## *A commentary on the so-called Opus historicum of Hilary and Poitiers*

Fleming, John

# A COMMENTARY ON THE SO-CALLED "OPUS HISTORICUM" OF HILARY OF POITIERS.

Presented for the Ph. D. Degree

by

Rev. John Fleming, M.A.,B.D.

SEPTEMBER, 1951.

Contents:

Abstract of Thesis.

The thesis consists of a commentary on the so-called "Opus historicum" of Hilary of Poitiers, together with relevant introductory sections, appendices and conclusion.

This work of Hilary has been recovered only within comparatively recent times, and, in its present mutilated form, contains 17 documents covering the period from the synod of Sardica to the death of the bishop of Poitiers. It represents the first attempt by a Western historian to combat the Arian heresy not only by the spoken word but also by written testimony and authentic documents of the period.

The thesis opens with an Introduction dealing with the historical background and authenticity of the work, the motives and method of its author, and its editors. This is followed by a section on Hilary and the Arian Controversy where short sketches are given of the early history of the Church in Gaul, the life of Hilary, and the course of Arianism to c.367. Then comes the actual Commentary in which every document is treated as a separate unit and provided in most cases with an introduction and conclusion.

Two appendices have been attached, one on the so-called Ad Const. I, which is now recognised to be a constituent part of B II, and the other on the warmly debated Liberius letters. Finally, there is the Conclusion which contains the various theories propounded on the original form of the collection and in which a verdict is passed on Hilary as a historian.

So far as is known, this is the first commentary on the work in English and it is presented in the hope that it may dispel much of the uncertainty, which surrounds the work, by assembling from many sources the material necessary to its understanding and use and by resolving many difficult problems of detail; and so may gain for it proper acknowledgment as the primary source for the history of Arianism in the West.

## Brief Chronological Table.

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 325 | (early) Summer | Synod of Antioch<br>Council of Nicaea. |
| 326/7 | | Council of Antioch against Eustathius. |
| 334 | | Council at Palestinian Caesarea. |
| 335 | April<br>July<br>Aug-Sept.<br>Sept.<br>Oct -Nov. | Death of Arius.<br>Council at Tyre.<br>Mareotic Commission in Egypt.<br>Council at Jerusalem<br>Athanasius receives formal audience at Constantinople. |
| 336 | Feb. | Council at Constantinople. Athanasius exiled to Treves. |
| 337 | May 22<br>Sept. 9<br>Nov. 23 | Death of Constantine<br>His three sons proclaimed Augusti.<br>Return of Athanasius to Alexandria. |
| 338 | Summer | Meeting of three Emperors at Viminacium to apportion the Empire. |
| 339 | Jan. | Council at Antioch appoints Gregory bishop of Alexandria. |
| 341 | Spring<br>Summer | Synod of Rome<br>Synod of the Dedication at Antioch. |
| 342 | Sept. | Synod of Sardica. Letters of this synod A IV, B II, 1, B II, 2 and Or. Syn. Sard. |
| 343/4 | | Macrostich Antioch. |
| 344/5 | | Council at Milan re-Photinus. |
| 346 | Oct. 21 | Return of Athanasius to Alexandria. |
| 346/7 | | Council at Milan re-Photinus, Valens and Ursacius. Valens' and Ursacius' letters to Julius and Ath. ( B II, 6, 8) |
| 350 | Jan. 18 | Rising of Magnentius. Death of Constans. |
| 351 | Sept. 28<br>Winter | Battle of Mursa.<br>Council at Sirmium re-Photinus. |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 353 | Aug. 13 | Death of Magnentius. |
| | Winter | Council of Arles. Paulinus of Trèves exiled. Fall of Vincent of Capua. |
| 353/4 | | Letters of Liberius to Caecilianus ( B VII, 4), to Ossius (B VII, 6) and to Constantius (A VII). |
| 355 | | Council at Milan. Exile of Lucifer, Eusebius and Dionysius. Liberius' letter to the exiles (B VII, 2). Exile of Ossius and Liberius. |
| 356 | Spring | Council at Biterrae. Sentence of exile passed on Hilary. Composition of B I and publication of his work. |
| 357 | | Fall of Liberius. Composition of B III, B VII, 8, 10, 11. |
| | Summer | Sirmian manifesto issued. |
| 358 | Lent | Council at Ancyra. |
| | August | Return of Liberius to Rome. |
| 359 | May 22 | Conference at Sirmium. Dated Creed. |
| | May-Dec. | Councils at Ariminum, Nikê and Seleucia. |
| | Dec. 31 | Acceptance of Creed of Nikê. Composition of A V, A VI, A VIII, A IX, and B VIII, 1 also in this period. |
| 360 | Jan. | Council at Constantinople. Homoean victory. |
| | Spring | Revolt of Julian. |
| | Autumn | Synod of Paris. Letter of same (A I). |
| c.360 | | Letter of Eusebius to Gregory (A II). |
| 361 | Nov. 3 | Death of Constantius. Accession of Julian. |
| 362 | Summer | Council of Alexandria. |
| c.362 | | Letter of Liberius to Italian bishops (B IV, 1). |
| 363 | June 26 | Death of Julian. Election of Jovian. Letter of Italian bishops to Illyricans (B IV, 2). |
| 364 | Feb. 16 | Death of Jovian. Valentinian and Valens Emperors. |
| | Autumn | Council of Lampsacus. Controversy of Hilary with Auxentius at Milan. |
| 366 | Feb. | Final restoration of Athanasius. |
| 366/7 | | The Germinius affair B V, B VI, and AIII. |
| 367 | (early) | Death of Hilary. |

## INTRODUCTION

According to Jerome[1], Hilary of Poitiers was the author of a "Liber adversum Valentem et Ursacium historiam Ariminensis et Seleuciensis synodi continens". As full authority can not always be given to the remarks which he makes on the titles of books in his catalogue and as this particular one savours of a cursory acquaintance rather than of any detailed knowledge, it is quite probable that Jerome himself, and not Hilary, has thus designated it.

Rufinus[2], too, mentions a book written by Hilary for the instruction of those who had subscribed the perfidy of Ariminum. This book, he continues, had fallen into the hands of Hilary's enemies and been corrupted by them without Hilary's knowledge; then, on the basis of these corruptions Hilary had been accused in council and excommunicated. Jerome[3] doubts the authenticity of Rufinus' assertions concerning this excommunication, and asks him to give the council at which the incident occurred, to name the bishops who were present, also the consuls and Emperor at the time of the council. Modern writers, such as Chapman[4], have attempted, not very successfully it must be confessed, to perform this task for Rufinus. But his account sounds very improbable and in this case at least Jerome seems to be the more trustworthy. It is true that/

Notes.
1. De Vir. Ill. 100.
2. De adulteratione librorum Origenis (epist. ad Macarium) P.G.XVII.
3. Apologia adv. lib. Ruf. II, 19.
4. in Rev. Ben. 1910 p.332sq.

that literary forgeries were not rare[5], but there seems to have been neither the time nor the opportunity before Hilary's death to transform and disfigure his book so that he could hardly recognise it and could not prove its falsity. To no council, where Hilary was present, can we attach such an attempt. The councils of Constantinople and Paris must be ruled out as being too early for any interpolations to have been made. The synod of Milan, where Hilary opposed Auxentius, must also be excluded because the sole aim of any Arian interpolations in his work would be to make him support, instead of denounce, the proceedings at Ariminum, and this being so, Auxentius could scarcely have accused him of heresy! Again, if the interpolations had been made in a Luciferian interest, as Chapman suggests, it is difficult to see how Auxentius could have made use of them for, by consenting to the Luciferian attitude, he would thus have betrayed the tactics and part played by his own party at Ariminum.

However this may be, the important point is that both Jerome and Rufinus give evidence for a book of Hilary on the Arian controversy.

Now it was for long asserted that this work of Hilary had been lost. But in the fifteenth century, P. Pithoeus discovered a collection of fourth century documents in the library of a friend at Paris. This collection was divided into two parts, the first of which bore no title, but the second attributed the book to Hilary of Poitiers thus: "Incipit liber secundus Hilarii Pictavensis provinciae/

Notes.

5. cf. Ath. Apol. ad Const. 6,11. Also B II, 1.

provinciae Aquitaniae, in quo sunt omnia, quae ostendunt vel quomodo, quibusnam causis, quibus instantibus sub imperatore Constantio factum est Ariminense concilium contra formellam Nicheni tractatus, qua universae haereses comprehensae erant"; and at the end of the last document of this second part were the words: "Explicit sancti Hilarii Liber ex opere historico".

Since the Gallic MS. in which the work was preserved, was not a very old one and of poor quality, Pithoeus delayed publishing an edition in the hope of recovering the old MS. from which his had recently been copied. Unfortunately he died with this wish unfulfilled, and N. Faber (Le Fèvre) then undertook the completion of his task and duly published an edition at Paris in 1598.

To Faber it seemed perfectly obvious that this was an authentic work of Hilary because the superscription and text agreed with Jerome's statement on Hilary's book and the style was similar to that of the genuine works of the bishop of Poitiers. He came to the conclusion that all the fragments, with the exception of B III ("Studens"), are what remain of that work of Hilary referred to by Jerome.

His optimism, however, was not shared by later commentators. While the authenticity of the Preface to the work (B I) is accepted by all, there has been great diversity of opinion with regard to the rest of the documents in the collection. A great deal of this suspicion, it must be admitted, has arisen because of the doubts cast upon the Liberius letters[6]. Stilting[7], for instance, who

Notes.
6. cf. section on these.
7. acta SS. Sept. VI p. 574sq.

has shown himself most eager to defend Liberius, admits the preface (B I), with some reservation, to be genuine, but wholly rejects all the other documents, mainly on grounds of style. Few supporters of Liberius have gone thus far, and indeed it is evident that Stilting has allowed his bias to corrupt his critical judgment in forming so low an estimation of the compiler, in refusing to acknowledge that, because of the detailed knowledge of the events since the synod of Arles revealed in the collection, the compiler must stand close in time to these events, in refusing to recognise the importance of the documents in the collection, and to admit that they fit well into the otherwise attested history of the period and have many parallels in other contemporary writings.

Baronius[8] accepted most of the fragments as genuine but doubted their compilation by Hilary. This opinion was shared by Tillemont[9]. Coustant[10] gave the matter greater attention. He noted that the encyclical of the synod of Sardica (B II) and the letter of Constantius to the synod of Ariminum (A VIII) were much more extensive in the Greek than in the Latin of the collection; that the creed of the synod of Eastern Sardica (A IV) was given in a different form by Hilary in his "De Synodis"; that in the MSS only the second group was attributed to Hilary while the other was anonymous; the anathemas against Liberius in B VII also caused him difficulty. On the other hand he admitted that the whole collection/

Notes.
8. t.V ad ann. 360 n.3.
9. t.VII Mem. p.454-5.
10. P.L. X col. 619sq.

tion still corresponded in content to the work mentioned by Jerome. He had no hesitation in ascribing the second group to Hilary not only because of the superscription and concluding remarks but also because of the contents and style of the Preface.[11]
Then, though a little doubtful, he decided that the first group also should be attributed to Hilary because (1) the codex Remensis, which is very old, already contained the two parts of the compilation; (2) most of the fragments in this group are connected with the history of the council of Ariminum mentioned in the superscription of the second part; (3) the two parts are interconnected e.g. A I is the answer to B VIII and B IV forms the transition to A VII; (4) there is a similar style in both sections.

Having come to this decision, he coalesced the two groups into one collection and arranged the documents in chronological order.

The textual deviations he explained as the result of faulty copies or change of residence. On the anathemas, he gave no decisive conclusion: "they can, as some think, be written by a later/

Notes.

11. From the Preface it appears that the author is a Gallican bishop who is writing shortly after the council of Arles 353 in defence of the Nicene creed and Athanasius and who has himself suffered humiliation at the hands of the Arians at the council of Biterrae (or Beziers). When we remember that Paulinus of Trèves had already been exiled at Arles (B I § 6), the choice can fall only on one man, Hilary of Poitiers. After the exile of Paulinus, he alone of the Gallic bishops had shown himself capable of leadership, had remained steadfast in face of Arian and imperial opposition, and had finally to suffer exile for his staunch defence of Athanasius at the council of Biterrae 356. cf. c. Const. 2 De Syn. 2.

later hand first of all in the margin and then inserted into the text ; or else they could be from Hilary himself, inserted in anger when he heard of Liberius' fall". He was no more definite on the problem of the disfiguration of the work, suggesting that it may have arisen as Rufinus relates[12] or purely by accident.

B III ("Studens") he regarded as a forgery of a contemporary Arian which Hilary recognised as such and inserted for this very reason in his work. The other Liberian letters he accepted as genuine. His final conclusion was that the fragments have all belonged to a now lost work of Hilary.

In more recent times Loofs[13], Gummerus[14] and Feder[15] have decided anew for the Hilarian origin of the whole collection, including the anathemas, and for the authenticity of the individual parts, in particular the Liberian letters.

The real difficulty in this question of authenticity has centred on the seeming inconsistencies in B III ("Studens"), but if Duchesne's interpretation of this letter is accepted[16], there remains no reason why all the documents in the collection should not be regarded as authentic material gathered by Hilary with a view to publication in the interests of the Nicene cause.

There is no doubt that not all the material collected by Hilary has been preserved. In the collection itself are various references/

Notes.
12. cf. loc. cit. in n.2.
13. Real.VIII.
14. Die Homousianische Partei p.93 n.2.
15. Stud. I.
16. cf. the section on the Liberius Letters.

references to documents no longer available: e.g. (1) a document dealing with the council of Arles, mentioned in B I, and following that, the account of the deposition and exile of Paulinus of Trève with which the whole work should begin; (2) the part dealing with Paul of Constantinople in A IV; (3) a short piece on the Nicene council in A V, 1; (4) the part concerning the Sirmian creed and the beginning of its refutation, and also Hilary's text indicating the disposition of the narrative text before the first letter of the synod of Sardica in B II; (5) the creed proposed at Niké in Thrace which should follow the letter of the synod of Ariminum to Constantius (A V).

Several theories have been expounded to explain these gaps. Saltet[17] contends that the work of Hilary has been revised in a Luciferian interest and, like Wilmart, places this revision and interpolation at the end of the fourth century. Schiktanz[18], on the other hand, suggests that the shortening took place in an Arian interest in the fifth or sixth century. Feder's opinion[19] is that some anonymous person who perhaps aimed at giving a new presentatio of the Arian troubles, made excerpts for himself from the "Opus Historicum" of Hilary and provided them with many marginal notes. The collector had found the excerpts without order, had copied them as two parts and transmitted them thus to posterity. Like Coustan he thinks that Jerome and Rufinus possessed the complete work of Hilary/

Notes.
17. in Bull. Litt. Eccles. 1905, 1907.
18. Die Hilarius Fragmente § 26.
19. Stud. I.

Hilary but that Sulpicius Severus, who used the fragments in his Chronicle, probably possessed only the collection of excerpts. As several of the fragments are contained in some canon law collections which can be traced back to the fifth century, Feder concludes that the origin of the collection should be placed about the end of the fourth century.

It will be seen that none of these theories carries very great weight. There is no evidence to support the claim of Luciferian or Arian interpolations, and a more natural explanation would seem to be that the gaps have occurred in the course of transmission. Moreover, if it is necessary to suppose an intentional shortening of the work - which is indeed very doubtful - what person would have been more likely to have done this than Hilary himself? Feder admits that this must have taken place very early, probably before the fifth century, but can only suppose an anonymous collector to have done this. If the abridgement did not occur accidentally, it seems more probable that Hilary himself had deliberately omitted some of the material for purposes of his own (for example, because the amount of material collected tended to overshadow his original plan).

No matter how these gaps may have occurred, it is unfortunate that, because of them, the original dimensions of Hilary's material can never now be known.

For the motives which induced Hilary to begin his collection, we must rely on the Preface (B I). This document indicates that, primarily, it was a peculiar insight of Hilary which led him to undertake his work, namely, his strong conviction that what was at stake in the early fifties of the fourth century was not simply the person of Athanasius, however much it may have appeared so on the surface of the controversy, but something much more important, the Nicene creed itself. That his Western brethren were blind to this fact had been amply shown at the council of Arles, where the orthodox had agreed to condemn Athanasius if their adversaries in their turn would anathematise Arianism. Hilary apparently was one of the few bishops in the West at this time who realised that the condemnation of Athanasius really involved a condemnation of the Nicene creed, and that the Nicene creed was implicated behind the person of Athanasius. His book was therefore intended to propagate this insight and so arouse opposition to the Arian deceit among his brother bishops.

Another factor in the compilation was the summary treatment meted out to him at the council of Biterrae. He had gone to that council in the hope of putting forward his case and convincing its members by an exposition of the true facts of the situation. His opponents, however, had thwarted his plan and prevented him from addressing the council and securing an audience with the Emperor. So he determined to reveal in writing "the faithlessness of the Arians, their false creeds and their deceitful works with respect to/

to Athanasius".[20]

This was a favourite method of Hilary. When outmanoeuvred in person by his opponents, he would resort to his well-tried weapon, the pen. He adopted this procedure after the council of Biterrae, again at Constantinople in 360 after his failure to secure an audience with Constantius (i.e. his c. Const.) and finally, after the failure of his mission against Auxentius at Milan (i.e. his c. Aux.) From his apparent defeats have issued abiding testimonies to his position, his beliefs and his actions.

To both these motives, must be added his passionate desire to defend the orthodox faith from all the assaults of its enemies.

