17-76.
- H. Hoppenbrouwers. *La plus ancienne version latine de la Vie de S. Antoine par S. Athanase*. Nimegue 1960.
- K. Hoss. *Studien über das Schrifttum und die Theologie des Athanasius*. Freiburg 1899.
- V. Hugger. 'Des hl. Athanasius Traktat in Mt. 11.27.' *ZKTh* 42 (1918), 437-441.
- _____. 'Mai's Lukaskommentar und der Traktat De passione athanasianisches Gut?' *ZKTh* 43 (1919).
- P. Hughes. *The Church in Crisis: A History of the General Councils 325-1870*. New York 1961.
- H. Hunger. *Die hochsprachliche profane Literatur der Byzantiner*. Munich 1978.

- A.M. Javierre. *El tema literario de la sucesion. Prolegómenos para el estudio de la sucesion apostolica.* Zurich 1963.
- H. Jedin. *Handbuch der Kirchengeschichte.* Vol. 2: *Die Reichskirche nach Konstantin dem Grossen.* Freiburg 1975.
- _____. *Handbuch der Kirchengeschichte.* Vol. 2/1: *Die Kirche von Nikaia bis Chalkedon.* Freiburg 1975.
- P.P. Joannou. *La législation Impériale et la christianisation de l'Empire romain (311-476).* *Orientalia Christiana Analecta,* no. 192. Rome 1972.
- _____. *Die Ostkirche und die Cathedra Petri im 4. Jahrhundert.* Bearbeitet von G. Denzler. *Päpste und Papsttum* Band 3. Stuttgart 1972.
- H.F. Jolowicz. *Historical Introduction to the Study of Roman Law.* Cambridge 1954.
- A.H.M. Jones. *Constantine and the Conversion of Europe.* London 1948.
- _____. 'The Date of the Apologia contra Arianos of Athanasius.' *JThS* NS 5 (1954), 224-227.
- _____. 'Notes on the Genuineness of the Constantinian Documents in Eusebius' Life of Constantine.' *JEH* 5 (1954), 196-200.
- _____. *The Later Roman Empire.* 2 vols. Oxford 1964.
- E.A. Judge. 'The Earliest Use of Monachos for "Monk" (P.Coll. Youtie 77) and the Origins of Monasticism.' *Jahrbuch für Antike und Christentum* 20 (1977), 72-89.
- E.A. Judge and S.R. Pickering. 'Papyrus Documentation of Church and Community in Egypt to the Mid-Fourth Century.' *Jahrbuch für Antike und Christentum* 20 (1977), 47-71.
- C. Kannengiesser. 'Le témoignage des *Lettres Festales* de S. Athanase sur la date de l'apologie Contre les païens - Sur l'incarnation du Verbe.' *RSR* 52 (1964), 91-100.
- _____. 'Le texte court du *De Incarnatione* athanasien.' *RSR* 52 (1964), 589-596; 53 (1965), 77-111.
- _____. 'Les différentes recensions du traité *De incarnatione Verbi* de S. Athanase.' *StP* 7 (1966), 221-229.
- _____. 'La date de l'Apologie d'Athanase Contre les Païens et Sur l'Incarnation du Verbe.' *RSR* 58 (1970), 383-428.
- _____. 'Les citations bibliques du traité athanasien Sur l'Incarnation du Verbe et les Testimonia.' In *La Bible et les Pères*, 135-160. Strasbourg 1970.

- C. Kannengiesser. 'Où et quand Arius composait-il la *Thalie*?' In *Kyriakon*, 346-351. 2 vols. P. Granfield and J.A. Jungmann, eds. Münster 1970.
- _____. 'Le recours au Livre de Jérémie chez Athanase d'Alexandrie.' In *Epektasis: Festschrift Jean Daniélou*. J. Fontaine and C. Kannengiesser, eds. Paris 1972.
- _____. 'Logos et Nous chez Athanase d'Alexandrie.' *StP* 11, TU 108 (1972), 199-202.
- _____. 'Athanase édité par R.W. Thomson.' *RSR* 61 (1973), 217-232.
- _____. 'Athanasius of Alexandria and the Foundations of Traditional Christology.' *Theological Studies* 34 (1973), 103-113.
- _____. 'Athanasius von Alexandrien. Seine Beziehungen zu Trier und seine Rolle in der Geschichte der christlichen Theologie.' *Trierer Theologische Zeitschrift* 82 (1973), 141-153.
- _____. 'Le mystère pascal du Christ selon Athanase d'Alexandrie.' *RSR* 63 (1975), 407-442.
- _____. 'L'interprétation de Jérémie dans la tradition alexandrine.' *StP* 12, TU 115 (1975), 317-320.
- _____. 'Théologie et Patristique: Le sens actuel de leur rapport vérifié chez Athanase d'Alexandrie.' In *Humanisme et Foi Chrétienne*. Mélanges scientifiques du Centenaire de l'Institut Catholique de Paris. C. Kannengiesser and Y. Marchasson, eds. Paris 1976.
- _____. 'Nicée 325 dans l'histoire du Christianisme.' *Concilium* 138 (1978), 39-47.
- _____. 'Athanasius of Alexandria and the Holy Spirit between Nicaea I and Constantinople I.' *Irish Theological Quarterly* 48 (1981), 166-180.
- _____. 'La Nouveauté Chrétienne vue par Origène.' In *L'Ancien et le Nouveau*, 111-135. J. Doré, ed. *Cogitatio Fidei* 3. Paris 1982.
- _____. *Holy Scripture and Hellenistic Hermeneutics in Alexandrian Christology: the Arian Crisis*. Colloquy 41 of the Center for Hermeneutical Studies in Hellenistic and Modern Culture. Berkeley 1982.
- _____. 'Athanasius of Alexandria - Three Orations Against the Arians. A Reappraisal.' *StP* 18 (1982), 981-995.
- _____. 'The Contemporary Task of Historical Theology.' Paper presented as inaugural lecture as C.F. Huisking Professor of Theology at University of Notre Dame. Notre Dame, 8 April, 1983.

- C. Kannengiesser. *Athanase d'Alexandrie évêque et écrivain. Une lecture des Traités 'Contre les Ariens'*. Théologie historique 70. Paris 1983.
- _____. 'Arius and the Arians.' *Theological Studies* 44 (1983), 456-475.
- _____. 'Les "Blasphèmes d'Arius" (Athanase d'Alexandrie, *De Synodis* 15): Un écrit néo-arien.' In *Mémorial André-Jean Festugière Antiquité païenne et chrétienne*, 143-151. E. Lucchesi and H.D. Saffrey, eds. Geneva 1984.
- _____. 'Athanasius von Alexandrien.' In *Gestalten der Kirchengeschichte*, 266-283. M. Greschat, ed. Bd. 1, Alte Kirche I. Tübingen 1984.
- _____. 'La Bible et la crise arienne.' In *Le monde grec ancien et la Bible*, 301-312. Vol. 1 *Bible de Tous les Temps* series. C. Mondésert, ed. Paris 1984.
- _____. 'Origenes, Augustin und der Paradigmenwechsel in der Theologie.' In *Theologie-Wohin*, 151-167. H. Küng and D. Tracy, eds. Oekumenische Theologie II. Zürich 1984.
- _____. 'The Blasphemies of Arius: Athanasius of Alexandria *De Synodis* 15.' In *Arianism*, 59-77. R.C. Gregg, ed. Philadelphia 1985.
- _____. 'La Bible dans les controverses ariennes en Occident.' In *Le monde latin antique et la Bible*, 543-564. Vol. 2 *Bible de Tous les Temps* series. J. Fontaine and C. Pietri, eds. Paris 1985.
- _____. 'The Athanasian Decade 1974-84: A Bibliographical Report.' *Theological Studies* (1985), 524-541.
- _____. 'Athanasius of Alexandria vs. Arius: "The" Alexandrian Crisis.' In *The Roots of Egyptian Christianity*, 204-215. B. Pearson and J. Goehring, eds. Philadelphia 1986.
- _____. 'L'Enigme de la Lettre au philosophe Maxime d'Athanase d'Alexandrie.' In *AAEEANΔPINA. Mélanges offerts à Claude Mondésert, S.J.* Paris 1987.
- _____. 'Athanasius of Alexandria Rediscovered: His Political and Pastoral Achievement.' Paper presented at Catholic University of America, Washington, D.C., 22 October, 1987.
- _____. 'Athanasius of Alexandria in East and West Revisited.' Paper presented at University of Virginia, 26 October, 1987.
- C. Kannengiesser, ed. *Politique et Théologie chez Athanase d'Alexandrie*. Actes du Colloque de Chantilly, 23-25 Septembre 1973. Théologie Historique 27. Paris 1974.

- C. Kannengiesser, ed. *Early Christian Spirituality*. Trans. P. Bright. *Sources of Early Christian Thought* series. Philadelphia 1986.
- K. Karakolas. 'Η ΕΚΚΛΗΣΙΟΛΟΓΙΑ ΤΟΥ ΜΕΓΑΛΟΥ ΑΘΑΝΑΣΙΟΥ. Thessaloniki 1968.
- H. Karpp. 'Textkritische Bemerkungen zu Athanasius, De Decretis Nicaenae Synodi 27, 1.' *VC* 28 (1974), 141-143.
- J. Kaye. *Works of John Kaye*. London 1876.
- A. Kee. *Constantine versus Christ. The Triumph of Ideology*. London 1982.
- T. Kehrhn. *De sancti Athanasii quae fertur Contra Gentes oratione*. Berlin 1913.
- J.N.D. Kelly. *Early Christian Creeds*. 2nd ed. London 1967.
- _____. *Early Christian Doctrines*. 4th ed. London 1968.
- E.W. Kemp. 'Bishops and Presbyters at Alexandria.' *JEH* 6 (1955), 125-142.
- G.A. Kennedy. *The Art of Rhetoric in the Roman World, 300 B.C. - A.D. 300*. Princeton 1972.
- _____. *Classical Rhetoric and Its Christian and Secular Tradition from Ancient to Modern Times*. Chapel Hill, N. Carolina 1980.
- _____. *Greek Rhetoric Under Roman Emperors*. Princeton 1983.
- F.H. Kettler. 'Der melitianische Streit in Aegypten.' *ZNW* 35 (1936), 159-163.
- B.J. Kidd. *A History of the Church to A.D. 461*. Oxford 1922.
- R. Klein. *Constantius II und die christliche Kirche*. W.B.G., Impulse der Forschung. Darmstadt 1977.
- _____. 'Zur Glaubwürdigkeit historischer Aussagen des Bischofs Athanasius von Alexandria über die Religionspolitik des Kaisers Constantius II.' *StP* 17 (1982), 996-1017.
- A.F.J. Klijn. 'Jewish Christianity in Egypt.' In *The Roots of Egyptian Christianity*, 161-175. B. Pearson and J. Goehring, eds. Philadelphia 1986.
- E. Klostermann, ed. *Eusebius Werke*. Vol. 4. *Die Griechischen Christlichen Schriftsteller der Ersten Jahrhunderte*. Berlin 1972.
- A.L. Kolp. 'Partakers of the Divine Nature: The Use of II Peter 1:4 by Athanasius.' *StP* 17 (1982), 1018-1023.

T.A. Kopecek. *A History of Neo-Arianism*. 2 vols. Patristic Monograph Series 8. Cambridge, Mass. 1979.

_____. 'Professor Charles Kannengiesser's View of the Arian Crisis: A Critique and Counter-Proposal.' Colloquy 41 of the Center for Hermeneutical Studies in Hellenistic and Modern Culture, 51-68. Berkeley 1982.

_____. 'Neo-Arian Religion: The Evidence of the *Apostolic Constitutions*.' In *Arianism*, 153-179. R.C. Gregg, ed. Philadelphia 1985.

H. Kraft. 'ΟΜΟΟΥΣΙΟΣ'. *ZKG* 66 (1954/55), 1-24.

_____. *Kaiser Konstantins religiöse Entwicklung*. Tübingen 1955.

M. Krause. 'Das christliche Alexandrien und seine Beziehungen zum koptischen Aegypten.' In *Alexandrien: Kulturbegegnungen dreier Jahrtausende im Schmelztiegel einer mediterranen Grossstadt*, 53-62. N. Hinske, ed. *Aegyptiaca Treverensia* 1. Mainz am Rhein 1981.

H. Kreilkamp. 'The Origin of the Patriarchate of Constantinople and the first Roman Recognition of its Patriarchal Jurisdiction.' Ph.D. dissertation, Catholic University of America, 1964.

K. Lake. 'Some further Notes on the Mss. of the Writings of St. Athanasius.' *JThS* 5 (1903), 108-114.

K. Lake and R.P. Casey. 'The Text of the *De Incarnatione* of Athanasius.' *HThR* 19 (1926), 259-270.

A. Laminski. *Der Heilige Geist als Geist Christi und Geist der Gläubigen*. Der Beitrag des Athanasios von Alexandrien zur Formulierung des trinitarischen Dogmas im IV. Jht. *Erfurter theologische Studien* Band 23. Leipzig 1969.

G. Larentzakis. 'Einige Aspekte des hl. Athanasios zur Einheit der Kirche.' *Κληρονομία* 6 (1974), 242-259.

_____. *Einheit der Menschheit, Einheit der Kirche bei Athanasius. Vor- und nachchristliche Soteriologie und Ekklesiologie bei Athanasius von Alexandrien*. Graz 1978.

J. Lassus. 'L'Empereur Constantin, Eusèbe et les lieux saints.' *Revue de l'Histoire des Religions* 171 (1967), 135-144.

F. Lauchert. *Die Lehre des heiligen Athanasius des Grössen*. Leipzig 1895.

_____. *Leben des heiligen Athanasius des Grössen*. Cologne 1911.

H.J. Lawlor. *Eusebiana. Essays on the Ecclesiastical History of Eusebius*. New York 1912.

- H.J. Lawlor. 'The Chronology of Eusebius.' *Classical Quarterly* 19 (1924), 94-101.
- J. Lebon. 'Pour une édition critique des oeuvres de S. Athanase.' *RHE* 3 (1925), 524-530.
- _____. 'Une ancienne opinion sur la condition du corps du Christ dans la mort.' *RHE* 23 (1927), 5-43, 207-241.
- _____. 'Athanasiana Syriaca.' *Le Muséon* 40 (1927), 205-248.
- _____. 'Athanasiana Syriaca.' *Le Muséon* 41 (1928), 169-216.
- _____. 'S. Athanase a-t-il employé l'expression ὁ κύριος ἀνθρωπος?' *RHE* 31 (1935), 307-329.
- _____. 'Altération doctrinale de la "Lettre à Epictète" de Saint Athanase.' *RHE* 31 (1935), 713-761.
- _____. 'Compte-rendu de H.G. Opitz, Untersuchungen zur Ueberlieferung der Schriften des Athanasius.' *RHE* 31 (1935), 783-788.
- J. Lebreton. 'ΑΓΕΝΝΗΤΟΣ dans la tradition philosophique et dans la littérature chrétienne du IIe siècle.' *RSR* 16 (1926), 431-443.
- H. Leclercq. 'Alexandrie (Archéologie).' *DACL* vol. 1, cols. 1098-1182.
- J. Lecuyer. 'Le problème des consécérations épiscopales dans l'Eglise d'Alexandrie.' *BLE* 65 (1964), 241-257.
- _____. 'La succession des évêques d'Alexandrie aux premiers siècles.' *BLE* 70 (1969), 81-99.
- G.M. Lee. 'Eusebius on St. Mark and the Beginnings of Christianity in Egypt.' *StP* 12 (1975), 422-431.
- L.T. Lefort. 'S. Athanase sur la virginité.' *Le Muséon* 42 (1929), 197-274.
- _____. 'Athanase écrivain copte.' *Le Muséon* 42 (1933), 1-33.
- _____. 'Athanase, Ambroise et Chenoute sur la virginité.' *Le Muséon* 48 (1935), 55-73.
- _____. 'Un nouveau "de virginitate" attribué à S. Athanase.' *AnalBoll* 67 (1949), 142-152.
- _____. 'Les lettres Festales de S. Athanase.' *Bulletin de la Classe des Lettres de l'Académie Royale de Belgique* 39 (1953), 643-656; 41 (1955), 183-185.
- _____. 'La chasse aux reliques des martyrs en Egypte au IVe siècle.' *La Nouvelle Cléo* 6 (1954), 225-230.