The material in the Collection can be roughly classified in three groups (1) those documents dealing with events up to 356 viz. A IV, A VII, B I, B II and the Or. Syn. Sard. (the so-called Ad Const.I); (2) those concerned with the period between 356 and 360 viz. A II, A V, A VI, A VIII, A IX, B VIII, B III, B VII; and (3) those belonging to the period after 360 viz. A I, A III, B IV, B V, B VI.

Only in the first group is there any evidence of a methodical arrangement of the material. From B II we gain an outline of the plan adopted by Hilary in the book which he published in 356[21]. His/

Notes.

20. Probably much of the material which he used in his book of 356 had been already collected and arranged in preparation for the defence which he had intended to make at Biterrae. He was therefore in a good position to produce his book before departing for exile.
21. cf."Conclusion" on this book.

His first aim[22] was to prove the innocence of Athanasius, and for this, he relied mainly on the decisions of Western Sardica. Secondly, he intended to expose the deceits of the Arians and their various changes of mind as exemplified in the conduct of Valens and Ursacius. Thirdly[23], he proposed to reveal the heresy of the Arian creeds (e.g. that of Eastern Sardica) by contrast with the pure faith of the Nicene creed. Thus he hoped to dispel Arian power in the West and gain victory for the orthodox cause.

In no other document, however, is any indication given of a similar arrangement with regard to the later material, and because of the disordered state and confusion in which the fragments have reached us and the gaps in the material, it is now impossible to detect any method or purpose embracing the Collection as a whole.

Nevertheless, even in its present mutilated form, the Collection is a work of primary importance. It covers the period from the synod of Sardica to the death of Hilary and represents the first attempt made by a Western historian to give an interpretation of the Arian controversy as it affected the West in his time. Through these documents, a bishop of the Gallican Church endeavoured to pass a contemporary judgment on the relations between Western orthodox bishops and the Arians and to rouse his brethren to a remediation of the Arian heresy.

Notes.
22. cf. B II, 5 p.142 L.8.
23. cf. B II, 9 p.147 L.23.

The reason for the comparative neglect of this Collection by modern scholars can be readily explained. They have found themselves unable to make full use of the information contained in the documents simply because of the many difficulties of language and subject matter and the obscure references with which the work abounds. Like every source book, it refers to many things which were common knowledge to the author and his contemporaries and treated as such, but whose importance and relevance have long been forgotten and which now present apparently insoluble problems to the reader.

It has been the purpose of the Commentary to try and resolve some of these problems so that this Collection may be given proper acknowledgment and take its rightful place among the primary sources for the history of the Arian controversy in the West.

It should be mentioned that no comments are passed on the biblical texts in the work because it has been decided that this was a separate and specialist problem.

It has been already stated that in the codex which Pithoeus discovered, the collection was divided into two parts, the first of which bore no title but the second ascribed the work to Hilary of Poitiers. Thinking that the two parts had become inverted, Faber, in his edition of 1598, changed the order so that the inscription covered the collection as a whole and the letter of the synod of Paris (A I), which lay at the beginning of the collection in/

in the codex, now followed the letter of the Easterns at Seleucia (B VIII) i.e. his order was B I-VIII, A I-IX. He entitled the work "Hilarii Pictavensis provinciae Aquitaniae episcopi ex opere historico Fragmenta numquam antea edita".

The editions of A. Drovart (1598), R. Nivelle (1598) and J. Gillot (1605) were almost exact copies of Faber's. Baronius[24] made slight textual emendations on Faber's text but not until P. Coustant's edition of 1693 was a real attempt made to correct the text. As a result of this work, Coustant's became the standard for many years and was the basis for such editions as S. Maffei (1730), J. Capellati (1749) and F. Oberthür (1785). Coustant also made a change in the order of the documents. Thinking that the sequence of Faber might lead to error equally as much as that of Pithoeus, he attempted to give one which would be chronologically accurate and in accordance with Hilary's plan. For this purpose, he noted all the gaps in the work, separated all the disconnected documents, combined those of similar context, and eventually obtained fifteen independent fragments, which he then arranged in chronological order thus: B I; B II; A IV; B III; A VII; B VII; A VIII and A IX (combined as one document); A V; A VI; B VIII; A I and A II (combined as one document); B IV; A III; B V; and B VI. To his edition, Coustant prefixed the title: Fragmenta ex libro sancti Hilarii Pictavensis Provinciae Aquitaniae, in quo sunt omnia, quae ostendunt vel quomodo, quibusnam causis, quibus instantibus sub/

Notes.
24. in his "Annales" of 1609.

sub imperatore Constantio factum est Ariminense concilium contra formellam Nicaeni tractatus, qua universae haereses comprehensae erant".

The great advance taken by Feder in his edition of 1916 was made possible through the discovery of the old MS which Pithoeus had so earnestly desired to find. As has been said, the codex used by Pithoeus was a fifteenth century one (i.e. "T"), to which Faber added marginal emendations (i.e. "C"). While entering into this heritage, Coustant also made use of the readings of J. Sirmond who had discovered another MS containing these documents (i.e."S"). But these codices were only of secondary value. Feder had the good fortune to come upon a MS of the ninth century (i.e. Cod. Parisinus Armamentarii lat. 483 - "A") and in 1906, by comparing "A" and "C", proved what had already been suspected by Schiktanz[25], namely, that "A" was the archetype from which "T" was copied. Because of this discovery, Feder's edition has an authority and importance far greater than that of any previous edition; it is for this reason that his text (as given in C.S.E.L. LXV) has been adopted as the basis for the Commentary, andit is assumed that the reader will have this at hand.[26]

Since he thought it an editor's duty to adhere closely to his MS., Feder has left unchanged the division into two parts and the order of the individual fragments of each part.

Notes.

25. l.c. p.22sq.
26. Very few references have been made in the Commentary to any variant in the readings of the various texts; this was thought unnecessary in view of the excellent textual apparatus which Feder has appended to his text.

In viewof the disordered state of the collection, this seems the best method, as any other order is bound to be artificial and serve no useful purpose. Then, because the titles used by previous editors to describe the work had no authority in the MSS., he felt justified in giving it a new title: "Collectanea Antiariana Parisina, quae vulgo dicuntur Fragmenta historica S. Hilarii Pictaviensis". He also made other minor alterations[27].

Notes.
27. cf. C.S.E.L. LXV Praef. II A 1 and Praef. II A 6.
Page references in the Commentary are those of C.S.E.L. LXV.

## Hilary of Poitiers and the Arian Controversy.

### A) Short Sketch of the Arian Controversy to 351.

Of all the heresies, that have endangered the truth for which the Christian Church stands, perhaps the most insidious was Arianism. It spread like a canker over the Church in the fourth century and constituted a real danger precisely because of its many points of contact with the orthodox faith. Arian practice and practical teaching did not differ from the orthodox, Arian baptism and eucharist were, on the surface, exactly the same as the orthodox, and both professed the Bible as the basis of their system. The issue was further confused by the numerous variations of Arianism, from the palest hue of misconstruction to the blackest shade of heresy. Unless ultimate principles were questioned, the two systems could have existed side by side with each other without the ordinary Church member noticing any great difference between them.

It was essentially an Eastern heresy, having its origin in Alexandria where its founder, Arius, was attached as presbyter to the important church of Baucalis; and during the first twenty or thirty years of its growth, the West remained relatively untouched by it. When it did eventually enter the controversy, the West showed itself consistently in support of Athanasius, but, on the whole, the struggle never aroused the same enmities, the same theological strife and philosophical wranglings as in the East. For one thing, the mass of Western bishops, never seem to have realised/

realised the full implications of the Arian heresy. For another, the West was not primarily interested in disputes concerning the faith, especially with regard to the doctrine of God; Western bishops showed more concern for practice, and were content to hold a simple faith. Again, in the East heresies had already gathered round the Person of Christ, and more than one had already occupied practically the same ground as Arianism, so that the Nicene creed was something of an innovation; the West, not having this background, found it easier to accept the Nicene decisions as authoritative and always binding.

It may safely be asserted that when Arius revolted from the doctrine which had become traditional in the Christian Church concerning the Person of Christ, he had no intention of disrupting, far less destroying Christianity, though later it was realised that this would have been the logical conclusion of his doctrine. He had been sincerely troubled as to how to reconcile the Person of Christ with the belief in one God, and his solution was to accord to Christ the highest honour short of full divinity. The crux of the matter was that, for Arius, Christ remained only a creature, so that; if He were calledGod, it was only in a lower and improper sense. His solution proved attractive and he soon found himself with strong support not only among his own friends in Egypt but also among bishops in other countries, such as those of Caesarea, Tyre, and Laodicea, and at court with the Emperor's sister Constantia. Indeed/

Indeed so strong had Arianism become by the year 325 that in some quarters it came as something of a surprise when the Council of Nicaea rejected an Arianising creed. But the result of this Council was that Arius found himself abandoned by nearly all his friends[1] and Arianism was condemned almost unanimously. For nearly 30 years after Nicaea Arianism remained under a cloud, but it still had its supporters and events were soon to prove that, though anxious to uphold the divinity of Christ, the Eastern bishops had nevertheless been compelled to go further than they wished in the formulation and subscription of the Nicene creed. Indeed, if the victory of the anti-Arian party at Nicaea came as a surprise, the reaction which followed the Nicene decisions was no less surprising. At first it seemed as if Nicaea had crushed Arianism for ever, and yet in an incredibly short space of time the struggle was quietly resumed.

This Arian reaction had its origin in the East and sprang, not from an extreme group of Arians[2], but from the conservatives, such as Eusebius of Caesarea. It was impossible at this stage, of course, to attack the Nicene creed directly but they sought to undermine/

Notes.

1. Of the 300 or so bishops present, only five refused to sign the Nicene creed, namely Eusebius of Nicomedia, Theognis of Nicaea, Maris of Chalcedon, Theonas of Marmarica and Secundus of Ptolemais. Eventually Eusebius, Maris and Theognis did sign, and, because they alone held out, only Theonas and Secundus were anathematised with Arius and his writings. cf. Soz. I, 21.
2. Such an attempt would have been doomed to failure from the start; in fact the leaders of the reaction did not dare publicly to avow themselves as Arians until the year 357.

undermine the authority of the council of Nicaea by procuring the return of the exiles and attacking the leading Nicenes, such as Eustathius of Antioch, Marcellus of Ancyra and Athanasius[3]. The latter, for their part, defended the action taken at Nicaea and rebutted the accusations of the Eusebians at such synods as Rome 341 and Western Sardica 342.

In 351 came one of the turning points in the controversy because in that year Constantius gained a signal victory at Mursa over the usurper Magnentius, and became virtually sole ruler of the Empire. It is difficult to say what precisely had made Constantius support the Arian cause. Since his father's death he had been ruler of the East and had no doubt come in contact with Arians and Arian ideas. He would also be influenced by the fact that the majority of the bishops in the East were of this persuasion. Furthermore he had suffered some humiliation at the hands of Athanasius in 345/6 when he had been compelled to write three letters to bid the bishop of Alexandria return home, and the course of events after 351 would seem to indicate that Constantius was actuated by a personal hatred of Athanasius. Sulpicius Severus[4] suggests, too, that he had been won over to the anti-Nicene party by a trick of Valens, bishop of Mursa. The latter had been in the train of the Emperor, and, as he learned the result of the battle of Mursa sooner than the Emperor, had announced it to him, asserting that an angel had/

Notes.

3. cf. the work of councils like those of Tyre 335, Jerusalem 335, Constantinople 336, Dedication Antioch 341, Eastern Sardica 342.
4. H.S. II, 38.

had brought him the news, and thus had reestablished his influence over the mind of Constantius.

Whatever the reason, his adherence to the anti-Nicene party can not be doubted, and his victory at Mursa had two important consequences for the Church. Firstly, the Eusebians were not slow to take advantage of the great opportunity thus afforded them and immediately began openly to work for the reestablishment of Arianism[5]. With Constantius as patron, they were able to pursue a much bolder policy than hitherto. Secondly, until 351 the Western Church had been left comparatively untroubled by the controversy which had rent the Eastern half of the Empire. But now Arianism came into the West with the full support of the Emperor, ably assisted by his henchmen, Valens and Ursacius; and the one Church above all others destined to play an important and decisive role in resisting this heresy was that of Gaul.

B) <u>The Church of Gaul and Life of Hilary to 353</u>.

The beginnings of the Christian Church in Gaul are for the most part vague and indistinct, but it seems certain that Christianity reached Gaul late. De la Tour[6] declares that the episcopal organisation of Gaul, if we except some cities such as Lyons, Vienne, Arles, does not go beyond the fourth century. Even at the end of that century, in the districts which witnessed the Missionary/

Notes.

5. e.g. the council of Sirmium 351, held, without doubt, at the request of Valens in order to discredit the Nicenes through a final attack on Photinus.
6. Les Origines Religieuses de la France p.5.

missionary activities of Martin of Tours, the old religion of paganism still prevailed[7]. Not that the Gallic Church had not already had its moments of distinction; indeed the earliest, definite, historical evidence for the activity of the Christian Church in Gaul is at the same time a noble tribute to its zeal and constancy[8]. But it is to the fourth century that the general foundation of Christianity in Gaul must be assigned. With the other churches in the Roman Empire it shared in the great increase in numbers and prestige which the imperial favour under Constantine brought, and only then was it possible to establish churches not only in the principal cities but also in the rural areas.

Young as it was, the Gallic church could not escape participation in the various controversies of the fourth century. At the Council of Arles 314, which dealt with the Donatist question, the following sees were represented: Arles, Vienne, Lyons, Vaison, Marseilles, Bordeaux, Eauze, Autun, Rouen, Reims, Trèves and Cologne. But it is rather surprising to find that not a single Gallican bishop is definitely known to have attended the Council of Nicaea[9], although we can hardly doubt that some at least from the central towns would be there. The first known contact with the controversy was when Athanasius was exiled to Trèves by Constantine in 336. There, he was welcomed by Constantine II and Maximin, bishop/

Notes.

7. cf. E. Mâle: La fin du paganisme en Gaule (Paris 1950)
8. cf. the letter in Eus. E. H. V, i concerning the persecution in Lyons and Vienne under Marcus Aurelius.
9. G. Morin, in Rev. Ben. XVI, 1899, p.72-75, suggests that a case can be made out for the presence of one Gallic bishop.

bishop of Trèves. Then, there is extant a list of 34 bishops, described as Gallican, who joined in the acquittal of Athanasius by Western Sardica[10] but the names of their sees are not given.

The two Emperors, Constantine II and Constans, do not seem to have taken a very active part in the affairs of the Western Church, and the Church of Gaul, like most of the other churches in the West, thus left to itself, gave almost wholehearted support to Athanasius and the Nicene creed. But the change in the political situation, which occurred in 351, greatly aided the Arian cause in Gaul, as in the rest of the West; indeed, it is no exaggeration to say that Arianism owed its establishment in Gaul to the influence of Constantius. Only after his accession as sole ruler was there any strong or determined support of Arianism there. But it was in Gaul, too, that Constantius was to find an opponent to his Arianism "as zealous and as courageous as Athanasius in the East". Swete[11] writes: "It is true that the West produced no great schools of thought like that of Alexandria or Antioch, and no local group of great theologians such as the three Cappadocian Fathers. Its writers were in many cases moulded by the influence of earlier or contemporary Greek theology and they translated or reproduced in Latin dress the teaching of Origen or Eusebius, Basil or the Gregories. Yet among the Western Fathers of the fourth and fifth centuries there are commanding personalities who have no superior in the East and not a few lesser authors of high merit.

A/

Notes.
10. Ath. Apol. c. Ar. 50.
11. Patristic Study p.115.

A succession of champions of the Nicene faith was called forth by the efforts of Arianism to capture the orthodox West". Into Gaul, at the beginning of the fourth century was born one of the greatest, most influential and powerful of these, a man destined to play a great part in the life not only of the Gallic church but of the whole Mediterranean world, namely, Hilary of Poitiers. Today Hilary is one of the least studied of the Fathers and yet his importance can be gathered from the title "The Athanasius of the West", given him by Duc de Broglie, an apt title indeed because the work, position and cause represented by Athanasius in the East was ably upheld in the West by the bishop of Poitiers. .... Smith[12] writes that the truest, noblest and most effective maintainer of orthodoxy in the West was not the bishop of Rome of the time but the Gallic bishop, Hilary.

That Hilary was born in Gaul is admitted by all[13], and indeed in the district of Aquitaine, which at that time surpassed all the other provinces of Gaul in "urbanitas"[14] and was the focus of Roman culture[15]. There has been some doubt as to the exact place of his birth[16] but it seems safe to rest on the authority of Jerome and Fortunatus who assert that he was born at Poitiers.[17] The date of his birth is unknown but must be placed in the early years of the fourth century. In his writings Hilary is curiously reticent/

Notes.
12. The Church in Roman Gaul p.181.
13. cf. Aug. c.Iul. I, 5:"Quis enim ignorat Hilarium episcopum Gallum".
14. Sulp. Sev. Dial I.
15. T. Haarhoff "Schools of Gaul" p.46.
16. cf. F. Chamard, Hist. Eccles.du Poitou, Bk.I, ch.VII p.202sq.
17. Lar. Comm. ad Gal. Praef. Fort. Miscell. Bk.8 ch.1

reticent about himself and his parents. That he came from a wealthy family may be inferred from the excellent education and training which he seems to have had, and also from the alternatives which arose before him as a young man about to set out on the voyage of life and seeking "an employment adequate to the powers of human life and righteous in itself". One of these was to lead a life of leisure combined with wealth; he must therefore have been in a position to enjoy this, since otherwise he would not have considered it. Fortunatus indeed affirms that he came from a noble family[18] and that his parents were Christian[19]. But the latter assertion seems to contradict the account given by Hilary at the beginning of his "De Trinitate"[20]. In this work there is no sign of his having been brought up from birth in the Christian faith; rather there is depicted an earnest young man reared in a pagan society, imbued with the various pagan ideasof the Divine Being and finding them wanting, suddenly CHANCING upon the books of the Old Testament and through them gaining an insight into the mystery of the Divine Nature unattainable by any human power of mind alone. If he had been nurtured from birth in the Christian faith, then the Holy Scriptures/

Notes.

18. "apud Gallicanas familias nobilitatis lampade non obscurus, imo magis prae ceteris gratia generositatis ornatus fuit".
19. P.L. IX, col.187 "a cunabulis tanta sapientia primitiva eius lactabatur infantia, ut iam tunc potuisset intelligi, Christum in suis causis pro obtinenda victoria necessarium sibi militem iussisse propagari".
20. De. I. § 1sq. Some scholars, such as Coustant and Chamard, have tried to reconcile the two by refusing to take the latter account literally, but there is nothing in the "De Trinitate" to substantiate this opinion.

Scriptures and their contents would have been familiar to him from childhood and he would have been thus early acquainted with the idea of God contained therein; there could have been no sudden dawning on what is one of the earthly foundations of the Christian faith. This impression would seem to be confirmed by Augustine who describes Hilary as coming to the Faith laden, like Cyprian, Lactantius and others, with the gold and silver and raiment of Egypt[21]. Auber[22], on the basis of the eminence of Hilary's father, suggests that his parents would be pagans because emperors did not then give high positions to Christians. So it seems probable that Hilary was not born into a Christian family.

Nothing certain is known about his education. From Ausonius and others we learn how complete was the provision for teaching at Bordeaux and elsewhere in Gaul. Bordeaux, the capital of Aquitaine, was at that time a true centre of intellectual culture[23]. In his Ep. ad Rust. I, 4, Jerome states that the schools in Gaul were then in their most flourishing state. In view of this high standard of culture and of the opportunities available for the highest education in Gaul itself, there is no need to conjecture, as some have done, that Hilary went elsewhere to/

Notes.

21. De Doct. Chr. II, 40. cf. also Jer. Is. XLVIII, 13. Hil. De Trin. VI, 19-21 and Ps LXI, 2.
22. Vie des Saints de l'Eglise de Poitiers.
23. cf. Haarhoff l.c. p.46sq.

to complete his education[24]. In view of the flourishing position of letters and literature in Aquitaine in his day, it is more likely that Hilary received there the first-rate education which was to bear rich fruit in his later work. There he would receive his grounding in Greek which was to prove so useful in his studies of the works of Origen and in his work on the Scriptures, and also his training in rhetoric and in the Latin language and literature. Jerome asserts that Hilary was a deliberate imitator of the style of Quintilian. He also describes Hilary's dignified rhetoric as "mounted on Gallic buskin and adorned with flowers of Greece" and calls Hilary "the Rhone of Latin eloquence". But he criticises his entanglement in long periods and says his works are not made for readers of mediocre learning. This is, in part, a justified criticism; Hilary's sentences are often laboriously long, yet they are perfectly constructed and due allowance has to be made for the hardness and profundity of the thoughts he is conveying. Erasmus later makes somewhat the same criticism when he accuses Hilary of being rather deficient in severity and simplicity of style.

In addition to his literary studies, Hilary would also receive training/

Notes.

24. The Benedictine editor asserts that in his first years Hilary was of obtuse ability but that he set out for Rome and thence to Greece and by ten years' assiduous study overcame this natural difficulty and obtained the graces of rare wisdom, erudition and eloquence. Jerome (Ep. ad Rust. I, 4), too takes it as natural procedure that a student in Gaul would complete his education in Rome: "ac post studia...Gallarum... misit Romam...ut ubertatem Gallici nitoremque sermonis gravitas Romana condiret". But there is no evidence that Hilary ever did this.

training in philosophy, which would include logic, to which, judging from his writings, he seems to have been specially attracted, some knowledge of natural phenomena to be used for purposes of analogy[25], and speculative thought, dominated at that time by Neoplatonism. Perhaps it was from his studies in Neoplatonism that there arose his desire for knowledge of God and for union with Him. Moreover, this perhaps proved the link which bound him so closely with Origen for the latter was likewise greatly attracted by Neoplatonism.

Thus prepared, Hilary set himself to study the Scriptures. What had led him to this, we do not definitely know; from his description in the "De Trinitate", it would seem to have been rather in the nature of a providential act of God than any working on man's part. Nowhere do we hear of any spiritual mentor whose personal influence or works disposed him to take this step. His search after the Truth seems to have been an independent one, guided only by the hand of God. The philosophical systems which claimed to treat of the nature of the Divine Being had been weighed in the balance and found wanting. The life of ease and wealth had been rejected because it seemed not far removed from the level of animal existence. Then the precepts of the philosophers who taught that to keep the soul free from blame and evade by foresight or elude by skill or endure with patience the troubles of life/

bles.

25. cf. De Trin. V, 11; VII, 14; IX, 4; X,14. In Matt. XXI, 8. In Ps. CXVIII, Ain, 16.

life, were rejected as negative counsels, not competent to lead to the good and happy life; men needed to know not only the precepts necessary for right action and living a good life but also something about the God to Whom we owe our existence. The philosophers could give no definite or sound knowledge of the Divine Being and so were rejected. Then he chanced on the Scriptures and found in God's utterance "I am that I am" the true solution to his questions concerning the nature of God. He was still deeply conscious of much weakness both in body and in spirit, but light and consolation came to him through reading the Fourth Gospel and the glad tidings announced there of the Incarnation of the Son of God.

How old he was when this conversion to Christianity took place we do not know but Fortunatus[26] states that he was married and had a daughter[27]. Whether his wife was a Christian and influenced him, whether she became a Christian at the same time as her husband, are questions to which no answer can be given. Nor do we know the post which Hilary held before he became a Christian, although it has been suggested, on the basis of his education and rank, that he would be either one of the officers attached to the court of the Governor of Gaul, known as "curiales", or/

Notes.
26. Vita S. Hil. I, 6.
27. Some writers, such as Fechtrup and Watson, treat this daughter as legendary.

or else a municipal magistrate[26].

The only indication available which helps to fix an approximate date for his conversion and elevation to the episcopate is a phrase in his "De Synodis" 91: "regeneratus pridem et in episcopatu aliquantisper manens", describing how, though he had long since joined the Christian Church and been a bishop for some time, he had never heard the Nicene creed until his exile in 356. His conversion might therefore be placed c.350 or a little earlier, and his elevation to the episcopate c.353[29]. How Hilary employed the time between his conversion and elevation, whether he entered the ministry of the Church of Poitiers, we can not say. Fortunatus tells us that he led the life of a perfect Christian layman, so that while still in a lay office he possessed, by the divine will, the grace of a pontiff, avoiding the communion of Jews and heretics, spreading the words of truth redounding to the fruit of the faith among the people.

As there is no evidence to the contrary, it is possible that Hilary was raised, like Ambrose, straight from the life of a layman to the episcopate. In his writings is plainly visible his high regard for the work and life of a bishop[30].

According to one tradition, he is said to have succeeded Maxentius, the brother of Maximinus of Trèves[31]; but this authority//

Notes.

29. cf. Cazenove l.c.
2 . cf. Till. Mém. VII, 438. We hear also of Martin of Tours coming to Poitiers when Hilary was already a bishop and staying with him as his disciple for a few years before Hilary went into exile.
30. cf. Ps.67§12-13. Ps.118, 14§§ 3, 4; Matt.X, 4. De Trin.VII, 1; XII, 20. Also see Reinkens p.50sq.
31. cf. Vita S. Maximini by Lupus of Ferrière.

authority for the existence of the see of Poitiers before Hilary is of no value, and Duchesne[32] places Maxentius as fifth after Hilary. So another tradition would have him as the first bishop of Poitiers; the episcopal list at any rate does not furnish a decisive argument for going back earlier. However that may be, it is plain that, while the city of Poitiers was one of the most important of Aquitaine[33], the see had then no great importance in the eyes of the Gallic Church. Still, like almost every other see in the West at this time, it had great potentialities, since to be a bishop in Gaul was to hold a position of importance, owing to the scarcity of Dioceses and their huge geographical extent.

This, then, was the position to which Hilary was raised at a crucial stage in the history of the Western Church, because Constantius and his satellites Valens, Ursacius and Saturninus of Arles (one of the few Gallican Arians) were now making determined efforts to coerce the Western bishops into condemning Athanasius. Hilary had thus to face the Arian challenge from the very beginning of his episcopate.

C) Hilary and the Arian Controversy from 353 to 360.

Immediately following the final victory of Constantius over Magnentius in 353, the anti-Nicene party set out to avail itself of the opportunity now presented to it. For the time being, doctrine/

Notes.
32. Fastes Episcopaux de l'ancienne Gaul II, 77.
33. cf. Amm. Marc. XV, 2. Chamard l.c. I, 2 p.78.

doctrine was kept in the background, and Constantius began by demanding from the bishops a summary condemnation of Athanasius. His aim was to strike an indirect but effectual blow at the Nicene creed since this creed and Athanasius were becoming identified with each other. For this purpose, therefore, a council was summoned to meet at Arles in the winter of 353 with Saturninus as president. It resulted in a resounding victory for the imperial policy because the decision condemning Athanasius was almost unanimous; even the representative of the bishop of Rome, Vincent of Capua, consented, although Liberius later disavowed him. Out of all the bishops present, only one, Paulinus of Trèves, refused to sign, and for his steadfastness, was exiled to Phrygia. Two years of uneasy peace ensued, while the Emperor was engaged in warfare on the frontiers. Then, in 355, another council was held at Milan and again ended in a victory for the court party. Only three bishops refused to sign the condemnation of Athanasius, namely, Dionysius of Milan, Eusebius of Vercelli and Lucifer of Cagliari, and they suffered the same fate as Paulinus.

At neither of these councils is any reference made to Hilary, and it seems unlikely that he was present. Probably he did not receive an invitation to attend because of the unimportant position of his see in the Church of Gaul at this time. Perhaps, too, he may have been reluctant to attend[34], especially in view of his recent election to the episcopate. His later attitude would seem to/

Notes.

34. cf. the attitude of Eusebius of Vercelli with regard to the council of Milan.

...idate that, if he had been present, he could not have ... silent in face of the heavy defeat of the orthodox. ... first entrance into the conflict took place shortly after ... Council of Milan, when, supported by other Gallic bishops, he ... excluded from the communion of Saturninus, Ursacius, and Valens[39]. ... made Hilary take up his stand against Arianism? It might ... been (1) that, like the majority of the Western bishops, he ... inherited the Western tradition of supporting Athanasius and the ... Nicene creed (2) that he had come in contact with Athanasius during ... latter's sojourn in Gaul (3) that he was led to adopt this ... ition through his study of the Scriptures.

We do not know how far he succeeded nor how many Gallic ... bops followed his lead in this matter. But what is certain is ..., by this courageous action, he exposed himself immediately ... the vengeance of the court bishops and Constantius, with the ... ories of Magnentius still fresh in his mind, was bound to regard ... as a new, if ecclesiastical, rebellion in Gaul. It was ...vitable that Hilary's active campaign against Arianism should ... be brought to an end, temporarily at any rate. About this ... time, the defenders of the Nicene creed, Athanasius, Ossius, ... ius, were being ruthlessly attacked; and Hilary was to be no ...ception/

...tes.

39. cf. Hil. c. Const.2. Saturninus of Arles occupies an evil preeminence in the writings of the orthodox, being represented as immoral, violent and apt to seek the aid of the civil power against the defenders of the Nicene creed. Hilary unites with Sulpicius Severus in censuring him more than his comrades.

exception. He was compelled to attend a council held at Biterrae (now Beziers, not far from the Gulf of Lyons) under the presidency of Saturninus in the Spring of 356[36]. We can not be sure either of what actually took place at the council or of what were the actual charges brought against Hilary - he himself is very vague when referring to it in his writings - but we know that the charges concerned, not his faith, but his conduct. Hilary tried to raise a question of faith but was refused a hearing[37]. It was the policy of the court party not to discuss doctrine, and through his recent outburst he had given them ample opportunity to accuse him of being a danger to the public peace and, through this, to secure his banishment[38]. So Hilary was deposed by the council and, instead of securing his aim, which was to obtain confirmation of the sentence of Western Sardica concerning Athanasius, he found himself charged with sedition before the Caesar Julian. The latter, however, would take no part in the dispute either because he felt the issue was too serious for him to decide without reference to the Emperor or because he did not wish to outrage the dominant/

Notes.

36. The exact date of this council is not known, but it must have been held not long after the synod of Milan 355. Furthermore the Caesar Julian was present and so this must have been when he was sojourning in Gaul during preparations for his Rhine campaign of 356/357. Now Julian left Milan in December 355 and spent the winter at Vienne, and it was not until June 356 that he was at Autun on the road to the Rhine (Amm. Marc. Res gestae XV, XVI). All this points to the spring of 356 as the probable time of the council of Beziers.
37. Hil. c. Const. 2.cf. B I.
38. Gwatkin takes another view and holds that the charge was one of immorality.

dominant church feeling in Gaul and alienate sympathies which he might need in future (especially when, as events were to prove, he was not interested in either side). The charge was then carried to Constantius[39], who acted at once and in the summer of 356 exiled Hilary to Phrygia in the Diocese of Asia along with Rhodanius, bishop of Toulouse[40].

Before proceeding further, we must review another side of Hilary's activities as bishop, namely, his literary activity before going into exile. To this period belongs the Commentary on St. Matthew's Gospel, the earliest of the extant and probably the earliest of all Hilary's writings[41]. It was also the first complete commentary on a Gospel produced by the Latin West and probably written in the first instance for the benefit of his church at Poitiers. Prior to this, Christians who understood only Latin and not Greek - probably the position of most Christians in Gaul and in the West generally by this time - did not possess any commentary on a Gospel or Epistle. It is justly reckoned among the most eminent claims of Hilary to our regard that he was the first in the West to perceive this want and attempt to supply it.

Another incident during this period must be mentioned. A tribute to the fame of Hilary as a teacher is seen in the visit paid to him by Martin, the future bishop of Tours. Martin, born in Pannonia/

Notes.
39. Hil. ad Const. II, 2.
40. Sulp. Sev. Chron. II, 39.
41. That it was written very early is shown by the fact that there is no allusion to Arianism in it.

Pannonia, the country of Valens and Ursacius, but converted from Paganism under orthodox influences, seems to have been attracted by Hilary, already bishop of Poitiers, and to have spent some time with him before his exile. It is said that Hilary wished to ordain him deacon but at his urgent wish refrained and admitted him instead to the humble office of exorcist[42]. Martin's visit is regarded as a fresh testimony to the fame, fervour and orthodoxy of Hilary.

To return now to Hilary's exile: it must have been with heavy heart that he set off into exile for, in addition to the sorrow caused by separation from his loved ones and his flock, he must have been sorely troubled by the spread of Arianism, which, after the council of Arles 353 had apparently swept like a flood over Gaul[43]. Hilary's apprehension that his diocese, bereft of its leader, would be won over to the Arian party is clearly revealed in his "De Synodis" 1sq. When he received no letter from his clergy for a time during his exile, he took this silence to mean that they had been won over to the Arian cause. One can imagine his joy when he discovered that this was not the case but that the delay had been caused only through their not knowing his address at that particular time.

His apprehension is understandable when we consider the determined effort made by the Arian party, after his exile, to capture/

Notes.
42. Sulp. Sev. Vita Mart. 5.
43. Sulp. Sev. Chron. II, 39.

capture the whole of the West[44].

Hilary's exile in Phrygia however, was to prove another of those happenings where, under the providence of God, misfortune is turned to blessing. It lasted from 356[45] till autumn 359 but he used that time in a number of ways beneficial to himself, to the church of his day and to posterity. He came to the East as a bishop of the Gallic Church and, though his ideas about the Nicene creed were somewhat vague, a defender and upholder of orthodoxy and Athanasius. Immediately, he entered an atmosphere far removed from that of Gaul. Instead of the simple faith of the West, he found the East teeming with all shades of opinion; it provided an excellent environment for the maturing of his own theological ideas.

Fortunately, his exile was not rigorous; circumstances indeed created for him a privileged situation. When he arrived in exile, the anti-Nicene party was triumphant; in the East all the great episcopal sees were in its power, and in the West the most notable of its opponents had been banished. But now came a change in the character and policy of this party. The divisions, hitherto concealed/

Notes.

44. cf. the extreme Arian manifesto issued by a Western council at Sirmium in the middle of 357. Hilary learned later that this manifesto did not gain anything like universal acceptance in Gaul.

45. Sulpicius Severus, Chron. II, 39, says that "Hilary and the others were driven into exile 45 years ago when Arbitio and Lollianus were consuls... But it is well-known that the persons exiled were celebrated by the admiration of the whole world and that abundant supplies of money were collected to meet their wants while they were visited by deputies of the catholic people from almost all the provinces".

...ed in face of the orthodox challenge, came to the surface ... once this challenge was removed, and soon three distinct, but ...stile, groups made their appearance (1) the extreme Arians or ...noeans (2) the Homoeans, a political, rather than doctrinal, ...ty, and (3) the conservative Semiarians or Homoiousians. ...tioned in Phrygia but having great freedom of movement, Hilary ...n found himself in contact with these groups and showed great interest in them all, though his sympathies lay with the Semiarians. ...e took the opportunity of examining the condition of religion in Asia Minor, formed an exceedingly unfavourable impression, especially with regard to the episcopate, and has left a bad report of his brother-bishops there. Nevertheless, while in exile, he attempted to remove the misunderstandings which prevailed between Eastern and Western bishops. On the one hand, the bishops of Gaul, with whom he kept in contact,[46] imagined that their brethren in Asia were simply Arians; this was a wrong impression because a large proportion of them were Semiarians not so very far removed from orthodoxy. On the other hand, the bishops of Asia thought that the Western bishops were lapsing into the error of Sabellianism. Hilary tried to correct these misleading conceptions not only in his "De Synodis" but also in his speech at the council of Seleucia 359.