- L.T. Lefort. 'A propos des Festale de S. Athanase.' *Le Muséon* 67 (1954), 43-50.
- _____. 'Athanasiana Coptica.' *Le Muséon* 69 (1956), 233-241.
- _____. 'L'homélie de S. Athanase des papyrus de Turin.' *Le Muséon* 71 (1958), 5-50 and 209-239.
- L. Leloir. 'Premiers renseignements sur la Vie d'Antoine en éthiopien.' In *Antidoros. Festschrift M. Geerard*, 9-11. Antwerp 1984.
- J.M. Leroux. 'Athanase et la seconde phase de la crise arienne (345-373).' In *Politique et Théologie*, 145-156. C. Kannengiesser, ed. Paris 1974.
- F.J. Leroy. 'Une homélie nouvelle, origéno-arienne, issue de milieux anti-Marcelliens. BHG 1076z, in Lc I, 31-44.' In *Epektasis. Festschrift pour J. Daniélou*, 343-353. Paris 1972.
- N. Lewis. *Life in Egypt Under Roman Rule*. Oxford 1983.
- J.T. Lienhard. 'Marcellus of Ancyra in Modern Research.' *Theological Studies* 43 (1982), 486-503.
- _____. 'The Epistle of the Synod of Ancyra, 358: A Reconsideration.' In *Arianism*, 313-319. R.C. Gregg, ed. Philadelphia 1985.
- H. Lietzmann. 'Chronologie der ersten und zweiten Verbannung des Athanasius.' *ZWTh* 44 (1901), 380-390.
- _____. 'Symbolstudien XIII.' *ZNW* 24 (1925), 193-202.
- _____. *A History of the Early Church*. 4 vols. New York 1961.
- _____. 'Die Anfänge des Problems Kirche und Staat.' In *Die Kirche angesichts der Konstantinischen Wende*, 1-13. Darmstadt 1976.
- A. Lippold. 'Bischof Ossius von Cordoba und Konstantin der Grosse.' *ZKG* 92 (1981), 1-15.
- G. Loeschke. 'Zur Chronologie der beiden grossen anti-arianischen Schreiben des Alexander von Alexandrien.' *ZKG* 31 (1910), 584-586.
- S. Longosz. 'Swiety Atanazy a Biblia.' *Ruch Biblijny i Liturgiczny* 27 (1974), 237-296.
- F. Loofs. 'Arianismus.' *RE* 3 (1897), 6-45.
- _____. 'Athanasius von Alexandria.' *RE* 3 (1897), 194-205.
- _____. 'Die chronologischen Angaben des sog. "Vorbericht" zu den Festbriefen der Athanasius.' *Sitzungsberichte der königlich preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften* (1908), 1013-1022.

- F. Loofs. 'Das Glaubensbekenntnis der Homousianer von Sardica.' *AAWB* (1909), 1.
- _____. 'Das Nicänum.' In *Festgabe K. Müller*, 68-82. Tübingen 1922.
- R. Lorenz. 'Das Problem der Nachsynode von Nicäa (327).' *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte* 90 (1970), 22-40.
- _____. 'Arius judaizans'? *Untersuchungen zur dogmengeschichtlichen Einordnung des Arius*. Göttingen 1980.
- _____. 'Die Christusseele im arianischen Streit: Nebst einigen Bemerkungen zur Quellenkritik des Arius und zur Glaubwürdigkeit des Athanasius.' *ZKG* 94 (1983), 1-51.
- _____. *Der zehnte Osterfestbrief des Athanasius von Alexandrien*. New York 1986.
- W. Lorimer. 'Critical Notes on Athanasius.' *JThS* 40 (1939), 37-46.
- A. Louth. 'Reason and Revelation in Saint Athanasius.' *Scottish Journal of Theology* 23 (1970), 385-396.
- _____. 'The Concept of the Soul in Athanasius' *Contra Gentiles - De Incarnatione*.' *StP* 13 (1975), 227-231.
- _____. *The Origins of the Christian Mystical Tradition*. Oxford and New York 1981.
- _____. 'Athanasius' Understanding of the Humanity of Christ.' *StP* 16 (1985), 309-318.
- C. Luibheid. 'Eusebius of Caesarea and the Nicene Creed.' *Irish Theological Quarterly* 39 (1972), 299-305.
- _____. 'The Arianism of Eusebius of Nicomedia.' *Irish Theological Quarterly* 43 (1976), 3-23.
- _____. 'Finding Arius.' *Irish Theological Quarterly* 45 (1978), 81-100.
- _____. *Eusebius of Caesarea and the Arian Crisis*. Dublin 1978.
- _____. *The Council of Nicaea*. Galway 1982.
- _____. 'The Alleged Second Session of the Council of Nicaea.' *JEH* 34 (1983), 165-174.
- R.J. Lyman. 'Christology and Cosmology: Will and Substance Models in Origen, Eusebius and Athanasius.' D.Phil. dissertation, Oxford University, 1983.
- _____. 'Substance Language in Origen and Eusebius.' In *Arianism*, 257-265. R.C. Gregg, ed. Philadelphia 1985.

- E.E. Malone. *The Monk and the Martyr*. Washington 1950.
- J.D. Mansi. *Sacrorum Conciliorum Nova et Amplissima Collectio*. Vol. 2. Florence 1758-1798.
- G. Mantzaridos. ΤΟΜΟΣ ΕΟΡΤΙΟΣ. Χιλιοστῆς ἑξακοσιοστῆς ἑπετείου Μεγάλου Ἀθανασίου. Thessalonica 1974.
- V.O. Marangoni. 'Juan 10,30 en la argumentacion escrituristica de san Atanasio.' *Stromata* 26 (1970), 3-57.
- Y. Marchasson and C. Kannengiesser, eds. *Humanisme et foi chrétienne. Mélanges scientifiques du centenaire de l'Institut Catholique de Paris*. Paris 1976.
- M. de Bertrand. 'Exégèse polémique, doctrinale et spirituelle de saint Athanase.' In *Introduction à l'histoire de l'église 1: Les Pères grecs et orientaux*, chap. 5. Paris 1980.
- H.J. Margull, ed. *The Councils of the Church*. Philadelphia 1966.
- R.A. Markus. 'Church History and the Early Church Historians.' In *The Materials, Sources, Methods of Ecclesiastical History*, 1-17. D.A. Baker, ed. Oxford 1975.
- Dom H. Marot. 'Les conciles romains des IV^e et V^e siècles et le développement de la primauté.' *Istina* 4 (1957), 435-462.
- _____. 'Vornicärische und ökumenische Konzile.' In *Das Konzil und die Konzile*, 23-41. Stuttgart 1962.
- H.I. Marrou. 'L'arianisme comme phénomène alexandrin.' *Académie des inscriptions et Belles Lettres, Comptes rendus*.(1973), 533-542.
- A. Martin. 'Athanase et les Méliitiens.' In *Politique et Théologie*, 31-61. C. Kannengiesser, ed. Paris 1974.
- _____. 'Aux origines de l'Eglise copte: L'implantation et le développement du Christianisme en Egypte (I^e - IV^e siècles).' *Revue des études anciennes* 88 (1981), 35-56.
- _____. 'Les premiers siècles du Christianisme à Alexandrie.' *Revue des études Augustiniennes* 30 (1984), 211-225.
- J. Mayer. 'Über Echtheit und Glaubwürdigkeit der dem heiligen Athanasius d. Grossen zugeschriebenen Vita Antonii.' *Der Katholik* (1886), Heft I. Neue Folge 55: Art. XXXII, 495-516 and Art. XXXIX, 619-636; Heft II. NF. 56: Art. XI 173-193.
- J.D. McCoy. 'Philosophical Influences on the Doctrine of the Incarnation in Athanasius and Cyril of Alexandria.' *Encounter* (Indianapolis) 38 (1977), 362-391.