Perhaps the greatest advantage of his exile was that it gave ... leisure to compose all, or almost all, of his principal work, ...e/
...es.

...ough exiled, he was not deposed from his see and thus was able to ...ercise in some part the administration of his diocese. cf. ad Const ..., 2. The great importance which he attached to this correspondence with the Gallican episcopate is seen in his anxiety over the long ...ilence of his correspondents cf. De Syn. 1

the "De Trinitate" in which his original thought comes to fullest expression.

In all these ways, then, the exile proved a source of blessing. It gave him time and leisure to write, to appreciate Eastern theology and the position of the Eastern bishops, to form a link between East and West and so to initiate the process of reconciliation between the Nicenes and Semiarians which was to find its completion in the final victory at Constantinople 381. "In this instance, as in those of Arius and Athanasius and many others, exile became an efficacious means for the spreading and strengthening convictions"[47]. Not only were Hilary's personal convictions on faith strengthened, but the influence of such a man must have carried great weight at a time when the theological opinions of the Easterns were in such a state of flux.

His exile in Phrygia came to an end when he was ordered to attend the Eastern council of Seleucia in September 359[48].

As we have seen, until 356 it was the conservatives in the anti-Nicene party who had shown the initiative and given leadership to the party. But in the Sirmian manifesto of August 357 came a direct challenge to this conservative supremacy. For the first time since the council of Nicaea, the extremists came out into the open as avowed Arians and boldly put forward a creed which was definitely and confessedly Arian in thought, in wording and in motive. But the time was not yet ripe for such thorough-going Arianism/

Notes.
47. Watson Introd. in Nicene Library Vo. IX. p. XVI-XVII.
48. Sulp. Sev. Chron. II, 42.

...anism. In the West a Gallic synod at once condemned this Sirmian manifesto[49]. In the East the conservative reply came at the synod of Ancyra 358, a synod small in numbers but large in authority as it was known to state the opinions of a great majority of the Eastern bishops. At the end of the synod its legates set off for the court at Sirmium and were just in time to prevent Constantius from being won over by the Anomoeans. A new council was then held and resulted in complete victory for the conservative Semiarians; a conservative creed was drawn up and signed by Ursacius, Valens and all the Easterns present. The Semiarians had thus regained the position lost at Sirmium, 357, and if their policy had been wisely guided, would have been in a most favourable position for acting as mediators between the Nicenes and the extreme Arians. This chance was lost through their next move, which was to send into exile a great host of the avowed Arians. By this persecution they proved themselves incapable of effecting a solution for soon the exiles returned all the more embittered and all the more ready to attack when the opportunity presented itself. So the stage was set for the emergence of a party of compromise. Such was the Homoean group, formed by Acacius in the East and Ursacius and Valens in the West. Their name was taken from their watchword ὅμοιον, which probably commended itself by its indefiniteness. "It was a term with a respectable past (Athanasius

./

...ter.

49. Hil. De Syn. 2, 3.

for example, had used it frequently in his earlier anti-Arian writings) and a promising future; for it would include Arianism as effectually as the Nicene term would exclude it"[50]

The strength of this new party was soon tested at the councils of Ariminum and Seleucia. The opponents there ranged themselves into two main blocs: on the one side were the Anomoeans and Homoeans - the smaller of the two groups - on the other, the Nicenes and Semiarians; for great as was the latter's suspicion with regard to the Nicene creed, their fear and hatred of Arianism was even greater and, if forced to make a choice between the two extremes, there was no doubt that their sympathies lay with the Nicenes. The person who had done most to remove the barriers of mistrust between the Nicenes and Semiarians was Hilary of Poitiers. His exile had shown him that the difference between these two parties was not so great as was supposed, and that, if the misunderstandings could be removed, it might yet lead to an union between East and West strong enough to settle the controversy and bring peace to the Church. In his "De Synodis", written with this end in view, he minimised all differences and tried to induce the Semiarians to accept the Nicene creed and his Western brethren to look with favour upon the slightest advance made by the Easterns in this direction. He carried his work of reconciliation a step further when summoned to the council of Seleucia. There he was heartily/

Notes.
50. Kidd History Vol.II p.151.

...tily and, it would seem, unanimously welcomed by the Semiarians ... allowed to address the council. On behalf of the Church in ... he disclaimed the Sabellianism of which it was suspected, ...ted his faith to the satisfaction of the council in accordance ... the Nicene confession, and was then received into communion ... the Easterns[51]. We know nothing of any further participation ... Hilary in the affairs of the council.

It was to be sometime yet, however, before this alliance ...tween the Nicenes and Semiarians became firmly established and ...ined sufficient power to enforce its solution of the controversy ...m the whole of the Church.

For the present, Hilary's hopes were quickly dashed. At ...riminum and Seleucia nothing decisive was effected, but, at ...nstantinople, in the more confined space and numbers of the ...lace, with more opportunity for intrigue, the Homoeans soon ...owed themselves the only party with the initiative, policy and ...ility to take advantage of the situation, and they gained a ...mplete victory. They won the day because they realised that ...nstantius was still intent on securing a compromise which would ...clude every colour of Arianism except the extreme Anomoeans, and ...eir vague, indefinite creed seemed to offer the best hope of this. ...e Homoean supremacy, thus set up, lasted for nearly twenty years, ...t was confined to the East. As we shall see, almost as soon as the/

Notes.
51. Sulp. Sev. Chron. II, 42.

the West was freed from the yoke of Constantius, it renounced the decisions taken at Ariminum, Seleucia and Constantinople and confirmed the Nicene faith.

Hilary had gone to Constantinople with the Seleucian legates, probably in the hope of securing the repeal of his sentence of exile. His writings give us a glimpse into his feelings at this particular time[52]. In his Ad Const.II, he is still hopeful of securing a just hearing from the Emperor; he asks him to put an end to the errors which so confused the Church and appeals to him both for a public discussion with Saturninus of Arles, whom he regarded as the chief author of his exile and who was then in Constantinople, and for an appearance in presence of the council which was then being held, in order to defend the orthodox faith on the authority of Holy Scripture. So far from obtaining either request, he did not even secure repeal of the sentence of exile but was ordered forthwith to return to Gaul[53]. According to Sulpicius Severus[54], this measure was suggested to the Emperor by the Arians in order to get rid of their adversary who was represented as "a sower of discord and disturber of the East". Loofs[55] gives another version; relying on those words of the c. Const.11 "fugere mihi sub Nerone licuit/

Notes.

52. Sulpicius Severus, Chron.II, 45, declares that Hilary at this time addressed three petitions to the Emperor. These have been taken to be the "Ad Const.II", the "c.Const." and the so-called "Ad Const.I". In view of Wilmart's work on the "Ad Const.I" in Rev. Ben.XXIV, it seems better to discard the last named and substitute the speech of which only part remains to us now in B VIII, 2 (cf.Commentary and Conclusion on this document).
53. Sulp. Sev. Chron.II, 45.
54. l.c.
55. Real. VIII p.63.

licuit", he asks if the exile must not have taken flight. This conjecture appealed to Wilmart who writes[56] "half sent from Constantinople, half a voluntary fugitive". X.Le Bachelet[56a], however, asks if this is not taking "Tugere" in too rigorous a sense. Watson[57] suggests that the Homoeans had been victorious in the struggle with the Semiarians but that the solid orthodoxy of the West was an influence which, as Hilary had hinted in the Ad Const.II, could not be ignored, while even in the East the Nicenes were a power worth conciliating; so the Homoeans gave a share of the Semiarian spoils to them[58] and it was as part of the same policy, and not because they were afraid of his arguments, that they permitted Hilary to return to Gaul[59].

Probably the order to return to Gaul was both a political and ecclesiastical move on the part of Constantius. If there was one man capable of destroying the political and ecclesiastical policy which Constantius had sought so hard to attain in the East, that man was Hilary. He showed this to the highest degree in his "Ad Const.", which was published shortly after the order to return and expresses his feelings at the failure of the Semiarian party, which he had in part supported, and on the whole religious situation/

Notes.

. in L'Ad Const. liber primus p.150.
a. D.T.C. VI.
. Introd.
. cf. Gwatkin Studies p.182.
. Fortunatus, P.L.IX col.190, said that Ursacius and Valens had solicited the Emperor to send Hilary back to Gaul because they knew that he would overcome them in the controversy and because they could not accomplish their heretical machinations while he was present.

...tion on the eve of his departure for Gaul. In this invective ... reflected the sentiments of indignation which animated Hilary ... the Homoeans, once returned to power, imposed their creed, ...ich had become the creed of Constantius, and avenged their recent ...feat at Ancyra by terrible reprisals against the Semiarians. ...l hope of conciliation and union in the near future had dis-...ppeared.

There is a marked difference in tone between this invective ... the "Ad Const.II", but just at this crisis Hilary had seen ...ough to drive him to despair; "and if we drive men to despair, ...e ought to be prepared to hear them speak the language of despair"[60]. Constantius has now become an anti-Christ and he laments that the ...uth is perishing not through torture and persecution but through ...bribery and intrigue.

So just as Constantius had banished Hilary to Phrygia because ...e thought him likely to upset his ecclesiastical policy in the ...st, now for a similar reason he sends him back to Gaul as a ...ossible source of trouble and unrest if allowed to remain in the ...st.

D) Return Home and Death of Hilary.

The succeeding years were partly occupied by his journey ...omeward, and after the return, by efforts which, though of a con-...ciliatory character, all aimed at the restoration of the faith as ...st/

...otes.
60. D.C.B.III, 63.

...t forth at Nicaea.

Probably he returned home by way of the "Via Egnatia" which ... through Thessalonica to Durazzo, thence by sea to Brindisi and ... to Rome, Northern Italy and into Gaul. Rufinus mentions him as ...ain in Illyricum for the restoration of the Faith, but it does ...t seem likely that he would attempt at this particular time to ...ast the Arians in a region where they were so strong; rather ...s purpose was to reinstate the Nicene Faith in areas where it had ...rmerly been upheld and to restore those bishops who had been ...ceived or fallen at Ariminum.

Socrates[61], Sozomen[62] and Rufinus[63] mention that he called on the churches through which he passed to return to the true faith ...t we do not know of any definite places he visited before his ...rival in Rome[64].

Hilary received a warm welcome when he did eventually reach Poitiers[65]. Among those who greeted him was his disciple Martin, ...o, on hearing of his return from exile, had gone to Rome to meet ...

...ssed.

... III, 10.
... V, 13.
... I, 30,31.
... Watson, Introd. p.XXIX sq., seems to have been mistaken in ...ring Hilary's work with Eusebius of Vercelli in the ...storation of the Faith during his return home from exile, ...cause it was not until a later date that Eusebius returned ... his see; for instance, he was only returning from exile ...n the council of Alexandria met in 362.
... Ser. adv. Lucif. 19. Fort. P.L.IX col.191.

..., and missing him there, had followed on to Poitiers[66].

His happiness on returning home, however, was mingled with sorrow because of the scenes he had witnessed on the way, for Constantius had banished all bishops who had refused to accept the formula promulgated at Ariminum[67]. But those who were thus punished were in a minority; according to Sulpicius Severus only twenty bishops remained firm, the rest were inveigled by Ursacius, Valens and their friends into signing the heretical creed of Ariminum. So the situation in the Gallic church was this: on the one hand were the bishops who had fallen at Ariminum and were now living at peace with their Arian neighbours in Gaul, yet whose faith was fundamentally orthodox; on the other were the bishops who had not fallen, who steadfastly refused any compromise with Arianism and in pursuance of such a policy refused to have communion with those who, though not Arians, had nevertheless fallen. Hilary's

...

Notes.

6. Sulp. Sev. Vita Mart. 6,7. Chamard, "Saint Martin et son monastère de Ligugé", states that "for long the West remained indifferent to the great monastic movement in the East, but the two men destined to encourage this movement in the West were Athanasius and Hilary. Athanasius did this during his exile at Trèves, which is probably the cradle of monastic life in the West. But the establishment of the monastery at Ligugé near Poitiers had far greater consequences for the West, because it was from here that the monastic movement spread throughout the whole of the West. And it was Hilary who inspired and encouraged his disciple Martin to establish the monastery at Ligugé. It would be during his exile in the East that Hilary would come in contact with and be attracted by the monastic institutions and this knowledge would be invaluable in the organisation and administration of the new community; he would indeed be the "father" of the new monastic family". This is yet another fruit of Hilary's exile and another of his claims to fame.

7. Socr. II, 37. Soz. IV, 19. Jer. adv. Lucif. Sulp. Sev. Chron. II, 45.

...seems to have been to try and hold a middle course between these ...factions. He wanted the lapsed bishops to renounce their error ...become reconciled to the orthodox faith but he also wanted the ...thodox extremists to welcome them into communion again on this ...profession of repentance.

While he may have been handicapped in his work at this time by ...suspicions aroused among his Gallic brethren through his ...evious relations with the Eastern Semiarians, suspicions which he ...had tried to remove by his "De Synodis" and "De Trinitate", he was ...nevertheless aided by a change in the political field.

When Hilary left Constantinople in 360, Constantius and the ...partier bishop Saturninus seemed secure in their domination both of ...the civil and ecclesiastical affairs of Gaul. As we have seen, the majority of the Gallic bishops had been overpowered by Constantius and had shared in the general debacle of the orthodox at Ariminum. But in May 360 Julian's troops mutinied at Paris, and Julian displaced Constantius as supreme ruler over Gaul. Saturninus now found himself powerless. As part of his policy, Julian had taken no part in the controversy but had already earned a name for himself as a righteous governor. The hostile power of Constantius having been thus removed, Hilary found the way made ...ady for his task of inducing the bishops to abjure their profession ...t Ariminum. Sulpicius Severus[63] speaks of frequent councils held ...ere held for this purpose; one of these was undoubtedly the

...council/
...otes.
...6. Chron. II, 45.

...sil of Paris whose synodal letter is still preserved[69].

The West had never been a fruitful ground for Arianism; its ... representatives there had been mere courtiers, like Ursacius, ... and Saturninus, who relied for their strength solely on the ... of Constantius. When this was removed, Western Arianism was ... with no foundation. Thus it was that, with the deposition of ...rninus[70], the Arian party in Gaul was soon destroyed, and all ... other Arian prelates, who must have been few in number, sub- ...tted to the orthodox tests, with one exception. Paternus of ...ipord, a man of no special fame, had the courage of his convic- ...ions, stubbornly asserted his belief, and suffered the same fate ... Saturninus. Sulpicius Severus asserts - though with some ...geration - that by his action at Paris Hilary earned the glory that by his single exertions the provinces of Gaul were cleansed ...m the defilements of heresy.

But the work of restoring the faith and the bishops who had fallen at Ariminum went on elsewhere and to this period also must belong his work with Eusebius of Vercelli. Rufinus[71], relates that together they "irradiated Italy, Illyricum and Gaul", though he adds that Hilary was the more successful of the two. Moreover, Rufinus directly connects the publication of the "De Trinitate" with this ... of reconciliation. It seems quite probable that the publica- tion/

Notes.
69. A I.
70. cf. A I §4.
71. H.E. I, 30,31.

tion must have come some time after the return from exile because there was not much opportunity for it to be influential before that period.

Their success in this work can be gathered from Hilary's statement in his "c. Auxentium" § 5 that Valens, Ursacius, Auxentius, Terminius and Gaius were the sole upholders of the Arian heritage.

Hilary's last active participation in the struggle against Arianism seems to have been in his controversy with Auxentius of Milan. As we have seen, when Hilary was exiled, his see was not filled, but when Dionysius of Milan had earlier suffered the same fate, his see was filled by an Eastern Arian, Auxentius[72]. As Dionysius died in exile, Auxentius remained in undisputed possession of the see. He at once became the leader of the Arian party in Italy and constituted a potential danger to the safety and security of Western orthodoxy. Like Valens and Ursacius he seems to have been a most unscrupulous person - Athanasius mentions him often and bitterly as a leader of the heretics - and the charitable tone generally adopted by Hilary when dealing with his opponents is absent in the case of Auxentius. In the latter half of 364, Hilary thought that the opportunity had come to assail this last stronghold of Western Arianism. Valentinian was now Emperor, and, as he favoured/

Notes.

72. The reason for this was probably that Milan was a much more important see than Poitiers. The choice of an Eastern Arian shows the dearth of suitable Arian candidates in the West.

promote orthodoxy, Hilary and Eusebius hastened to Milan in the hope of securing his help. Their first action seems to have been to arouse opposition against Auxentius, for the latter complains of this in his petition to the Emperor. His appeal was successful and Hilary was forbidden to stir up the people against their bishop. The bishop of Poitiers, however, had other plans, and he induced Valentinian to set up a commission of two lay officials with "some ten" bishops as assessors. Hilary and Eusebius were both present and Auxentius pleaded his own cause. According to Hilary, the profession made by Auxentius was thoroughly insincere, though Valentinian believed that he was acting in good faith.

Legally, Auxentius was in a strong position[73] and this must have weighed heavily with Valentinian and been a powerful inducement to him to give his support to the bishop of Milan. Yet morally it was Hilary and Eusebius who were in the right and, as Hilary and Auxentius knew only too well, the decisions of the council of Ariminum, on which the latter placed so great stress, had been obtained only by force and deliberate fraud.

The outcome was that Hilary was commanded to return to Gaul and at once obeyed. Once more, however, as on previous occasions, he used his pen to give vent to his feelings and gave an account of the happenings at Milan in his "c. Auxentium".

Notes.

73. cf. his important status in Milan compared to that of Hilary, bishop of the relatively unimportant see of Poitiers, his actual possession of the see, his insistence on the authority of the council of Ariminum.

There is much to admire in the courage, steadfastness and zeal displayed by Hilary in defending and propagating the Nicene faith. From the day he adopted it, not exile, not imperial disfavour, not even failure could shake his resolve or weaken his confidence; at all times in all lands he was prepared to uphold it, no matter the consequences. While his efforts may often seem to have met with scant success, full credit must be paid him for his foresight in encouraging a Nicene-Semiarian alliance in order to secure ultimate victory, and for his contribution to the solution of the theological problems, which underlay the controversy, given in his "De Trinitate".

Though thus busily engaged in eradicating the influence of the Arian heresy, Hilary did not neglect his literary work after his return from exile. Jerome mentions a book "To Sallust the prefect" or "Against Dioscurus", which purports to be a memoir published in 361/362 against the violences exercised in Gaul by Dioscurus, vicar of the prefect Sallust, when the Christian Church had to combat, not heresy, but paganism under Julian. This struggle did not last long, the end coming with the death of Julian, and through it all the Church in Gaul remained united.

During this period also he wrote his Commentary on Job and his Homilies on the Psalms, both of these works being adaptations from Origen, attempts, as it were, to popularise and improve upon the teaching/

teaching of Origen in the Latin West.[74].

Hilary has also some claim to fame as the first Latin Christian hymn-writer. How far he was successful in this we do not know, for, according to Jerome[75] he complained of finding the Psalms unteachable in sacred song.

Finally, there is his historical work, of which the collection of documents now before us represents only a part. He began this work almost at the beginning of his episcopate and seems to have been adding material to it right up to the time of his death.

Jerome[76] states that he died in the reign of Valens and Valentinian. Sulpicius Severus[77] places his death more particularly in the sixth year of his return from exile. As we have seen, he returned home immediately after the council of Constantinople and so must have reached Poitiers 360/361. Moreover, the last event recorded in his historical work must have taken place at the end of 366 or the beginning of 367[78]. So his death is probably to be placed early in 367.[79]

Notes.

74. From the Homilies on the Psalms we get an indication of Hilary's pastoral work as bishop for here he is seen imparting instruction to his own familiar congregation, and he knows his people so well that he pours out whatever is passing through his mind.
75. Comm. in Gal.II Praef.
76. De Script. Eccles. 100.
77. Chron. II, 45.
78. cf. § V, § VI.
79. Gregory of Tours, Hist. Franc. I, 36, puts it in the fourth year of Valentinian and Valens, i.e. Spring 367 -Spring 368. This is also found in Jerome's Chronicle though some MSS of this work place it in the previous year (cf. R. Helm Die Chronik des Hieronymus in Eusebius Werke (Leipzig 1913) t.VI p.245

Series A. I. Letter to Eastern bishops from a synod at Paris c.360.

SUMMARY. (1) In their reply to a letter from some Easterns, the Gallican bishops declare that at the synods of Ariminum and Nikê the Arians had deceitfully used the authority of those same Easterns to secure the omission of the word "usia"(= οὐσία) because the Easterns' letter made it quite clear that this had been done without their knowledge and consent. (2) The Gallicans, therefore, defend the use of the word "homoousios" as put forward by the Easterns against the Arians and used prudently in the West to describe the true and lawful birth of the only-begotten Son of God, at the same time repudiating the charge of Sabellianism so frequently brought against them. More significant still - they show themselves prepared, under certain conditions, to accept the word "likeness" when describing the relations of Father and Son in the Godhead. (3) There follows a condemnation of one of the most important Arian tenets "He was not before He was born". (4) Reference is again made to the Arian deceit concerning the word "usia" and also to Hilary's gallant, but vain, efforts at Constantinople to procure the condemnation of the great blasphemies accepted at Ariminum. Following the example of Hilary and the Easterns, the Gallic bishops excommunicate Auxentius, Valens, Ursacius and other Arians, reject all the blasphemies mentioned in the Easterns' letter, and especially condemn the apostate bishops who have been intruded into the sees of the exiled/

exiled clergy. They also promise to excommunicate and depose any Gallic bishop who resists their decrees or holds a wrong opinion on the meaning of the word "omousion"( ὁμοούσιον ). In conclusion they inform the Easterns of the excommunication of Saturninus of Arles by all the Gallican bishops.

COMMENTARY. This synodal letter has been preserved only in this collection of documents but its authenticity has never been questioned and, as will be seen later[1], Sulpicius Severus knew of this letter and indeed used it in the composition of his "Chronicle". The text as found in the Faber-Coustant edition has been adopted by Baronius ad ann.362 n CCXXXsq. and various Collections of Canons such as Binius I, 484, Sirmond (Concilia antiqua Galliae I, Paris 1629, 16sq), Ed regia III,215-218, Labbe-Cossart II, 821sq. , Harduin I, 727-730, Coleti II, 953sq., Mansi III, 357-359, Conciliorum Galliae Collectio I, Paris 1789, 198.

p.43 L.3sq. Incipit fides catholica...episcopos - Just as Hilary had expounded his faith at the Council of Seleucia in order to remove all suspicion of Sabellianism and thus promote a closer relationship between the Western Nicenes and Eastern Semiarians, so now in answer to an Eastern request, the Western bishops at the Council of Paris give a statement of their faith for the same purpose and by so doing, demonstrate clearly that Hilary's action had the support of the orthodox West.

Notes.
1. see note on p.46 L.1.

L.3,4 apud Pariseam civitatem - Paris was probably chosen as meeting-place of the Council because it was the favourite city of the Caesar Julian[2], whose protection the Gallican bishops would naturally seek as counterbalance to the enmity of the Emperor Constantius.
For most of the fourth century Trèves (or Trier) was for all practical purposes the capital of Gaul, but for a very short period about the middle of the century Paris was able to lay claim to this title through the use made of it by the Caesar Julian as his head-quarters and favourite place of residence.
In itself, it was an important military camp, lying as it did on the route followed by the barbarians on their way from the north to the south.
Christian traces are found from the end of the third century, but only in the fourth century did Christianity gain a real footing in the city.

L.4 episcopis Gallicanis - With the important exception of Saturninus of Arles, the Gallican bishops seem to have held consistently to the orthodox Nicene position. The theological wranglings, which so disturbed the East, had very little effect on the West, which was more concerned with the practical than the philosophical problems of Christianity. The typical Western bishop was content to rest satisfied with the decisions of the Council of Nicaea 325, which was held to be definitive and binding on all.
Not so, the East.
The reason for this difference in attitude towards Nicaea between East/

Notes.
2. Amm. Marc XX, 8, 2.

East and West was probably that whereas, before the Council, the East had long been troubled by the problem of the Person of the Son of God and had gradually in process of time formed itsown traditional doctrine on this question[3], the West, with a few exceptions such as Tertullian and Novatian, had no such inheritance. The Easterns therefore regarded the Nicene creed with suspicion as something new, tending to jeopardise their own traditional interpretation of the problem, while the West with no such background looked upon the Nicene decisions as having an authority which could not be violated without danger to the true faith.

L.4, 5 Orientales episcopos - From the context it is evident that these were representatives of the Semiarian party at Constantinople, The Easterns had always suspected the West of Sabellianism, but Hilary, by his courageous exposition of the faith at Seleucia, had been able to dispel some of this suspicion. The calamitous events at Seleucia and Constantinople would further induce the Eastern Semiarians to seek an alliance with the Western Nicenes as a feasible means of retrieving their fortunes. In thus bringing together "fellow-sufferers" in East and West, the Arians at Ariminum, Seleucia, and Constantinople had unwittingly made an important contribution to the orthodox cause. Though the Semiarian cause was now too weak for such an union to have much effect upon it, this reconciliatory movement was important in so far as it helped to remove some of the misunderstandings between East and West, showed that/

Notes.

3. largely a synthesis of the various subordinationist theories,

that an amicable agreement could be reached between the two, and thus paved the way for the final solution of the problem.

p.43, L.6,7 Dilectissimis...Orientalibus omnibus...manentibus - In B VIII, 1 p.174 L.14.15 the Semiarian legates speak of themselves as representing the whole synod of Seleucia, and, by implication, the whole of the East. It would be as such that they addressed their letter to the Gallican bishops.
According to Hil. c.Const.12 the Semiarians were indeed numerically by far the strongest party represented at the Seleucian synod. This gives some weight to their claim to represent the whole of the East. As no synodal lists are extant, it is impossible to tell which provinces were represented.

L.11,12 doctrinis et propheticis et apostolicis - i.e. the Old and New Testaments.

L.13-15 deum patrem.. per.. Iesum Christum in sancto spiritu confiteri - this formula for expressing the relations of the three Persons in the Trinity is found frequently in Athanasius[4].

Notes.
4. e.g. Ep. I ad Serapionem P.G. 26 col.561 § 12 ὁ Θεὸς δι' Υἱοῦ ἐν Πνεύματι; ibid. col.577 § 20 τὸν ἁγιάσμον τὸν ἐκ Πατρὸς δι' Υἱοῦ ἐν Πνεύματι ἁγίῳ γινόμενον; ibid col.596 § 28 Ὁ γὰρ Πατὴρ δι' αὐτοῦ τοῦ Λόγου ἐν Πνεύματι ἁγίῳ; ibid. col.600 § 30 Ἡ γὰρ διδομένη χάρις καὶ δωρεὰ ἐν Τριάδι δίδοται παρὰ τοῦ Πατρὸς δι' Υἱοῦ ἐν Πνεύματι ἁγίῳ.

L.15sq. Sed plane.. causa cumulatur - This feeling of hopefulness would spring (1) from the fact that the bishops who had fallen at Sirmium and Ariminum were recovering and seeking communion with the Nicenes again. Though no legislative measures were taken until the synod of Alexandria 362, it is very probable that this process of recovery would begin as soon as the Arian deceits were disclosed at the synod of Constantinople 360. (2) from the knowledge that, by the revolt of Julian in May 360, they now could hope that the imperially-bolstered Arianism of the West would soon disappear. (3) from Hilary's work of reconciliation, of which this council is but one example[5].

L.16-18 liberans nos..societati - this probably refers to the effect both of the removal of Constantius' influence and of Hilary's work in Gaul after his return from exile.

L.16,17 errore mundi - the Arian heresy was a worldly error because (1) its failure to recognise Jesus Christ as the Son of God had its source in its dependence, not on revelation, but on worldly knowledge (2) its chief strength lay in its reliance on worldly power. Especially was this true in the West where both the leading Arians, Saturninus of Arles and Auxentius of Milan were imperial nominees.

L.17 inexpiabili - this means, not that those who repented of the Arian/

Notes.
5. Sulp. Sev. II, 45.

...n error could never receive forgiveness - the tenor of the ...ter shows it to be otherwise - but that it was now evident to the ...mes that there could be no rapprochement between orthodox and ...ian. That such an alliance might have seemed a possibility to ... can be gathered from Philostorgius (H.E. V, 1) complaining that ... appointments of Acacius were mostly Nicene.

... Gallican bishops are not here foreshadowing the later Luciferian ...sition of refusing to deal with bishops who had once fallen. For example, on learning that the Semiarians had been deceived into ...ting as they had done at Seleucia and Constantinople, they are ...lly prepared to renew negotiations and seek a satisfactory union with them.

L.10 ex litteris vestris - this letter is no longer extant. It ...ives a forced interpretation to presume, as Coustant[6] and Schiktanz[7] ..., that the Easterns had communicated by letter with Hilary at Constantinople. He had been in the company of the Easterns at Seleucia and there is no reason to suppose that it would be otherwise at Constantinople. Their close relations at Seleucia and Constantinople would therefore make such a letter unnecessary. It seems more reasonable to suppose that the letter would be addressed, not to Hilary, but directly to the Gallican bishops, and would be given to Hilary as he set out to return to Gaul.

Neither is there any suggestion that the letter had come from Hilary ...d not from the Eastern bishops nor that Hilary had informed them by ...tter/

...tes.

6. note (g) col. 710-711 P.L. X.
7. p.40.

letter and not in person[8].

L.19sq. fraudem diaboli etc - this refers to the deception practised by Valens, Ursacius and the other Arians at Nikê on the legates of the Ariminum synod and at Ariminum itself in falsely using the authority of the Seleucian bishops to overthrow the Nicene "usia" and gain acceptance for their new creed.

L.20 sq ut divisi in partibus etc - the Arians had been able to use the geographical division for their own ends e.g. fostering the suspicion of Western Sabellianism among the Easterns.

L.22sq. nam plures..coacti - the Gallican's letter is the only authority for this statement but Soz.H.E. IV, 19, Ath. Ep. ad Afros 3, Hil. c. Aux. give similar accounts.

p.44, L.1sq. sub auctoritate... coacti - cf p.43 L.19; p.45 L.8,9. According to Ath.De Syn. 30, Theod II, 16, the reason for the rejection of the term "usia" was that it was unscriptural. But, as the same criticism could be passed on their own terms, it is probable that the Arians gave this other reason in order to strengthen their case. The Nicenes' justification for the use of the term "usia" was that, though the word itself is not found in Scripture, the idea conveyed by it certainly is. cf Hil. De Syn. 87sq.

Notes.
8. for these opinions see Coustant, note (d) col.709 P.L.X.

p.44 L.2,3 quod verbum..inventum - i.e. at the Council of Nicaea previously the words "ousia" and "homoousios" had been regarded with suspicion both as tending towards a Manichean view of the Son as part of the divine essence and as lending themselves to Sabellian. In spite of itshistory, however, the Nicene Fathers were compelled to use it as the only word which provided an adequate safeguard against Arianism.

L.3 a nobis..susceptum est - cf. the note on p.43 L.4 episcopis Gallicanis.

L.4 "omousion" - it had been the aim of Hilary in his "De Synodis" and in his personal efforts at Seleucia to show that the words "homoousios" and "homoiousios" were not far removed in meaning and could indeed be reconciled with each other. To this end, he had tried to dispel some of the suspicions which had gathered round the word "homoousios". In their letter the Gallican bishops now act in like manner. They affirm the true use of the word "omousios"(i "homoousios") to express the birth of the only-begotten Son from the Father. It does not mean a common possession of the divine essence whereby the Son appears as a mode of the Father, but conveys the idea of whole and perfect only-begotten God born from whole and perfect unbegotten God, of one substance ("usia" or "substantia") with God the Father, and like the Father in the highest sense of true God to true God, excluding all thought of creaturehood, adoptionism and modalism./

Modalism. The divinity is not to be thought of as a "oneness" (= "unio") i.e. one Person with three modes, but as an unity (= "unitas"), which preserves the true fullness of the Birth, and the relationship is not merely one of love[9] which implies a subordinationist tendency, but of divinity("divinitas" = οὐσία, Schiktanz p.36), one between two divine persons.

The Nicenes admitted that the word "homoousios" had been condemned at the Council of Antioch 269 but argued that while Paul of Samosata used the word in one sense, Arius denied it in another, and hence it was repudiated at Antioch in one sense and enacted at Nicaea in another[10]. According to Ath. De Syn. 45 the Council of Antioch had understood "homoousios" in a bodily sense, whereas the Nicenes used it in an immaterial sense, to show that the Son was not a creature, but of the essence of the Father. The word had fallen into disrepute at Antioch because a materialising inference was threatened from it. The Nicene Fathers on the other hand had used this word to denote that Father and Son are of the same "usia" and thus combat the Arian doctrine that the Son of God was a creature. In the Nicene sense it denoted the true and legitimate birth of the only-begotten God the Son from God the Father.

Notes.
9. Schiktanz p.38 thinks "caritas" = βουλησις.
10. cf. Hil. De Syn. 77sq. Ath. De Syn. 43.

L.5, 6 secundum Sabellii blasphemias - not much is known of the heretic Sabellius, though the sect to which he gave his name lasted at least until well on in the fifth century[11]. He used to be placed about the middle of the third century, but the discovery of the "Philosophumena" of Hippolytus has proved this to be a mistake and places him at the close of the second and beginning of the third century. Writing in the fourth century, Basil of Caesarea makes him an African by birth[12] and there is no doubt that when Dionysius was bishop of Alexandria 247-65, his teaching enjoyed great popularity in the Libyan Pentapolis[13]; but there is no contemporary evidence to support Basil's statement. Sabellius' main centre of activity was Rome where doctrines similar to those he taught were already being circulated, mainly through the influence of Praxeas, Noetus and his brother.

According to Hippolytus, Sabellius was at first undecided in his views but was perverted to Monarchianism by Callistus[14]. Hippolytus asserts that he tried to correct him and temporarily succeeded, but under Callistus' influence Sabellius once again lapsed into heretical views. On his accession in 217, however, Callistus excommunicated Sabellius in order, according to Hippolytus[15], to be able thus to defend himself against any charge of heresy. That is the last that is heard of Sabellius.

Notes.

11. cf. the letter of the Church of Constantinople in the latter half of the fifth century (in Van Espen's Ius Eccles. III, p.171).
12. In his Ep. CCVII § 1 he refers to him as "the Libyan".
13. Eus. H.E. VII, VI. Ath. De Sententia Dionysii §§ 5, 9.
14. Refut. IX, 11. Hippolytus is of course extremely biased against Callistus and too great reliance can not be placed on his statements.
15. Refut. IX, 12.