- W.H. McKean. *Christian Monasticism in Egypt*. London and New York 1920.
- E.P. Meijering. 'The Doctrine of the Will and of the Trinity in the Orations of Gregory of Nazianzus.' *NedThT* 27 (1973), 224-234.
- _____. *Orthodoxy and Platonism in Athanasius. Synthesis or Antithesis*. 2nd ed. Leiden 1974.
- _____. 'HN ΠΟΤΕ ΟΤΕ ΟΥΚ ΗΝ Ο ΥΙΟΣ. A Discussion on Time and Eternity.' *VC* 28 (1974), 161-169.
- _____. *God, Being, History: Studies in Patristic Philosophy*. Amsterdam and Oxford 1975.
- O. Meinardus. *Christian Egypt, Ancient and Modern*. Cairo 1965.
- _____. *Christian Egypt, Faith and Life*. Cairo, n.d.
- _____. 'An Examination of the Traditions pertaining to the Relics of St. Mark.' *OrChP* 36 (1970), 348-376.
- P. Meinhold. 'Die gesamtchristliche Bedeutung des. hl. Athanasius.' *Kyrios* 14 (1974), 97-114.
- A. Meredith. 'Orthodoxy, Heresy and Philosophy in the Latter Half of the Fourth Century.' *Heythrop Journal* 16 (1975), 5-21.
- _____. 'Emanation in Plotinus and Athanasius.' *StP* 16 (1985), 319-323.
- P. Merendino. *Paschale Sacramentum*. Eine Untersuchung über die Osterkatechese des hl. Athanasius von Alexandrien in ihrer Beziehung zu den frühchristlichen exegetisch-theologischen Ueberlieferungen. Münster 1965.
- M. Meslin. *Les Ariens d'Occident*. Paris 1967.
- R.L.P. Milburn. *Early Christian Interpretations of History*. The Bampton Lectures of 1952. London 1954.
- M. Miller. 'Archaic Literary Chronography.' *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 75 (1955), 54-58.
- J.A. Moehler. *Athanasius der Große und die Kirche seiner Zeit, besonders im Kampfe mit dem Arianismus*. 2nd ed. Mainz 1844.
- _____. *Athanase le Grand et l'Eglise de son temps en lutte l'arianisme*. 3 vols. Trans. Zickwolff and Cohen. Paris 1849.
- E. Molland. 'La développement de l'idée de succession apostolique.' *RHPR* 34 (1954), 1-29.

- A. Momigliano. 'Pagan and Christian Historiography in the Fourth Century A.D.' In *The Conflict of Paganism and Christianity in the Fourth Century*, 79-99. Oxford 1963.
- V. Monachino. 'Communio e primato nella controversia ariana.' *Archivum Historiae Pontificum* 7 (1969), 43-78.
- C.W. Mönnich. 'De Achtegrond van de ariane Christologie.' *NedThT* 4 (1950), 378-412.
- O. Montevecchi. *La Papirologia*. Torino 1973.
- F. Morard. 'Encore quelques reflexions sur monachos.' *VC* 34 (1980), 395-401.
- A.M. Moreira. *Potamius de Lisbonne et la controverse arienne*. Louvain 1969.
- A.A. Mosshammer. *The Chronicle of Eusebius and Greek Chronographic Tradition*. Lewisburg, PA. 1979.
- E.D. Moutsoulas. 'Ο Μέγας Ἀθανάσιος. Athens 1974.
- _____. 'Η Ἀρελανή ἔρως καὶ ὁ Μέγας Ἀθανάσιος. Athens 1979.
- _____. 'Le problème de la date des "Trois discours" contre les Ariens d'Athanase d'Alexandrie.' *StP* 16 (1985), 324-341.
- E. Mühlenberg. *Appollinaris von Laodicea*. Göttingen 1959.
- _____. 'Vérité et bonté de Dieu.' In *Politique et Théologie*, 215-230. C. Kannengiesser, ed. Paris 1974.
- C.D.G. Müller. 'Athanasius von Alexandrien als koptischer Schriftsteller.' *Kyrios* 14 (1974), 195-204.
- P. Nautin. 'Deux interpolations orthodoxes dans une lettre d'Arius.' *AnalBoll* 67 (1949), 131-141.
- _____. 'La doctrine d'Arius.' *Annuaire de l'Ecole pratique des Hautes Etudes*, V^e section: Sciences Religieuses 83 (1974-75), 231f.
- J.M. Neale. *A History of the Holy Eastern Church. The Patriarchate of Alexandria*. 2 vols. London 1847.
- A. Neander. *General History of the Christian Religion and Church*. Trans. J. Torrey. Edinburgh 1859.
- New Dictionary of Christian Theology*, 1983 ed. S.v. 'Arianism', by R.C. Gregg.
- J.H. Newman. *The Arians of the Fourth Century*. London 1833.

J.H. Newman. *Lyra Apostolica*. 14th ed. London 1867.

_____. *An Essay on the Development of Christian Doctrine*.
Rev. ed. London 1878.

_____. *Select Treatises of St. Athanasius in Controversy with
the Arians*. 2 vols. 2nd ed. London 1881.

_____. *Apologia Pro Vita Sua: Being a History of His Religious
Opinions*. London 1890.

_____. *Catholic Sermons of Cardinal Newman*. London 1957.

A. de Nicola. 'La concezione e la storia del male nel Contra
Gentes - De Incarnatione de S. Atanasio.' *Augustinianum* 16 (1976),
85-106.

H. Nordberg. *Athanasius' Tractates Contra Gentes and De Incarnatione:
An attempt at Redating*. Commentationes Humanarum Litterarum
28.3. Helsinki 1961.

_____. 'A Reconsideration of the Date of Athanasius' Contra
Gentes and De Incarnatione.' *StP* 3 (1961), 262-266.

_____. *Athanasiana, I*. Helsinki 1962.

_____. 'On the Bible Text of St. Athanasius.' *Arctos. Acta
philologica Fennica. The New Scholasticism* 3 (1962), 119-141.

_____. *Athanasius and the Emperor*. Commentationes Humanarum
Litterarum 30.3. Helsinki 1963.

E. Norden. *Die antike Kunstprosa*. 2 vols. Leipzig 1898.

K.E. Norman. 'Deification: The Content of Athanasian Soteriology.'
Ph.D. dissertation, Duke University, 1980.

F.W. Norris. 'Gregory Nazianzen's Opponents in Oration 31.' In
Arianism, 321-325. R.C. Gregg, ed. Philadelphia 1985.

J.R. Nyman. 'The Arian Controversy from its beginnings to the Council
of Nicaea.' D.Phil. dissertation, Oxford, 1960.

_____. 'The Synod of Antioch (324-325) and the Council of Nicaea.'
StP 4, TU 79 (1961), 483-489.

H.G. Opitz. 'Das Syrische Corpus Athanasianum.' *ZNW* 33 (1934), 18-31.

_____. 'Die Zeitfolge des arianischen Streites von den Anfängen
bis zum Jahr 328.' *ZNW* 33 (1934), 131-159.

_____. *Untersuchungen zur Ueberlieferung der Schriften des
Athanasius*. Arbeiten zur Kirchengeschichte 23. Berlin und Leipzig
1935.

- H.G. Opitz. 'Euseb von Caesarea als Theologie: Ein Vortrag.' *ZNW* 34 (1935), 1-19.
- T. Orlandi. 'Sull'Apologia secundo (contra Arianos) di Atanasio di Alessandria.' *Augustinianum* 15 (1975), 49-79.
- E. Osborn. 'Arian Obedience: Scouting for Theologians.' Review of Gregg and Groh, 1981. *Prudentia* 16 (1984), 51-56.
- S. Papadopoulos. ΑΘΑΝΑΣΙΟΣ Ο ΜΕΓΑΣ ΚΑΙ Η ΘΕΟΛΟΓΙΑ ΤΗΣ ΟΙΚΟΥΜΕΝΙΚΗΣ ΕΥΝΟΔΟΥ. Athens 1975.
- W.C. de Pauley. 'The idea of man in Athanasius.' *Theology* 12 (1926), 331-338.
- R. Payne. *The Holy Fire. The Story of the Fathers of the Eastern Church*. London 1958.
- B. Pearson and J. Goehring, eds. *The Roots of Egyptian Christianity*. Philadelphia 1986.
- P. Peeters. 'L'épilogue du synode de Tyr en 335.' *AnalBoll* 63 (1945), 131-144.
- _____. 'Comment S. Athanase s'enfuit de Tyr en 335.' *Académie royale de Belgique: Bulletin de la classe des lettres et des sciences morales et politiques*. 5^e série, Tome 30 (1945), 131-177.
- J. Pelikan. *The Light of the World. A Basic Image in Early Christian Thought*. New York 1962.
- _____. *The Christian Tradition: A History of the Development of Doctrine*. Vol. 1: *The Emergence of the Catholic Tradition*. London 1971.
- _____. *Historical Theology - Continuity and Change in Christian Doctrine*. New York 1971.
- _____. 'Council or Father or Scripture: The Concept of Authority in the Theology of Maximus the Confessor.' In *The Heritage of the Early Church: Essays in Honor of the V. Rev. Georges V. Florovsky*, 277-288. D. Neiman and M. Schatkin, eds. Rome 1973.
- _____. *The Excellent Empire. The Fall of Rome and the Triumph of the Church*. San Francisco 1987.
- G.A. Pell. *Die Lehre des heiligen Athanasius von der Sünde und Erlösung*. Passau 1888.
- H.R. Percival, ed. *The Seven Ecumenical Councils of the Undivided Church, their Canons and dogmatic Decrees, together with all the Canons of all the Local Synods which have received ecumenical acceptance, edited with notes gathered from the writings of the greatest Scholars*. *LNPF* 14, 2nd series. Reprint ed. Grand Rapids 1974.