Sabellius hasnot left much in writing but traces of his teaching can probably be gathered from Hippolytus "Refutatio", Ath. Expositio Fidei, De decretis, De Synodis, and especially the first three Orat. c. Ar.

L.6 unionem - "unio" in the sense of "oneness" i.e. trying to preserve the unity of the Godhead but losing the distinction of Persons within it, so that the Father is one mode and the Son another mode of the same subsistence cf Hil. De Trin. IV, 42; VI,11; VII,21. Comm. in Ps. CXXII § 7.

L.8,9 "unius"..vel 'usiae' vel 'substantiae' - this is directed against the Arians. Tertullian had used "substantia" as the equivalent of the Greek οὐσια and ὑποστάσις[16]

L.9,10 "creatura" appliesboth to the Arians and to the dynamic Monarchians; "adoptio" to the dynamic Monarchians; and "adpellatio" to the modalistic Monarchians.

p.44 L.10,11. quia ex ipso esset - that is the equivalent of the ἐκ της οὐσιας του πατρος of the Nicene Creed. "ex deo deus" and "lumen ex lumine" are found in the Nicene Creed. "Virtus" is found frequently in Tertullian meaning (1) supernatural being, angel (2) deeds showing power, miracles[17]. "Ex spiritu spiritus" is probably mentioned/

Notes.
16. e.g. in his adv. Prax.
17. adv. Marc.5,8; 3,16; adv. Iud. 9sq; adv. Prax.23.

mentioned as further safeguard against suspicions of a materialist view of the word "homoousios".

L.12 sq. similitudinem quoque etc - in this statement come to fruition the labours of such men as Hilary and Basil of Ancyra who desired to see an alliance between the Western Nicenes and Eastern Semiarians. The Gallican bishops here make their greatest concession by recognising the Semiarian "similitudo" as a word which could be suitably used to describe the relations of Father and Son in the Godhead. They qualify this recognition, however, because even the Acacians had been willing to concede a likeness, though in their case one only in will and operation[18]. The likeness which the Gallicans will admit is one that is worthy of God the Father, a likeness of true God to true God, one which covers the essence, so that while there is not a single deity, there is an unity in the deity which allows for and gives full weight and meaning to the true birth of God the Son. The Son and Father are in a true sense one, not merely bound together by love- even the Arians could admit this - but by divinity[19]. It is noticeable that/the Gallicans do not attempt to give a direct credal quotation or statement, but the general tenor is that of the Nicene creed.

Notes.

18. cf. Epiph. Haer. 72, 12-22.
19. That is, while the Arians could admit that both Father and Son were united by the love which flowed only from one, viz the Father, they could not admit that both were united by the divine essence which was the common possession of Father and Son. The first still implied the subordination of the Son to the Father, the second their equality.

The Scriptural background of these sections is reminiscent of Hilary's style, and his influence is clearly seen when § 2 is compared with such passages as De Syn. 68, 88, and c. Const. 22 : e.g. "Homousion, sanctissimi viri, intelligo ex Deo Deum, non dissimilis essentiae, non divisum, sed natum, et ex innascibilis Dei substantia congenitam in Filio, secundum similitudinem, unigenitam nativitatem" (De Syn. 88).

L.26 "non erat ante quam nasceretur" - this was one of the principal Arian propositions condemned in the Nicene creed because it denied eternity to the Son of God and made Him a creature of time. In this section the Gallicans defend themselves against the charges of Sabellianism and Subordinationism (1) To say that the Son had an existence before He was born does not imply that He is unbegotten i.e. make Him the same as the Father. (2) He became truly man and it is as man and only as man, because of human limitations, that He is subordinate to the Father.

p.45 L.8,9 cum ex litteris vestris.. cognoscat - see notes on p.43 L.18sq.

L.9,10 pietatem eorum - i.e. the legates of the Ariminum council cf. § VIII, 1, 2, and agreeing with L.10 "conventos" by a sense construction.

L.10/

L.10 qui de Arimino Constantinopolim reverterunt - this would be towards the end of 359. cf.B VIII, 1.

L.11sq neque eos...nuntiaverit - from B VIII, 2 can be gained some idea of the speech made at Constantinople to the legates of Ariminum by Hilary.

L.11, 12 tantarum blasphemiarum - i.e. those of the creed of Nike.

L.9 "ex litteris vestris" L.13 "Hilarius nuntiaverit" - this distinction between the letter of the Easterns and Hilary's announcement is noteworthy. If Hilary had sent a letter[20], the Gallicans would have been bound to mention that this news had come in his letter, as distinct from that of the Easterns. The fact that they make the distinction between "ex litteris vestris" and "nuntiaverit" is evidence that Hilary was present in person at the council of Paris to give them this news. This view is strengthened by L.17-19 "professionem qui.. negavit".[21]

Notes.
20. As Coustant and Schiktanz assert.
21. It seems more reasonable to put the natural interpretation on "nuntiare", since there is no real objection to it, than to adopt the opinion of Schiktanz (p.40) who wishes it to be understood of a written communication.

L.14-15 ab his omnibus..gesta sunt - see the notes on p.43 L.18sq. and p.45 L.8sq.

L.15 Auxentium - Auxentius, bishop of Milan, was one of Hilary's strongest opponents in the West, and only a few years later Hilary was to have the worst of a controversy with him in Milan itself[22]. He became bishop after the expulsion of Dionysius in 355 and though at one time a member of the Semiarian party, he is usually associated with the Valens group.

Since Ursacius, Valens, Gaius, Megasius and Justinus were all legates of the synod of Ariminum, it is quite probable that Auxentius also acted in this capacity; he could be included in the "ceteris Ariminensis synodi legatis" B VIII, 1 p.174 L.6, 7.

et Ursacium ac Valentem - Ursacius and Valens were leading exponents of Arianism in the West and as such were in constant conflict with Hilary. They must have been born c.300 or even earlier because they were actively engaged in the controversy at the time of Arius' recall from exile. Indeed they probably adopted the Arian point of view from contact with Arius during the latter's exile in Illyricum. Essentially courtier bishops, despite various changes of fortune, they seem to have retained their influence at court almost to the end of their lives[23].

Like/

Notes.
22. see Hil. c. Aux.
23. The last mention of either of them in history tells how Valens obtained the recall of the Arian Eunomius from exile in 367 (Philost. H.E. IX, 8).

Like most of their party, though Arian at heart, they frequently changed their views outwardly to suit the times.

p.45 L.15 Gaium - Gaius is frequently mentioned along with Valens and Ursacius and presumably belonged like the others to the province of Illyricum[24]. A V, 1 proves his presence at Ariminum, and despite his condemnation there along with Ursacius, Valens and Germinius[25], he was a legate of the Western synod at Constantinople[26]. Later he associates himself with Valens, Ursacius and Paulus in the letter to Germinius[27].

L.16 Megasium et Iustinum - both were legates of the synod of Ariminum at Constantinople[28]. The latter is probably to be identified with the Justinus present at the synod of Nikê[29]. Megasius is mentioned in A VI, p.87 L.6 as being in the Valens group at Ariminum.

L.17 sq. iuxta fratris..negavit - the distinction made again[30] between the letter of the Easterns and the profession of Hilary is further proof for Hilary being present in person at this council of Paris.

L.18 horum L.20 eorum - i.e. Ursacius, Valens and the others.

Notes.
24. cf.Ath. Ep. ad Epictetum in Post Nicene Library vol.4 p.570 No LIX.
25. A IX, 3 cf A V, 3.
26. B VIII, 1.
27. B V.
28. B VIII, 1 p. 174 L.5,6.
29. A V, 3 p. 86 L.2.
30. cf.p.45 L.8,13.

L.19 blasphemias - cf L.12 note.

L.20 sacerdotes apostatas - Feder[31] and Schiktanz[32] are of the opinion that the phrase applies only to the depositions at Constantinople[33]. While there is no doubt that the bishops would be thinking especially of these recent happenings, there seems no reason why it should not have a wider reference to include all those unworthily elected to the sees of the exiled bishops e.g. Auxentius intruded in place of Dionysius who was exiled at Milan 355.

L.21,22 aut ignoratione aut impietate - it is possible that some of the persons elected to the sees of exiled bishops - and many of those agreeing with their election - would either not know the full facts of the case, or if they did, would not understand the complicated issues at stake and would accept the see in good faith; others - probably the majority - would accept the sees, fully aware of the sin they were committing.

L.23, 24 intra Gallias - the Council regards itself not as a mere provincial, but as a national one, claiming to speak for the whole of Gaul and asserting that its decisions are valid for the whole of Gaul. cf. p.46 L.4 ab omnibus Gallicanis episcopis. It seems very probable that there would be representatives from the whole of Gaul present at the Council.

Unlike/

Notes.
31. StudienIn.63.
32. p.40.
33. e.g. Eudoxius of Antioch took over the see of Macedonius of Constantinople (Socr. H.E. II, 42, 43. Soz. H.E. II, 24,25).

Unlike England, where the State adopted the Church's territorial arrangements, Gaul had early been highly developed into various districts for civil purposes by the State, so that when the Church in Gaul came to plan out its episcopate, it found an organisation already prepared for it.

At this time the chief civil divicions of the province of Gaul were: Narbonensis, Aquitaine, Lugdunensis, Belgica[34], and these were adopted by the Church in Gaul for her own organisation and administration after the Council of Antioch 341[35] and the Western synod of Sardica 342 which mediated the canons of Antioch to the West.

p.45 L.25 - p.46 L.1 neque enim.. iudicandus - transl. "For, not to mention other things, neither will he be judged worthy of sanctity in respect of the name of bishop (lit. office of bishop) who either permits an opportunity of preaching (sc.those blasphemies) by not condemning (them) or strives against God and the majesty of the only-begotten God, Christ, by thinking otherwise than as we think concerning the expression "omousion".

p.46, L.1-7 a quo (sc. sacerdotio)...fecerunt - in no other contemporary document is this incident concerning Saturninus mentioned. But in Sulp. Sev. Chron.II, 45 the following passage is found: "Resistebat sanis conciliis Saturninus Arelatensium episcopus, vir sane pessimus et ingenio malo prævoque.Verum etiam praeter haeresis infamiam multis atque infandis criminibus convictus,

Notes.

34. For further information see Duchesne Fastes Ep; "Breviarium ... Ruf. Festi"; Lavisse "Hist. de France" vol. 1 pt.II.

ecclesia electus est;" he may therefore have been relying on this letter for his information.

L.? Saturninum - Saturninus was the eighth bishop of Arles coming between Valentinus and Artemius. He first came into prominence when as bishop of Arles he presided at the council held there in 353 He alone, among all the leading Gallic bishops, supported the cause of Arianism. In 356 he was again president at the council of Beziers which exiled Hilary - the latter indeed regarded him as the chief perpetrator of his exile[36]. It is probable that he was one of the legates sent by the synod of Ariminum to the Emperor at Constantinople, cf. Hil. ad Const.II, 3.

L.2,3 iam Saturninum..iam litteras - the emphasis on the "iam" is noteworthy - already before this Saturninus has been condemned. So (1) there is no need to condemn him again - the previous condemnation still stands. (2) they have thus an earlier authority for the step they are now taking.
The previous condemnation of Saturninus is mentioned in (a) Hil. c. Const. 2 "After the exile of Paulinus, Eusebius, Lucifer, and Dionysius 5 years ago, along with the Gallican bishops I broke off communion with Saturninus, Valens and Ursacius ". (b) Hil. De Syn. 2 "After that, you had denied him (i.e. Saturninus) communion for the whole three years until now".

Notes.
36. Hil. De Syn. 2, ad Const.II, 3.

L.2 statutis salubribus - i.e. the Nicene creed.

L.3 secundum fratrum...litteras - these letters are not now preserved and so it is impossible exactly to determine their authors or the time of writing. They might have been written by Gallicans about the time of Beziers; or written to Hilary in exile and shown by him to the Easterns when at Constantinople.cf. Hil. De Syn. 2; or written from some of the provincial synods held in Gaul since Hilary's return from exile.

p.46 L.5 vetera...crimina - e.g. the part he had played in securing the exile of orthodox Gallican bishops such as Hilary[37].

L.6 epistolis suis - None of these letters have survived but it is probable that, just as the Nicenes were sending out letters in order to win support and strengthen their position (such as the one under discussion), so Saturninus would be doing the same. He would possibly be trying to make known as widely as possible the decrees of the Council of Constantinople 360.

CONCLUSION. This is a most interesting letter showing that despite the lack of knowledge on both sides and the doubts and suspicions purposely fostered by the Arians, some degree of understanding and agreement was still possible between East and West in face of the Arian danger. There is no doubt that the disasters at Constantinople 360 (of which another glimpse is given in B VIII)

Notes.
37. Hil. De Syn. 2.

precipitated this quest for an alliance. To orthodox Westerns and Semiarian Easterns a mutual alliance would seem the only way of counteracting the Homoean victory at Constantinople, and as great haste would be necessary to meet this critical situation, it is probable that the Easterns' letter was written and the synod of Paris held before the autumn of 360. The anger revealed in the Gallicans' letter concerning the events at Ariminum, Nikē and Constantinople indicates that the letter must have been written shortly after those councils, when the deceits practised by the Arians were still fresh in the public mind and the cause of much embarrassment and wrath in anti-Arian circles. The date 360 is also supported by the choice of Paris as the meeting-place for the Council. This city had only recently come into prominence because of the Caesar Julian's using it as his headquarters and favourite place of residence, and it seems reasonable to suppose that the Gallican bishops had chosen it in an effort to gain Julian's favour, when the latter was still in Gaul and had still not shown where his real sympathies lay.38.

From the contentsof the letter, it has been seen that the bishops addressed are Easterns who, though not wholly accepting the terms "usia" and "homoousios", still feel drawn to Western supporters of these terms through mutual opposition to & detestation of the Arian heretics, and are presumably representatives of the Semiarian party/

Notes.

38. For these reasons Blondell "Lib. de primatu" p.127-8 and Faber Praef. 18 P.L.X col 900-1 seem wrong in dating it 366 and 362 respectively.

party at Constantinople.

That the real inspiror of this council of Paris was Hilary is not doubted but there is considerable divergence of opinion as to whether Hilary himself was there in person or instigated it purely by letter. Faber[39], Reinkens[40], Gummerus[41] think he was present. Coustant[42], Viehhauser[43], Schiktanz[44] take the opposite view. According to Schiktanz the Easterns had written to Hilary while he was still at Constantinople and he in turn had sent their letter with one of his own to his Gallican brethren. But the Gallicans' letter (A I) gives no indication of this having happened, no reference is made to Hilary's absence from the council or to any letter written by him, indeed the three passages in which the Gallicans mention Hilary definitely give the impression that he was present[45].

The better explanation seems to be that Hilary had received the letter while at Constantinople (rather than had it sent to him as Reinkens p.248 asserts cf "credidistis" p.43 L.19), had carried it personally with him on his return from exile, and had made this letter a reason for the summoning of the Council of Paris, which he himself attended.

Schiktanz/

Notes.
39. Praef.18.
40. p.248, 250.
41. p.172-3.
42. P.L. X col. 709-710 note (d).
43. p.32.
44. p.40-1.
45. p.43 L.18,19 "ex litteris vestris..Hilario credidistis"; p.45 L.8,13 "ex litteris vestris..Hilarius nuntiaverit" (Schiktanz strains the meaning of "nuntiare" to cover a written communication, but even if this were so, one would still expect the additional "in litteris suis" in distinction to L.8); p.45 L.16,17 "secundum litteras vestras..Hilarius

Schiktanz is also of the opinion that the approach of "Homoousian" and "Homoiousian" fits the situation in Seleucia in t last months of 359. There is no doubt that Hilary had taken the opportunity at Seleucia to promote better relations between Nicene and Semiarian. But there is no reason to suppose that this work was not continued at Constantinople; indeed, as events proved, it became all the more urgent and necessary there.

As further support to his case, Schiktanz cites Sulpicius Severus' statement[46] that Hilary returned to his country by a roundabout way, and from this concludes that he would have sent hi communication to his Gallic brethren with more speed; the presump tion being that after a long exile and with Nicene affairs in such perilous plight Hilary was in no hurry to return home and had by inclination chosen this long route. This of the man whose anxiety and concern for his homeland is so strikingly demonstrated in his "De Synodis". The more reasonable explanation is that Hilary had chosen this roundabout journey not of his own free will - after his long exile he would naturally be anxious to return as quickly as possible to his own proper sphere of labour in order at such a grav crisis to conduct matters in person rather than merely by letter - the choice would be forced upon him by the unsettled political conditions of the time. The Persian war still disturbed the Empir and ordinary travelling would be disrupted. That he did not waste much time on the way home is proved by Martin's failure to contact him/

Notes.
46. in hic Vita Martini 6.

him at Rome and their meeting eventually only at Poitiers[47].

That Hilary was the inspiror of the council of Paris and was himself present is supported (1) from the internal evidence of the letter itself[48]; (2) by Sulpicius Severus' statement in his Chronicle II, 45 that Hilary held frequent councils in Gaul after his return from exile in order to combat Arianism.

Political conditions at this particular time favoured the work of reclamation and reconciliation to which Hilary and the other Gallican bishops set themselves and of which this council of Paris is a typical example. For in May 360 Julian, the Caesar of Gaul, revolted against the Emperor Constantius and thus was removed the principal source of Arian strength in the West. Julian showed an attitude of indifference towards the Nicene-Arian dispute, and without the imperial favour Arianism, which had never been very strong in Gaul, was bound to give way before determined Nicene attacks. Saturninus, as leader of the Arians in Gaul, was naturally the centre of attack, and with his fall the Arian party in Gaul was soon destroyed[49]. Though they had fallen at Ariminum, the majority of the Gallican bishops were not attracted by Arianism and renounced it at the earliest opportunity.