- V. Peri. 'La cronologia delle lettere festali di sant' Atanasio e la quaresima.' *Aevum* 35 (1961), 28-86.
- P. Perichon. 'Pour une édition nouvelle de l'historien Socrate: les manuscrits et les versions'. *RSR* 53 (1965), 112-120.
- R.E. Person. *The Mode of Theological Decision Making at the Early Ecumenical Councils. An Inquiry into the Function of Scripture and Tradition at the Councils of Nicaea and Ephesus*. Basel 1978.
- R.M. Peterson. 'The Gift of Discerning Spirits in the Vita Antonii 16-44.' *StP* 17 (1982), 519-522.
- A.L. Pettersen. 'A Reconstruction of the Date of the Contra gentes-De Incarnatione of Athanasius of Alexandria.' *StP* 17 (1982), 1030-1040.
- _____. '"To Flee or not to Flee": An Assessment of Athanasius' *De Fuga Sua*.' In *Persecution and Toleration*, 29-42. W.J. Sheils, ed. Oxford 1984.
- _____. 'Christ's Death - A Liturgical Event for Athanasius of Alexandria?' *The Downside Review* 346 (1984), 22-31.
- _____. 'The Questioning Jesus in Athanasius' *Contra Arianos III*.' In *Arianism*, 243-255. R.C. Gregg, ed. Philadelphia 1985.
- _____. 'Did Athanasius Deny Christ's Fear?' *Scottish Journal of Theology* 39 (1986), 327-340.
- M. Pieper. 'Zwei Blätter aus dem Osterbrief des Athanasius vom Jahre 364 (Pap. Berol. 11948)'. *ZNW* 37 (1938), 73-76.
- S. Pieszczoeh. 'Notices de la collégialité chez Eusèbe de Césarée (Histoire Ecclésiastique)'. *StP* 10 (1970), 302-305.
- C. Pietri. 'La question d'Athanase vue de Rome (338-360)'. In *Politique et Théologie*, 93-126. C. Kannengiesser, ed. Paris 1974.
- T.E. Pollard. 'Logos and Son in Origen, Arius and Athanasius.' *StP* 2 (1957), 282-287.
- _____. 'The Exegesis of John X 30 in the Early Trinitarian Controversies.' *New Testament Studies* 3 (1957), 334-349.
- _____. 'The Origins of Arianism.' *JThS* NS 9 (1958), 103-111.
- _____. 'The Exegesis of Scripture and the Arian Controversy.' *The Bulletin of the John Rylands Library of Manchester* 41 (1959), 414-429.
- _____. *Johannine Christology and the Early Church*. Cambridge 1970.

- T.E. Pollard. 'Eusebius of Caesarea and the Synod of Antioch (324/25).' *Ueberlieferungsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen* herausgeben von Franz Paschke. Berlin 1981.
- F. Preisigke. *Namenbuch*. Heidelberg 1922.
- G.L. Prestige. 'ἀγέν(ν)ητος and γεν(ν)ητός and kindred words in Eusebius and the Early Arians.' *JThS* 24 (1923), 486-496.
- _____. 'ἀγέν(ν)ητος and cognate words in Athanasius.' *JThS* 34 (1933), 258-265.
- _____. *Fathers and Heretics*. London and New York 1940.
- _____. *God in Patristic Thought*. London 1952.
- K. Prümm. '"Mysterion" und Verwandtes bei Athanasius.' *Zeitschrift für katholische Theologie* 63 (1939), 350-359.
- E.B. Pusey. *The Councils of the Church*. London 1857.
- J. Quasten. *Patrology*. 3 vols. Antwerp and Utrecht 1975.
- L.B. Radford. *Three Teachers of Alexandria: Theognostus, Pienus^l, and Peter*. Cambridge 1908.
- H. Rahner. *Kirche und Staat im frühen Christentum*. Munich 1961.
- A. Recheis. 'Sancti Athanasii Magni Doctrina de primordiis seu quomodo explicaverit Genesim 1-3.' *Antonianum* 28 (1953), 219-260.
- R. Reitzen. *Des Athanasius Werk über das Leben des Antonius. Ein philologischer Beitrag zur Geschichte des Mönchtums*. SAH 1914. Phil. Hist. Kl. Abh. 8.
- H.R. Reynolds. *Athanasius, His Life and Work*. London 1889.
- J. Rezette. 'Le mystère de l'Eglise dans la controverse anti-arienne chez saint Athanase.' *Studii Biblici Franciscani Liber Annuus* 25 (1975), 104-118.
- M. Richard. 'Saint Athanase et la psychologie du Christ selon les Ariens.' *Mélanges de Science Religieuse* 4 (1947), 5-54.
- _____, ed. *Asterii Sophistae Commentariorum in Psalmos Quae Supersunt*. Symbolae Osloenses, Fasc. Supplem. xvi. Oslo 1956.
- F. Ricken. 'Nikaia als Krisis des altchristlichen Platonismus.' *TP* 44 (1969), 321-341.
- _____. 'Zur Rezeption der platonischen Ontologie bei Eusebius von Kaisareia, Areios und Athanasios.' *TP* 53 (1978), 321-352.

- W. Riedel and W.E. Crum, eds. and trans. *The Canons of Athanasius of Alexandria*. London 1904.
- H. de Riedmatten. *Les Actes du procès de Paul de Samosate, étude sur la Christologie du III^e au IV^e Siècle*. Fribourg 1952.
- D. Ritschl. *Athanasius. Versuch einer Interpretation*. Zurich 1964.
- _____. 'Athanasius, Source of New Questions.' In *Konzepte. Gesammelte Aufsätze Bd. 1: Patristische Studien*, 74-77. Bern 1976.
- A.M. Ritter. *Das Konzil v. Konstantinopel und sein Symbol*. Göttingen 1965.
- A. Robertson. Prolegomena to his edition: *Select Writings and Letters of Athanasius, Bishop of Alexandria*. LNPF 4, 2nd series, 1891.
- _____. 'On Some Mss. of the Writings of St. Athanasius, Part I.' *JThS* 3 (1902), 97-110.
- G. Roethe. *Zur Geschichte der römischen Synoden im 3. und 4. Jahrhundert*. Freiburg 1937.
- S. Rogala. *Die Anfänge des arianischen Streites*. Forschungen zur christlichen Literatur und Dogmengeschichte, Bd. VII, I. Paderborn 1907.
- J. Roldanus. *Le Christ et l'homme dans la théologie d'Athanase d'Alexandrie. Etude de la conjonction de sa conception de l'homme avec sa christologie*. Studies in the History of Christian Thought series, vol. 4. Leiden 1968.
- M.J. Rondeau. 'L'Épître à Marcellinus sur les Psaumes.' *VC* 22 (1968), 176-197.
- _____. 'Une nouvelle preuve de l'influence littéraire d'Eusèbe de Césarée sur Athanase: l'interprétation des psaumes.' *RSR* 56 (1968), 385-434.
- W. Rordorf and A. Schneider. *L'évolution du concept de tradition dans l'Eglise ancienne*. Traditio Christiana 5. Berne 1982.
- R. Ruether. *Gregory of Nazianzus: Rhetor and Philosopher*. Oxford 1969.
- W.G. Rusch. 'A la recherche de l'Athanase historique.' In *Politique et Théologie*, 161-177. C. Kannengiesser, ed. Paris 1974.
- _____. 'Some Comments on Athanasius' *Contra Apollinarem I*, 3.' In *Arianism*, 223-231. R.C. Gregg, ed. Philadelphia 1985.
- _____, ed. and trans. *The Trinitarian Controversy*. Sources of Early Christian Thought series. Philadelphia 1980.