In/

Notes.

47. Sulp. Sev. Vita Martini 6,7.

48. e.g. in § 2 the evident care of the Westerns to show clearly what they mean by "homoousios" and "usia" and their anxiety to avoid a charge of Sabellianism is an exact parallel of Hilary's efforts in his "De Synodis" and of his conduct at Seleucia. It is also confirmed from the other passages already given where mention is made of him.

49. Sulp. Sev. Chron.II, 45.

In all this work Hilary took a leading part; Sulpicius Severus indeed claims that it was by his efforts alone that Gaul was cleansed from the Arian heresy.

This letter of the Gallican bishops, therefore, makes an important contribution towards our understanding of the Arian controversy in showing (1) that there was a possibility of union between East and West and of synthesis between "homoousios" and "homoiousios". (2) that Hilary had done something to remove the suspicions between Eastern Semiarians and Western Nicenes by his "De Synodis" and by his speech at Seleucia. (3) that Gaul at least was not overwhelmed by the disasters at Ariminum, Seleucia and Constantinople but was determined to overcome them, and still held firmly to the Nicene creed.

Throughout the whole letter, the insularity of the Gallic bishops is apparent. Their main interest is in Western affairs, in justifying themselves against the charge of Sabellianism, in explaining the fall at Ariminum and Nike, the bishops condemned have all direct connection with the West, and the only reference to Constantinople is in connection with the conduct of the legates of the council of Ariminum.

Series A II. Letter of Eusebius of Vercelli to Gregory of Elvira c.360.

SUMMARY.

(1) Eusebius compliments Gregory for his resistance to Ossius and his repudiation of the many bishops who fell at Arimimum and entered into communion with Valens, Ursacius and their party. He thanks him for his kind remembrance of him, exhorts him to remain steadfast in his defence of the Nicene faith and to renounce all relations with hypocrites, and on that condition promises him fellowship. (2) Now suffering his third exile, he tells how his own experience has shown him that the hope of the Arians lies not in themselves but solely in the imperial favour. He asks Gregory to write again and tell him how his work of restoration and reconciliation progresses. The letter ends with a salutation from all those present with Eusebius.

COMMENTARY.

This letter has been preserved only in Hilary's work. Besides Faber-Coustant, Baronius ad ann.357 n.XXXV has edited it. Various titles have been given to the letter through some MSS.[1] having been influenced by the form of the subscription[2],

p.46 L.11 sanctissimo - on this form see Conclusion.

Notes.
1. e.g. the one followed by Coustant.
2. see Feder p.46 L.11 note in app. crit.

Gregorio - the subscription reveals that this Gregory is a bishop of Spain and it is commonly accepted[3] that he is Gregory of Elvira (near Grenada). In the literature of his own time, Gregory's see is rarely mentioned; he is called only "episcopus Hispaniarum or Hispaniensis", but Jerome, De Vir. ill.105, gives: "Gregorius Baeticus, Eliberi episcopus". Little is known about the life of Gregory and very different estimates have been formed of him. Gams[4] has done a great deal of work on him but unfortunately this work is marred by his bias against Gregory. His main contention is that Ossius is free from the taint of heresy and he condemns Gregory as the author of what he considers to be calumnies against Ossius. According to Gams, Gregory fell into heresy at Ariminum, and he gives the following reasons in support of his view: (1) he rejects the claim of this letter of Eusebius to be considered in favour of Gregory on the ground that Eusebius' only source of information would be Gregory's own letter of self-condemnation. But it is evident from his letter to the Church at Vercelli[5] that Eusebius was in communication with other persons, and it therefore seems very unlikely that the only source of information available to him on the important events at Ariminum and Nikē was Gregory's letter. Also it is not apparent what advantage Gregory could hope to gain by thus deceiving Eusebius. Sooner or later the latter/

Notes.
3. e.g. Gams II, 256, Coustant col. 713 (b). Schihtanz p.42.
4. Kirchengeschichte von Spanien II, 256-9, 279-82, 310sq. Regensburg 1864.
5. in P.L. XII.

latter would discover the truth and condemn Gregory for his deception, and by impugning his authority and integrity, make it well-nigh impossible for him ever to take a leading part in church affairs in future. Internal evidence from the letter itself, too, seems to suggest that Eusebius has much fuller information about Gregory than he would obtain from a letter[6]. (2) he asserts that according to all other authorities, not one of the bishops of Ariminum stood firm. This is not quite accurate. Julian the Pelagian[7] states that about seven had remained faithful to Nicaea. But in any case there is no definite evidence that Gregory was at Ariminum. Gams' only basis for saying that he was is the rather shaky one of identifying him with the Gregorius mentioned among the legates at Nike[8]. It seems more reasonable to suppose that he was not present at Ariminum because (a) if he had been present and given way, he could never have risen to leadership of the Luciferian party. Even if his friends had been willing to overlook this lapse, his enemies would certainly not have been slow to take advantage of it. (b) if he had been present and resisted, he would almost certainly have been sent into exile, but in their "Libellus precum" Faustinus and Marcellinus make no mention of this, rather they state that he had never suffered this punishment[9]. Moreover the statement that he had refused his assent to very many who had fallen at Ariminum n

need/

Notes.

6. cf. note on p.46 L.19 "hoc vivis proposito" and L.22 "quibus potes tractatibus".
7. in Augustine "Imperf. Opus c.Iulianum I, 75 P.L.XLV.col.1101.
8. cf.A V, 3 p.86 L.2.
9. Lib. prec.10.

need not at all imply that Gregory was present in person at the Council.

Gams' theory must therefore be rejected. But there is no doubt that he is right in accepting the evidence of the "Libellus precum" as to the leading part played by Gregory in the Luciferian party[10]. Florez[11] is unwilling to allow this because of the many inaccuracies found in that book. In this case, however, its evidence is strengthened by a statement of Jerome in his Chronicle[12] where he associates Gregory with Lucifer of Cagliari and says that the latter with Gregorius, a Spanish, and Philo, a Libyan bishop, "nunquam se Arianae miscuit pravitati".

In his De vir. ill.105 Jerome has inserted the following notice about Gregory: "Gregorius Baeticus, Eliberi episcopus, usque ad extremam senectutem diversos mediocri sermone tractatus composuit, et de Fide elegantem librum, qui hodieque superesse dicitur". There has been much speculation as to the book "De Fide". The Bollandists[13] conclude "etiamnum latet". Ceillier[14] considers it to be a treatise variously ascribed to Gregory of Nazianzus, Ambrose, or Vigilius of Thapsus, which, however, is attributed to Phoebadius of Agen[15] and is printed among his works by Migne[16]. Gams[17] thinks that a treatise "De Trinitate", formerly ascribed to Gregory/

Notes.
10. eg. Lib. prec. 9, 10, 20, 25, 27.
11. Esp. Sagr. XII, 121 (Madrid 1704).
12. P.L. XXVII, 695.
13. Acta S.S. Ap.III, 270.
14. "Auteurs sacrés" VI, 59 (Paris 1737 ed).
15. Hist. litt. de la France I, pt.II, 273-276.
16. P.L. XX, 31.
17. p.314.

Gregory, though really written by Faustinus (of the Lib. prec.), is the work to which Jerome alludes. He considers that Jerome was misled by Gregory claiming the book as his own, which, according to his ideas, he could rightfully do. The ideal of the early Church, which Gregory wished to restore, included the right of common property, which could presumably cover writings. Gregory, then as head of the party, so Gams concludes, might claim a work composed by one of his followers. While the theory which attributes the "De fide" to Phoebadius of Agen has still its supporters[18], Wilmart and Morin have done much to discredit it and secure recognition for Gregory as the real author. Morin was also the first to attribute the "Tractatus Origenis" to Gregory and this was supported by Wilmart. The latter later rediscovered another work of Gregory viz. the "Tractatus in Canticis Canticorum", inserted by G. Heine in his "Bibliotheca anecdotorum"[19]. [20].

Thus have been recovered several of the tractates of Gregory long considered lost.

The date of Gregory's death is uncertain. If the "qui" in Jerome's statement[21] refers to Gregory himself and not to his book, he would still be alive c.392.

Notes.

18. e.g. Durengues "La question du "De fide" (Agen, 1909).
19. Leipzig 1848
20. see Wilmart in "Bull. Litt. Eccles. 1906 p.233sq. Morin in "Rev. d'hist. et de litt. rel.1900 p.145sq. and Rev. Ben.1902 p.229sq.
21. see above.

...5 L.11. Eusebius - that the Eusebius here mentioned is the ...hop of Vercelli is gathered both from the details given in the ...ter itself[22] and from the similarity of this letter with the ...ers known to have been written by Eusebius of Vercelli[23]. ...ebius of Vercelli stands in the forefront of the defenders of ... Nicene Creed in the middle of the fourth century. He was born ... Sardinia but the date of his birth is not known. His first ...pearance in history is as a "reader" a t Rome, and he became ...hop of Vercelli in 340. Nothing eventful seems to have taken ...lace in the first years of his episcopate, but in 354 he was asked ... Liberius of Rome to join Lucifer, Pancratius and Hilary in an ...bassy to Constantius to request the summoning of a council which ...ght decide the controversy between Nicene and Arian[24]. When ...is council was duly held in Milan 355, Eusebius, probably fore-...eing the result, was at first unwilling to attend but later ...hanged his mind after urgent entreaties from the Nicenes, Arians ...nd Constantius himself[25]. This urgency makes all the more ...trange the treatment he received when he did eventually arrive ...t Milan. For the first ten days after his arrival he was not ...llowed to enter the council, and when at last he was invited ...long with Lucifer, Pancratius and Hilary, he was immediately asked ...o sign a condemnation of Athanasius. Eusebius avoided this by ...roducing/

...otes.
...  e.g. his firm adherence to the Nicene faith, his three exiles.
...  P.L.XII.
...  Jaffé Reg. Pontif. I, 33.Mansi III, 204-5.
...  Mansi II, 237.

producing a copy of the Nicene creed and asking all to subscribe in order to remove all suspicion of heresy. This, of course, threw the council into confusion, and, to avoid similar occurrences, its subsequent meetings were held in the imperial palace[26]. There, through imperial pressure, the Arians were able to secure the exile of Eusebius and the others who had remained loyal to Athanasius. Eusebius was exiled to Scythopolis in Syria where a leading Arian, Patrophilus, was bishop. Later he was transferred to Cappadocia and then to Egypt. This letter to Gregory was written during his exile in the Thebaid in Egypt[27]. After the accession of Julian and the general amnesty which followed, Eusebius went to Alexandria where he met Athanasius. He took a leading part in the synod which met there in 362 and was sent to Antioch with a letter from the council to the Antiochenes concerning the schism there. Unfortunately, however, Lucifer of Cagliari had arrived at Antioch before him and complicated issues by electing a rival bishop, Paulinus. The result was that Eusebius had to leave with his mission unaccomplished. After a tour of the Eastern churches, he went to Illyria and then to Italy where he joined forces with Hilary in an attempt to re-establish the Nicene faith. Jerome places his death in 371.

There are three letters of Eusebius extant[28] (1) a brief answer to/

Notes.

26. Hil. Lib. I ad Const. § 3 p.186sq. Ath. Hist. Ar.76 Sulp. Sev. Chron.II, 39.
27. cf. p.47 L.1 tertio laborantes exilio.
28. see P.L.XII.

to Constantius saying he would attend the council of Milan. (2) one to the Church at Vercelli describing his treatment at Scythopolis(3) the present one to Gregory of Elvira.

L.13 Sinceritatis - according to Soutar[29] "sinceritas" in titles is usually addressed by a superior to an inferior ecclesiastic. At the time of Ossius' fall, Gregory is described as a "rudis episcopus" and is practically unknown[30]. In A VIII, 1 p.94 L.5 Constantius thus addresses the Italian bishops assembled at Ariminum.

Gregory's letter no longer survives.

L.14 transgressori...Ossio - Ossius (or Hosius) of Cordova in Spain was one of the most distinguished leaders of the orthodox party in the first half of the fourth century. He is thought to have been born about the middle of the third century but it is not known when he became bishop. In the early part of his episcopate he attended several small synods, though he was not present at Arles 314. He had the great honour of presiding both at the council of Nicaea and later at that of Sardica. Nothing is heard of him for some time after Sardica, but with the renewal of Arian fortunes in the middle of the century he became a main target of attack. At first he remained staunch to the Nicene Creed/

Notes.
29. Glossary of Later Latin p.379.
30. Marc. and Faust. Ep.II, 34 p.15 C.SE.L. XXXV.

creed[31] but later succumbed to Arian pressure. About the middle of 357 a second great synod of Sirmium was summoned. According to Soz. IV, 12 all the members were Western bishops, with the Arians, Valens, Ursacius and Germinius, in command. They issued the "second Sirmian" creed, which was openly Arian in tone[32] and it is this creed which Ossius is said to have subscribed[33]. This is what is referred to in the phrase "transgressor Ossius" cf. Lib. prec. 34[34]. Ath. Hist. Ar. 45 asserts that he renounced this weakness and anathematised the Arian heresy before his death. In this same book, written in 358, Athanasius mentions his death, so this must have taken place shortly before. He seems to have been about one hundred years old when he died and had been bishop for more than sixty years[35].

L.14,15 cadentibus plurimis Arimino - cf. A V, VI, VIII, IX, B VIII. For "cadentibus" see the Conclusion. The bishops referred to here are probably Spanish bishops with whom Gregory would have contact when they returned home after the council of Ariminum.

L.15 Valentis, Ursacii - see note on them A I p.45 L.15.

L.16 quos ipsi.. damnaverunt - After rejection of their heretical creed, the synod of Ariminum on 21st. July 359[36] condemned as heretics and deposed Ursacius, Valens, Germinius and Gaius.

Notes.
31. cf. his letter to Constantius in Ath. Hist. Ar.44.
32. Hil. De Syn. 11. Ath. De Syn. 28. Socr. II, 30.
33. Socr. II, 31 Soz.IV, 12. Ath. Hist. Ar. 45 Apol.c.Ar.89,90; Apol. de Fuga 5.
34. C.S.E.L. XXXV p.15.
35. Ath. Hist. Ar.42,45. Sulp. Sev. II,55.
36. A IX, 3 p.96 L.14.

L.18 sq. gratulamur tibi etc - Eusebius feels that through this strong action of Gregory the sacrifices of exile are not in vain. He rejoices that there are still bishops able to resist the Arian heresy.

L.19 quia hoc vivis proposito - this phrase seems to support the view that Eusebius had other sources of information in addition to Gregory's letter. He could not have made this statement if he had been relying solely on that letter. cf. Gams in note on Gregorio L.11.

L.19, 20 Nostri dignatus es meminisse - Jerome[37] relates that after the synod of Ariminum many bishops wrote letters of consolation to those confessors who, because of their defence of Athanasius were in exile.[38]

L.21 Ypocritis - "Hypocrites" in so far as their acceptance of the creed of Nikē was one given only under imperial pressure and renounced as soon as this was removed. The success of Hilary and Eusebius of Vercelli in restoring the fallen bishops may be cited as further proof of this.

L.22 tractatibus - cf. note on Gregorio L.11.

Notes.
37. adv. Lucif. 19 P.L.XXIII, 172 c.
38. see Conclusion on tone of such phrases as this and p.47 L.8, 9 dignare nobis scribere.

L.23 de regno saeculari - see note on p.47 L.2 - 4.

p.47 L.1 tertio laborantes exilio - after the council of Milan 355, Eusebius was exiled first to Scythopolis in Syria[39], then to Cappadocia[40], and lastly to Egypt[41].

L.2-4 quoniam omnis spes..regni saecularis - this statement is certainly true of the West. The few leading Arians in the West, such as Saturninus of Arles, were able to retain their sees only because of the support of the Emperor; with the removal of imperial favour through the death of Constantius, the strength of Arianism in the West vanished and it did not long survive. Auxentius, who remained at Milan until his death in 374, must have been one of the last survivors of Arianism in the West. In the East, as in the West, court influence and intrigue played a part, but the situation in the East as a whole was rather different. The East was genuinely interested in the theological problems and wranglings of the various groups, Nicene, Arian, Semiarian, and Eastern bishops were not content to rely on one creed as the final, once-for-all statement of the Church's faith, but were ever searching for new and fuller statements of the truth. The result was that many Eastern bishops, who supported Arianism, accepted it not merely temporarily on grounds of expediency as a theological/

Notes.
39. see Eusebius' letter P.L.XII, col 947sq.
40. Jerome De vir. ill. 96.
41. Ruf. H.E. I, 27. According to Socr.III, 5 and Theod.III, 2 he was living in Upper Thebaid.

theological system thrust upon them against their will by the imperial power, but because they genuinely believed in it and accepted it on its own merits. In this lies one of the reasons for the Homoean supremacy established at Constantinople lasting in the East for almost twenty years. To very many Eastern bishops the Homoean system was not a mere imperial creed but was sincerely regarded as a safe and reverent formula of faith. That the strength of the Arians lay wholly in the protection afforded them by the imperial power is also asserted in Eusebius' letter to the presbyters and people of Italy[42].

L.3 in suo haud unito consensu - in theory the Arians might still be regarded as a party composed of a variety of "splinter-groups", held together only by their common hatred of Athanasius and the Nicene creed, but for all practical purposes the Homoeans had established a complete supremacy at Constantinople and thus achieved a large degree of unanimity.

L.7 in passionibus perdurare cupimus - an account of his sufferings in exile is given by Eusebius P.L. XII, 950sq.

L.8, 9 dignare nobis scribere - see Conclusion on tone of this phrase cf.p.46 L.19sq.