- G.J. Ryan. *De Incarnatione of Athanasius*. Part 1: *The long recension manuscripts*. Studies and Documents series 14. London 1954.
- H. Saake. 'Das Präskript zum ersten Serapionbrief des Athanasios von Alexandria als pneumatologisches Programm.' *VC* 26 (1972), 188-199.
- _____. *Pneumatologica: Untersuchungen zum Geistverständnis im Johannesevangelium, bei Origenes und Athanasios von Alexandria*. Frankfurt 1973.
- B. Salleron. *Matière et corps du Christ chez Saint Athanase d'Alexandrie*. Rome 1967.
- R.L. Sample. 'The Christology of the Council of Antioch (268 C.E.) reconsidered.' *ChH* 48 (1979), 18-26.
- C.J. Sansbury. 'Athanasius, Marcellus, and Eusebius of Caesarea: Some Thoughts on their Resemblances and Disagreements.' In *Arianism*, 281-285. R.C. Gregg, ed. Philadelphia 1985.
- J.M. Sansterre. 'Eusèbe de Césarée et la naissance de la théorie "césaropapiste".' *ByZ* 42 (1972), 131-195 and 532-594.
- S. Sbodorne. 'Caratteristiche strutturali di alcune vite di santi dei secoli III-IV.' *Koinonia* 2 (1978), 57-67.
- F. Scheidweiler. 'Zur neuen Ausgabe des Athanasius.' *ByZ* 47 (1954), 73-94.
- W. Schneemelcher. 'Athanasius von Alexandrien als Theologe und als Kirchenpolitiker.' *ZNW* 43 (1950-51), 242-256.
- _____. 'Zur Chronologie des arianischen Streites.' *ThLZ* 79 (1954), col. 393-400.
- _____. 'Die Epistula Encyclica des Athanasius.' In *Gesammelte Aufsätze*, 290-337. Thessalonica 1974.
- _____. 'Kirche und Staat im 4. Jahrhundert.' In *Die Kirche angesichts der konstantinischen Wende*, 220-235. G. Ruhbach. Darmstadt 1976.
- _____. 'Der Schriftgebrauch in den "Apologien" des Athanasius.' In *Text - Wort - Glaube*, 209-219. Arbeiten zur Kirchengeschichte series, 50. M. Brecht, ed. Berlin and New York 1980.
- J.B. Schoemann. 'Εὐκὼν in den Schriften des heiligen Athanasius.' *Scholastik* 16 (1941), 335-350.
- H.J. Schroeder. *Disciplinary Decrees of the General Councils*. London 1937.

- W. Schubart. 'Alexandria.' *RAC*, vol. 1. Cols. 271-283.
- E. Schwartz. 'Die Quellen über den melitianischen Streit.' *NGG* 1905, 164-187 (*GS III*, 87-116).
- _____. 'Die Dokumente des arianischen Streites bis 352.' *NGG* 1905, 257-299 (*GS III*, 117-168).
- _____. 'Das antiochenische Synodalschreiben von 325.' *NGG* 1908, 305-374 (*GS III*, 169-187).
- _____. 'Von Nicaea bis zu Konstantins Tod.' *NGG* 1911, 367-426 (*GS III*, 188-264).
- _____. 'Von Konstantins Tod bis Sardica 342.' *NGG* 1911, 469-522 (*GS III*, 265-334).
- _____. *Die Synode von Antiochien im Jahr 324/325. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des Konzils von Nicäa.* Berlin 1913.
- _____. *Der s.g. Sermo major de fide des Athanasius.* Munich 1925.
- _____. 'Zur Kirchengeschichte des 4. Jahrhunderts. *ZNW* 34 (1935), 129-213 (*GS IV*, 1-110).
- _____. *Zur Geschichte des Athanasius. (Gesammelte Schriften III.* W. Eltester and H.D. Altendorf, eds.) Berlin 1959.
- _____. *Zur Geschichte der alten Kirche und ihres Rechtes. (Gesammelte Schriften IV.* W. Eltester and H.D. Altendorf, eds.) Berlin 1960.
- _____. *Das Geschichtswerk des Thukydides.* Reprint ed. Hildesheim 1969. From the 3rd, unchanged edition of 1929.
- E. Seeberg. *Die Synode von Antiochien in Jahre 324-25.* Berlin 1913.
- O. Seeck. 'Untersuchungen zur Geschichte des Nicänischen Konzils.' *ZKG* 17 (1896), 1-71 and 319-362.
- _____. *Geschichte des Untergangs der antiken Welt.* Stuttgart 1920-1923.
- _____. *Regesten der Kaiser und Päpste für die Jahre 311 bis 476 n. Chr. Vorarbeit zu einer Prosopographie der christlichen Kaiserzeit.* Stuttgart 1919. Reprint ed. Frankfurt 1964.
- R. Seiler. 'Athanasius' *Apologia contra Arianos.* Ihre Entstehung und Datierung.' Ph.D. dissertation, University of Tübingen. Düsseldorf 1932.
- R.V. Sellers. *Eustathius of Antioch and His Place in the Early History of Christian Doctrine.* Cambridge 1928.

- V. Sesan. *Kirche und Staat im römisch-byzantinischen Reiche seit Konstantin dem Grossen und bis zum Falle Konstantinopels*. Bd. 1: Die Religionspolitik der christlichen römischen Kaiser von Konstantin der Grossen bis Theodosius dem Grossen (313-380) Leipzig 1973.
- W. Seston. 'Constantine as Bishop.' *JRS* 37 (1947), 127-131.
- K.M. Setton. *Christian Attitude towards the Emperor in the Fourth Century*. New York 1941. Reprint ed. New York 1967.
- H.J. Sieben. 'Zur Entwicklung der Konzilsidee: Werden und Eigenart der Konzilsidee des Athanasius von Alexandrien.' *TP* 45 (1970), 353-389.
- _____. 'Athanasius über den Psalter. Analyse seines Briefes an Marcellinus.' *TP* 48 (1973), 157-173.
- _____. 'Herméneutique de l'exégèse dogmatique d'Athanase.' In *Politique et Théologie*, 195-214. C. Kannengiesser, ed. Paris 1974.
- M. Simonetti. 'Nota sull'ariano Candido.' *Orpheus* 10 (1963), 151-157.
- _____. *Studi sull'arianesimo*. Rome 1965.
- _____. 'Le origini dell'Arianesimo.' *RSLR* 7 (1971), 317-330.
- _____. 'Teologia alessandrina e teologia asiatica al concilio di Nicaea.' *Augustinianum* 13 (1973), 369-398.
- _____. *La crisi ariana nel IV secolo*. Studia Ephemeridis 'Augustinianum' 11. Rome 1975.
- _____. Review of Gregg and Groh (1981). *RSLR* 18 (1983), 304-306.
- C.G. Singer. 'Athanasius.' *Journal of Christian Reconstruction* 2 (1975), 163-178.
- K.E. Skurat. 'Die Heilsbedeutung der Menschwerdung Christi nach der Lehre des hl. Athanasius.' *Stimme der Orthodoxie* 8 (1975), 46-50, 9 (1975), 53-57.
- M. Slusser. 'Athanasius, Contra Gentes and De Incarnatione: Place and Date of Composition.' *JThS* 37 (1986), 114-117.
- J.D. Smith. *The Death of Classical Paganism*. New York 1976.
- R.W. Smith. *The Art of Rhetoric in Alexandria*. The Hague 1974.
- D. Staniloae. 'Die Erlösungslehre des hl. Athanasius des Grossen.' *Kyrios* 14 (1974), 25-42.

- D. Staniloae. 'La doctrine de saint Athanase sur le salut.' In *Politique et Théologie*, 277-293. C. Kannengiesser, ed. Paris 1974.
- A.P. Stanley. *Lectures on the History of the Eastern Church*. London 1861.
- G.C. Stead. 'The Significance of the Homoousios.' *StP* 3 (1961), 397-412.
- _____. 'The Platonism of Arius.' *JThS* NS 15 (1964), 16-31.
- _____. 'Eusebius and the Council of Nicaea.' *JThS* NS 24 (1973), 85-100.
- _____. '"Homoousios" dans la pensée de Saint Athanase.' In *Politique et Théologie*, 231-253. C. Kannengiesser, ed. Paris 1974.
- _____. 'The Concept of Divine Substance.' *VC* 29 (1975), 1-14.
- _____. 'Rhetorical Method in Athanasius.' *VC* 30 (1976), 121-137.
- _____. *Divine Substance*. Oxford 1977.
- _____. 'The *Thalia* of Arius and the Testimony of Athanasius.' *JThS* NS 29 (1978), 20-52.
- _____. 'Athanasius' *De Incarnatione*: An Edition Reviewed.' *JThS* NS 31 (1980), 378-390.
- _____. 'The Scriptures and the soul of Christ in Athanasius.' *VC* 36 (1982), 233-250.
- _____. 'Atanasio'. In *Dizionario patristico e di antichità cristiane* 1. A. Di Berardino, ed. 1983.
- _____. 'The Freedom of the Will and the Arian Controversy.' In *Platonismus und Christentum. Festschrift für Heinrich Dörrie*. H.D. Blume and F. Mann, eds. *Jahrbuch für Antike und Christentum*, Ergänzungsband 10 (1983), 245-257.
- _____. *Substance and Illusion in the Christian Fathers*. London 1985
- J.N. Steenson. 'Basil of Ancyra and the Course of Nicene Orthodoxy.' D.Phil. dissertation, Oxford University, 1983.
- A. Stegmann. 'Zur Datierung der drei Reden des heiligen Athanasius gegen die Arianer.' *ThQ* 96 (1914), 227-231.
- B. Steidle. '*Homo Dei Antonius*. Zum Bild des Mannes Gottes im alten Mönchtum.' *SA* 38 (1956), 148-200.

- J. Stevenson. *Studies in Eusebius*. Cambridge and New York 1929.
- P. Stiegele. *Der Agennesiebegriff in der griechischen Theologie des vierten Jahrhunderts*. Freiburg 1913.
- R.H. Storch. 'The "Eusebian Constantine".' *ChH* 40 (1971), 145-155.
- C. Strange. 'Athanasius on Divinization.' *StP* 16 (1985), 342-346.
- H. Sträter. *Die Erlösungslehre des hl. Athanasius*. Freiburg 1894.
- J.A. Straub. 'Kaiser Konstantin als ἐπίσκοπος τῶν ἐκτός.' *StP* 1 (1957), 678-695.
- _____. 'Constantine as ΚΟΙΝΟΣ ΕΠΙΣΚΟΠΟΣ: Tradition and Innovation in the First Christian Emperor's Majesty.' *DOP* 21 (1967), 39-55.
- P.M. Strohm. 'Die Trinitätslehre des hl. Athanasius und ihr Missverstehen im Abendland.' *Kyrios* 14 (1974), 43-60.
- A. Stuelken. *Athanasiana. Literatur und dogmengeschichtliche Untersuchungen*. (TU 19,4) Leipzig 1899.
- W.R. Telfer. 'Arius Takes Refuge in Nicomedia.' *JThS* 37 (1936), 60-63.
- _____. 'The Codex Verona LX(58)'. *HThR* 36 (1943), 169-246.
- _____. Review of 'The Study of St. Athanasius', inaugural lecture F.L. Cross. *JThS* 47 (1946), 88-90.
- _____. 'When did the Arian Controversy Begin?' *JThS* 47 (1946), 129-142.
- _____. 'St. Peter of Alexandria and Arius.' *AnalBoll* 67 (1949), 117-130.
- _____. 'Sozomen I.15. A Reply.' *JThS* 50 (1949), 187-191.
- _____. 'Episcopal Succession in Egypt.' *JEH* 3 (1952), 1-13.
- _____. 'Meletius of Lycopolis and Episcopal Succession in Egypt.' *HThR* 48 (1955), 227-237.
- _____. 'The Author's Purpose in the Vita Constantini.' *StP* 1 (1957), 157-167.
- _____. *The Office of a Bishop*. London 1962.
- M. Tetz. 'Eine arianische Homilie unter dem Namen des Athanasius von Alexandrien.' *ZKG* 64 (1952/53), 299-307.
- _____. 'Athanasiana.' *VC* 9 (1955), 159-175.

- M. Tetz. 'Zur Edition der dogmatischen Schriften des Athanasius von Alexandrien. Ein kritischer Beitrag.' *ZKG* 67 (1955/56), 1-28.
- _____. 'Markellianer und Athanasios von Alexandrien. Die markellianische *Expositio fidei ad Athanasium* des Diakons Eugenios von Ankyra.' *ZNW* 64 (1973), 75-121.
- _____. 'Ueber nikaische Orthodoxie. Der sog. Tomus ad Antiochenos des Athanasios von Alexandrien.' *ZNW* 66 (1975), 194-222.
- _____. *Theologische Realenzyklopädie*, 1977, Bd. 2. S.v. 'Athanasius von Alexandrien'.
- _____. 'Zur Biographie des Athanasius von Alexandrien.' *ZKG* 90 (1979), 304-338.
- _____. 'Athanasius und die Vita Antonii: Literarische und theologische Relationen.' *ZNW* 73 (1982), 1-30.
- _____. 'Athanasius und die Einheit der Kirche: Zur Oekumenischen Bedeutung eines Kirchenvaters.' *Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche*. Bd. 81 (1984). Heft 2, 196-219.
- E. Theodorou. 'Die Diakonie der Kirche nach dem hl. Athanasius.' *Kyrios* 14 (1974), 85-96.
- R.W. Thomson. 'A Syriac Corpus of Athanasiana.' *StP* 3 (1961), 142-145.
- _____. 'The Text of the Syriac Athanasian Corpus.' In *Biblical and Patristic Studies for R.P. Casey*, 250-264. J.N. Birdsall and R.W. Thomson, eds. Freiburg 1963.
- _____. 'Some Remarks on the Syriac Version of Athanasius' *De Incarnatione*.' *Le Muséon* 77 (1964), 17-28.
- _____. 'The transformation of Athanasius in Armenian theology. A tendentious version of the Epistula and Epictetum.' *Le Muséon* 78 (1965), 747-769.
- L.S. Tillemont. *Mémoires pour servir à l'histoire ecclésiastique des six premiers siècles*. 16 vols. Tome 8: *Histoire de S. Athanase*. Paris 1693-1712.
- K.J. Torjesen. 'The Teaching Function of the Logos: Athanasius, De Incarnatione XX-XXXii.' In *Arianism*, 213-221. R.C. Gregg, ed. Philadelphia 1985.
- T.F. Torrance. 'Spiritus Creator: A Consideration of the Teaching of St. Athanasius and St. Basil.' In his *Theology in Reconstruction*, 209-228. London 1965.

- T.F. Torrance. 'The Hermeneutics of Saint Athanasius.' *Ecclesiastikos Pharo Alexandreias* 52 (1970), 446-468.
- _____. 'Athanasius. A Study in the Foundations of Classical Theology.' In his *Theology in Reconciliation*, 215-266. London and Grand Rapids, Mich. 1975.
- _____, ed. *The Incarnation. Ecumenical Studies in the Nicene-Constantinopolitan Creed A.D. 381*. Edinburgh 1981.
- R. Trevijano. 'The Early Christian Church of Alexandria.' *StP* 12 (1975), 471-477.
- C.N. Tsirpanlis. 'Aspects of Athanasian Soteriology.' *KAHPONOMIA* 8 (1976), 61-76.
- A. Tuilier. 'Le sens du terme ὁμοούσιος dans le vocabulaire théologique d'Arius et de l'Ecole d'Antioche.' *StP* 3 (1961), 421-430.
- _____. 'Le sens de l'adjectif oecumenique dans la tradition apostolique et dans la tradition byzantine.' *Nouvelle Revue théologique* 86 (1964), 260-271.
- _____. 'Les évangélistes et les docteurs de la primitive église et les origines de l'Ecole (didaskaleion) d'Alexandrie.' *StP* 17 Part 2 (1982), 738-749.
- J. Tulloch. 'Athanasius.' *Encyclopedia Britannica*, 9th ed. (London, 1889)
- C.H. Turner. 'Notes on the Apostolic Constitutions.' *JThS* 16 (1914/1915), 54-61.
- H.E.W. Turner. *The Pattern of Christian Truth*. London 1954.
- V. Twomey. *Apostolikos Thronos: The Primacy of Rome as reflected in the Church History of Eusebius and the historico-apologetic writings of St. Athanasius the Great*. Münster 1982.
- W. Ullmann. 'The Constitutional Significance of Constantine the Great's Settlement.' *JEH* 27 (1976), 1-16.
- D. Unger. 'A Special Aspect of Athanasian Soteriology.' *Franciscan Studies* 6 (1946), 30-53 and 171-194.
- I.O. de Urbina. *El Simbolo Niceno*. Madrid 1947.
- _____. 'L'anima umana di Cristo secondo S. Atanasio.' *OrChP* 20 (1954), 27-43.
- _____. *Nicée et Constantinople. Histoire des Conciles Oecumeniques*, vol. 1. Paris 1963.

- J. Van Haelst. 'Les sources papyrologiques concernant l'Eglise en Egypte à l'époque de Constantin.' In *Proceedings of the Twelfth International Congress of Papyrology*, 499, nos. 29-35. Toronto 1970.
- J.C.M. van Winden. 'On the date of Athanasius' Apologetical Treatises.' *VC* 29 (1975), 291-295.
- A.A. Vasiliev. *History of the Byzantine Empire 324-1453*. 2 vols. Reprint ed. Madison, Wisconsin 1958.
- G. Viaud. *La liturgie des Coptes d'Egypte*. Paris 1978.
- L. Voelkl. *Der Kaiser Konstantin. Annalen einer Zeitwende, 306-337*. Munich 1957.
- H.J. Vogt. 'Parties in the History of the Church: Athanasius and his Contemporaries.' Trans. F. McDonagh. *Concilium* (1973-1979), Pt. 1, 37-49.
- G. Voisin. 'La Doctrine christologique de saint Athanase.' *RHE* 1 (1900), 226-248.
- A. Vööbus. *A History of Asceticism in the Syrian Orient*. 2 vols. Louvain 1960.
- _____. 'Entdeckung einer unbekanntenen Biographie des Athanasios von Alexandrien.' *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 71 (1978), 36-40.
- W. de Vries. 'Die Struktur der Kirche gemäß dem ersten Konzil von Nikaia und seiner Zeit.' In *Wegzeichen. Festgabe zum 60. Geburtstag von Prof. Dr. Hermenegild M. Biedermann OSA*. Hrsg. v. E. Chr. Suttner, u. C. Patock, eds. *Das östliche Christentum*, N.F., Heft 25, 55-81. n.d.
- _____. 'Die Ostkirche und die Cathedra Petri im IV. Jahrhundert.' *OrChP* 40 (1974), 114-144.
- J.B. Walker. 'Convenance épistémologique de l'homocousion dans la théologie d'Athanase.' In *Politique et Théologie*, 255-275. C. Kannengiesser, ed. Paris 1974.
- D.S. Wallace-Hadrill. 'The Eusebian *Chronicle*: The Extent and Date of Composition of its Early Editions.' *JThS* NS 6 (1955), 248-253.
- _____. *Eusebius of Caesarea*. London 1960.
- F. Wallis. 'On Some Mss. of the Writings of St. Athanasius: Part I and Part II.' *JThS* 3 (1902), 97-111 and 245-258.
- C. Walters. *Monastic Archaeology in Egypt*. Warminster 1974.
- J.W.C. Wand. *Doctors and Councils*. London 1962.

- A. Weber. 'Αρχή ein Beitrag zur Christologie des Eusebius von Cäsarea. Rome 1964.
- E. Weigl. *Untersuchungen zur Christologie des hl. Athanasius*. Paderborn 1914.
- R. Weijenborg. 'Apollinaristic Interpolations in the *Tomus ad Antiochenus* of 362.' *StP* 3 (1961), 324-330.
- M.L. West. 'The Metre of Arius' *Thalia*.' *JThS* NS 33 (1982), 98-105.
- J. Wicks. Introduction to his English translation of *Communio, Church and Papacy in Early Christianity* by L. Hertling. Chicago 1972.
- M.F. Wiles. 'In Defence of Arius.' *JThS* NS 13 (1962), 339-347.
Republished in *Working Papers on Doctrine*, 28-37. London 1976.
- _____. *The Making of Christian Doctrine*. Cambridge 1967.
- M.F. Wiles, in collaboration with R.C. Gregg. 'Asterius: A New Chapter in the History of Arianism?' In *Arianism*, 153-179.
R.C. Gregg, ed. Philadelphia 1985.
- R.L. Wilken. 'Tradition, Exegesis, and the Christological Controversy.' *ChH* 34 (1965), 123-142.
- G.H. Williams. 'Christology and Church-State Relations in the Fourth Century.' *ChH* 20 (1951), No.3:3-33 and No.4:3-26.
- R.D. Williams. 'The Logic of Arianism.' *JThS* NS 34 (1983), 56-81.
- _____. 'The Quest of the Historical *Thalia*.' In *Arianism*, 1-35.
R.C. Gregg, ed. Philadelphia 1985.
- _____. 'Arius and the Melitian Schism.' *JThS* NS 37 (1986), 35-52.
- _____. *Arius. Heresy & Tradition*. London 1987.
- F. Winkelmann. 'Der trinitarische Streit in zeitgenössischer Sicht.' *Das Altertum* 13 (1967), 99-107.
- H. Winter. 'Recourse to Rome: Batiffol's Argument.' *Revue de l'Université d'Ottawa* 37 (1967), 477-509.
- J.G. Winter. *Life and Letters in Papyri*. Ann Arbor, Michigan 1933.
- M. Wojtowytsch. *Papsttum und Konzile von den Anfängen bis zu Leo I (440-461)*. Stuttgart, n.d.
- C.U. Wolf. 'Eusebius of Caesarea and the Onomasticon.' *The Biblical Archaeologist* 27 (1964), 66-96.

- H.A. Wolfson. 'Philosophical Implications of Arianism and Apollinarianism.' *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 12 (1958), 5-28.
- _____. *The Philosophy of the Church Fathers*. Vol. 1: *Faith, Trinity, Incarnation*. 2nd ed. Cambridge, Mass. 1964.
- R. Yanney. 'The Church Behind Saint Athanasius the Great.' *Coptic Church Review* 9, no. 2 (1988), 35-44.
- F.M. Young. 'A Reconsideration of Alexandrian Christology.' *JEH* 22 (1971), 103-114.
- _____. *The Use of Sacrificial Ideas in Greek Christian Writers from the New Testament to John Chrysostom*. Patristic Monograph Series, no.5. Philadelphia 1979.
- _____. *From Nicaea to Chalcedon*. London 1983.
- T. Zahn. *Forschungen zur Geschichte des neutestamentlichen Kanons und der altkirchlichen Literatur*. III.Theil: *Supplementum Clementinum*. Erlangen 1884.
- G. Zaphiris. 'Connaissance naturelle de Dieu d'après Athanase d'Alexandrie.' *Kleronomia* 6 (1974), 61-96.
- _____. 'Reciprocal Trinitarian Revelation and Man's Knowledge of God According to St. Athanasius.' In *ΤΟΜΟΣ ΕΟΡΤΙΟΣ*, 287-373. G. Mantzarides, ed. Thessalonika 1974.
- _____. 'Der Logos Gottes als Quelle des Lebens nach Athanasios dem Grossen.' In *Philoxenia*. A. Kallis, ed. Münster 1980.

ADDENDUM TO BIBLIOGRAPHY

- R.P.C. Hanson. *The Search for the Christian Doctrine of God*. Edinburgh, 1988
- C. Kannengiesser. 'St. Athanasius of Alexandria Rediscovered: His Political and Pastoral Achievement'. *Coptic Church Review* Vol. 9, No. 3 (Fall 1988), pp. 68 - 74
- _____. 'Athanasius of Alexandria. A Paradigm for the Church of Today'. *Pacifica* Vol. 1 (1988), pp. 85 - 99
- A. Louth. 'St. Athanasius and the Greek *Life of Antony*'. *JTS NS* Vol. 39, 2, (October 1988), pp. 504 - 509
- G.C. Stead. 'Athanasius' Earliest Written Work'. *JTS NS* Vol. 39, 1, (April 1988), pp. 76 - 91
- _____. Review 'St. Athanasius *contra Apollinarem* by George Dion. Dragas'. *JTS NS* Vol. 39, 1, (April 1988), pp. 250 - 253
- J. Wells. 'The Argument to Design in Athanasius and Maximus'. *The Patristic and Byzantine Review* Vol. 8, No. 1 (1989), pp. 45 - 54