Notes.
42. P.L. XII, 950.

[illegible], 10 quid malos..correxeris - Eusebius distinguishes three [illegible]ups of bishops (1) the wicked who have consented to the decrees [illegible] Ariminum and have therefore to be corrected. (2) those who [illegible]ve remained steadfast (3) those who are in need of warning and [illegible]vice lest they should be ensnared by the deceits of Ariminum [illegible] by the bishops who have already fallen.
In all probability this is a reference to Gregory's work in his [illegible]meland[43].

[illegible]9sq. salutant te omnes sq. - see Conclusion on similarity of ending [illegible]tween this letter and that of Eusebius to the Church of Vercelli[44].

[illegible]11 Diaconus - because of this similarity in ending, Saltet thinks [illegible]e better reading is "diaconus". But the endings are in no way [illegible]tly the same and there seems no reason why it should not refer [illegible] a particular person called "Diaconus", as in several inscriptions. [illegible]e may indeed have been the one who gave Eusebius the additional [illegible]formation about Gregory[45].

[illegible]13, 14 Gregorium episcopum Spanensem - mention has already been [illegible]de of the rarity with which Gregory's see is designated in the [illegible]erature/

[illegible]es.

. In the business of correcting the fallen bishops Eusebius would follow the ruling of the Council of Alexandria 362 which recommended generous treatment except to the extreme Arians.

. P.L.XII, 954.

. see previous notes. In Corp. Inscr.Lat.III, 2654 and Carm. epiph. 768 and 1789 "Diaconus" appears as a proper name.

literature of his time. He is usually given the title "episcopus Hispaniarum or Hispaniensis"[46]. cf."Ossius, bishop of Spain" in Eus. V.C.III, 7 and Socr. H.E. I, 8.

CONCLUSION.

From Eusebius' statement that he is now in his third exile, it follows that this letter must have been written from the Upper Thebaid in Egypt[47] some time between the end of the council of Ariminum and the general amnesty granted by Julian on his accession in 361. The reference to the Arians placing their hopes in the worldly power[48] can refer only to Constantius' reign.

Saltet[49] and Chapman[50] have attempted to prove that this letter is a Luciferian forgery. According to Saltet, the letter was forged to give publicity to the strong Luciferian Gregory by placing him under the patronage of Eusebius, the renowned defender of the Nicene faith, thus creating the impression that before the Council of Alexandria had committed him to a definite policy, Eusebius had given his approval to Gregory and his "uncompromising attitude". But the letter itself contradicts this opinion simply because it faces/

Notes.
46. "Spanensis" is from the shortened form "Spania".
47. cf.note p.47 L.1.
48. cf.p.47 L.2sq.
49. Bull. Litt. Eccles. 1905 p.225sq and 1906 p.300sq.
50. Rev. Ben. 1910 p.326-7.

faces a different situation from that dealt with by the council of Alexandria and similar councils and out of which the Luciferian schism arose. The Luciferians objected to the leniency shown by bishops who fell at Ariminum and later repented of their fall. In Eusebius' letter there is no sign that the "transgressor" Ossius and the other fallen bishops had YET repented. The Luciferians could therefore gain no advantage from Eusebius' approval of Gregory because it was given in a totally different situation and was in no way incompatible with the policy of the Council of Alexandria. The "uncompromising attitude" praised by Eusebius is Gregory's resistance to heresy, not his resistance to fallen, but repentant bishops.

Saltet further argues that the placing together of the letter of the Council of Paris and this letter to Gregory is not fortuitous. On the basis of a statement in Augustine's "Contra Parmenianum" I, 7[51] that councils were held in Spain and Gaul with regard to Ossius and on the assumption that this is the only council we know of held in Gaul between 359 and 384, Saltet concludes that this Council of Paris must have absolved the memory of Ossius. Now, he continues, since the principal object of Eusebius' letter is to encourage Gregory in his opposition to Ossius, the decision of the Council of Paris on Ossius must have been suppressed by the forger and this letter substituted in its place.

But/

Notes.

51. P.L. XLIII, col. 38.

But again Saltet's argument is unconvincing for although the council of Paris is the only one of which we have now record, it was not the only one held in Gaul at that time. Sulpicius Severus, Chron. II, 45 mentions several such councils. Nor is there anything in the only document which has survived from the council of Paris[52] that gives the slightest justification for presuming that it had dealt with the case of Ossius. Secondly, even a cursory reading of the letter shows how ill-founded is Saltet's assertion that the principal object of Eusebius' letter is to encourage Gregory in his opposition to Ossius. Apart from the statement at the beginning of the letter, where Ossius is classed with the other fallen bishops, no more mention is made of him. Gregory is encouraged to stand firm in face of all heretics, but Ossius is mentioned by name probably because both he and Gregory were Spanish bishops. Another reason given by Saltet in support of his theory is that, according to the letter, Eusebius in 360-361 still does not know of Ossius' death whereas Gregory could not have avoided mentioning this if he had written to Eusebius.
But again there is nothing in the letter to suggest that Ossius was still thought of as alive. Besides, this was not the primary concern of the writer. The important point was that Ossius had fallen and Eusebius' main interest was in the constancy of Gregory, who, though only a "rudis episcopus", had not allowed himself to be influenced/

Notes.
52. viz. A I.

influenced by the fall of the most prominent Spanish bishop of that time.

Then Saltet brings objections to the style, tone and various phrases in the letter. (1) he asserts that the use of the word "sanctissimus" (p.46 L.11) is evidence for a later date of composition because this word is not often used in the fourth century. But Eusebius' jubilation both on account of the receipt of Gregory' letter and of the latter's conduct is sufficient justification for this form. (2) according to Saltet the use of "cadentibus" (p.46 L.14,15) supposes Gregory's presence at the council of Ariminum whereas the "Libellus precum"[53] implies that he was not there. Apart from the fact that a Luciferian forger would have been careful not to contradict the "Libellus precum", the context makes it seem certain that the Present Participle is used here of an event which has very recently taken place, owing to the difficulty of expressing the Past Participle active with a verb like "cadere".

(3) Saltet argues that the excessive adulation, the complimentary tone and effacement characterising the letter to Gregory are alien to the rude, brusque style of the other letters of Eusebius and hardly accord with the style that would be used by the prominent bishop Eusebius to the still young and unknown Gregory.

But it can be safely argued that any difference in style and tone between this and the other letters of Eusebius is satisfactorily explained/

Notes.

53. P.L. XIII, 91 A.

explained by the different circumstances and subjects. The accommodating style of the letter to Gregory is understandable in view of the circumstances in which it was written. The exiled Eusebius would naturally be overwhelmed when the sorry news of Ariminum reached him, but his joy on discovering that there were still some bishops who remained constant to the Nicene creed would be unbounded and explains the tone of his letter.

(4) Saltet then proceeds in the opposite direction and attempts to prove the forgery from the similarity of ending, of ideas and of characteristic expressions with the other attested letters of Eusebius. This letter to Gregory, he concludes, is a gross imitation of the others. It seems more natural to accept these similarities as evident signs of authenticity cf. Gams. op. cit. p.256sq., 279sq.

Saltet's theory must therefore be rejected and the letter of Eusebius to Gregory treated as genuine and authentic. According to Jerome[54], after the synod of Ariminum many bishops wrote letters of consolation to those confessors who, because of their defence of Athanasius and the Nicene creed, were in exile. Gregory's letter to Eusebius comes into this category. The answering letter encouraging Gregory to defend the orthodox faith is the natural reply of the experienced Eusebius to a young bishop who promises to be a valient upholder of the Nicene faith.

Chapman[55] can not see any reason why Hilary should have inserted this/

Notes.
54. adv. Lucif. 19 P.L.XXIII, 172 c.
55. op. cit.

this letter in his collection. Surely it is sufficient reason that, by the example of two Western bishops at this time of crisis, it showed that there were still some in the West who refused to be intimadated by the disasters at Ariminum and had still the courage to resist the Arians.

Series A III. The Creed of Germinius.c.366-7.

SUMMARY. Germinius confesses his belief in the one true God the Father and in Christ His only-begotten Son our Lord Who is like in everything to the Father, and in the Holy Spirit the Paraclete Who is given to us from God the Father through the Son.

COMMENTARY. The creed of Germinius has been preserved only in this collection. It is found in the various editions, in Hahn "Symbole" § 192(3rd.Ed.) and in Baronius ad ann.359 n.XXIX.[1]

p.47 L.16 epistula - Stilting[2] rejects this fragment as spurious because its inscription does not agree with its contents - "and neither is it a letter nor does Germinius make a dissertation against the Arians". In answer to this objection it may be replied (1) that the authenticity of B V and VI has never been questioned and this Creed fits perfectly into the situation there depicted and agrees closely with the statements made in B VI; (2) that an alternative and reasonable explanation of the discrepancy between title and contents is that an explanatory letter, which at one time accompanied the creed, has now dropped out. That such a letter was necessary, is proved from B VI where the deception of Valens and his associates with regard to the phrase "per omnia" is/

Notes.
1. Baronius wrongly places the creed in 359; a more probable date is the end of 366 or the beginning of 367 - see conclusion.
2. Acta s.s. Sept. VI, 575.

is revealed. In this letter Germinius would probably recount the happenings at Sirmium (359) and Ariminum and thus uphold his own position.

L.16 Germini - Germinius was first of all bishop of Cyzicus, the metropolis of the Hellespontine province, and was later translated by Constantius in 356 to Sirmium in Pannonia, on the high road from Aquileia which passed through Naissus and Constantinople[3]. Shortly after his translation he took part in the council of Sirmium 357 at which for the first time since Nicaea Arianism had dared to declare itself publicly. He was also present at the council of Sirmium 359, in which Arians and Semiarians participated[4]. Later he left the Valens group and adopted the Semiarian position[5].

L.16 Arrianos - Germinius is thinking particularly of the Valens group.cf. B V, VI.

L.17 Qui - Coustant[6] is of the opinion that Faber was wrong in suggesting "qui" here because the subject should be, not the Arians, but either those who were unwilling to rescind their evil action at Ariminum or those who had taken part at Sirmium in 358. The evidence furnished by B VI, however, makes Coustant's view untenable. It seems more correct to retain the "qui" and refer the deception implied in L.17,18 to the action of Valens and his confederates/

Notes.
3. Ath. Hist. Ar. 74.
4. B VI § 3.
5. cf. A III B V B VI.
6. P.L. X col 717 (d).

confederates at Nikē in describing the Son as ὅμοιος τῷ πατρὶ κατὰ τὰς γραφάς without the addition of the important κατὰ πάντα as given in the 4th Sirmian Creed 359[7]. It was the chief accusation of Germinius against Valens and his associates that they had forgotten or tried to conceal, their former acceptance of the Dated Creed containing the all important phrase κατὰ πάντα ; and they had first attempted this deception at Nikē, allowing the phrase κατὰ τὰς γραφάς but artfully omitting κατὰ πάντα cf. L VI. §3. In accordance with this interpretation, the "qui" refers to "Arrian

L.17 subscripserant in concilio Ariminensi - this refers to Valens and Ursacius securing recognition of their heretical Nikē creed by the whole council of Ariminum.

L.17,18 scientes quod male fecerunt - Valens, Ursacius and the other leading Arians were fully aware of the sin and deceit of which they were guilty in issuing their creed and of the deceitful means used to obtain its acceptance by the council of Ariminum[8].

L.19,20 unum verumdeum - cf. the μονον καὶ ἀληθινον Θεον of the Dated Creed. According to Gwatkin[9] this phrase was new in the conservative series of creeds, though it is found in the Antiochene creed/

Notes.

7. i.e. the Dated Creed of Pentecost Eve, May 22,359 drawn up by Mark of Arethusa; originally composed in Latin (Hahn p.2o4 n.249) but surviving now only in Greek.
8. cf. Socr. H.E. II,37 Soz H.E. IV, 19. Theod. H.E. II, 21 Sulp. Sev. Hist. Sacr. II, 43sq.
9. Studies p. 171 n.3.

creed of Cassian, was used by Asterius and defended by Eusebius against Marcellus. In itself it could be interpreted to indicate the inferiority of the Son because logically it implies that the Son is not true God.

L.21 unicum - Tertullian uses both "unigenitus" and "unicus" as renderings of the Greek μονογενης [10]. But the customary Old Latin translation apparently was "unicus" [11] and this is the word used in most native Latin creeds [12]. "Unigenitus" is usually found in Latin translations of Greek creeds and indeed it owes its eventual prevalence to the influence of the Greek-speaking East upon the Latin theological controversies of the fourth century.

L.21,22 de vero deo patre verum dei filium - this phrase is not quite the equivalent of the Nicene τον υἱον του θεου..... θεον ἐκ θεου, and in itself might leave a loop-hole for the Arians who could also designate Christ as Son of God and affirm that He comes from the Father (i.e. from the Father's will) but would add "as do all other creatures". This interpretation, however, is prevented by what follows in L.22-24.

L.22 Ante omnia genitum - the Lucianic (i.e. 2nd. Antioch 341) formula/

notes.

10. e.g. in adv. Prax.15 where he quotes John 1,14 and 1,18 he uses "unigenitus; in adv. Prax.21 where he quotes John 3,16 he uses "unicus".
11. cf. Novatian, Hil., Mar. Victorinus, Jerome.
12. e.g. the Sirmian creed of 357.

formula has "begotten before the ages from the Father".
The 4th Sirmian has "begotten before all ages and before all origin and before all conceivable time and before all comprehensible essence". "Ante omnia saecula genitum" would have been the more usual expression but Germinius probably felt that by expressing it in absolute terms he gave no opening whatever to the Arians.

p.47 L.22-23 divinitate..scientia - most of these attributes are to b e found in the other creeds of this period e.g. the 2nd. Antioch has θεοτης, δυναμις, δοξη; the 3rd. Antioch has δυναμις, σοφια; the 4th Antioch has σοφια, δυναμις, ζωη, φως; Seleucia 359 has φως, ζωη, σοφια, δυναμις.
L.23 per omnia similem - ὁμοιος κατα παντα and ὁμοιουσιος had become the watchwords of the Semiarian conservatives, who, while emphatically opposed to extreme Arianism, also found disturbing Sabellian elements in the Nicene use of the word ὁμοουσιος. The 4th Sirmian 359 creed had described the Son as ὁμοιος τῳ πατρι κατα τας γραφας and ὁμοιος τῳ πατρι κατα παντα [13] Valens, Ursacius and their followers had subscribed this creed, but almost immediately afterwards at Nikē had omitted the latter and more important phrase. By this means they were able to give an Arian interpretation to the former phrase, namely, that the Son was like in part and unlike in part.

Notes.
13. cf. B VI, § 3.

This deceit on the part of Valens and the others may indeed have been one of the reasons for Germinius' change of mind[14].

L.24 perfectum de perfecto genitum - cf. the τελειον ἐκ τελειου of the Lucianic creed. This phrase disappeared in the transition from the Eusebian phase of Eastern conservatism, which emphasised the distinction of the Lord' personality, to the Semiarian, which stressed His essential likeness to the Father and preferred the phrases ὁμοιουσιος and ὁμοιος κατα παντα.
Germinius' use of both sets of phrases in his creed might be indicative of a movement at this time to combine elements from the two systems, the old Eusebian and the more recent Semiarian.

The creed continues with a confession of the remaining articles found in the traditional "regula fidei", birth from the virgin Mary, foretold in the Old and fulfilled in the New Testament, passion, death (though no mention of the burial or descent into Hell) resurrection, ascension and the last judgment. Finally comes a brief confession of faith in the Holy Spirit, the Paraclete In its brevity this assertion of belief in the Holy Spirit resemble the Western attitude to this article of faith, but the formula "qui .. a deo patre per filium datus est" is the normal Greek one. Except for bishops like Hilary, who had been influenced by Eastern theological thought, the West as a whole simply asserted that the Holy Spirit is the one God likewise. But in the East matters were more/

...es.
14. see later B VI.

more complicated and there was much speculation on this question. When forced eventually through hatred of the Arians to compromise with the Nicenes on the relation of the Father and Son in the Godhead, some Semiarians[15] tried to find consolation in developing a doctrine of the Holy Spirit, which embodied their favourite principle of subordination. On the other hand, at the council of Alexandria 362 it was asserted that whoever regards the Holy Spirit as a creature and separates Him from the substance of Christ in so doing divides up the Holy Trinity, gives a hypocritical adherence to the Nicene faith and only in appearance renounces Arianism[16]. Others again asserted that the statement that the Spirit is from the Father and from the Son[17] means that the Spirit is a creation of the Son, is therefore double caused. To avoid this they adopted the formula "the Spirit is from the Father through the Son", the one used by Germinius in his creed.

CONCLUSION. The creed of Germinius takes as its basis the 4th Sirmian or Dated Creed of 359 and plainly shows that he has now given his adherence to the Semiarian party. The actual date of composition cannot be fixed but is has close connections with B V and /

Notes.

15. e.g. Macedonius of Constantinople who defended the doctrine that the Spirit is a creature similar to the angels and subordinate to the Father and Son.
16. cf. Ath. Tom. ad Antioch 3; 5.
17. This came to be the Western doctrine-"a patre filioque".

and B VI. It is, however posterior to both because in neither B V nor B VI, is there any knowledge of it or reference made to it; indeed, had it been published earlier, B V and B VI would have been unnecessary. Coustant[18] thinks that the creed is the occasion for the writing of the letter B V. But Faber[19] is right in making it an answer to that letter. Valens and his party could not possibly have had any doubts as to Germinius' position if he had already published such a creed before they wrote their letter. The creed is therefore to be placed at the end of 366 or the beginning of 367 and must have been one of the very last documents collected by Hilary.

Notes.

18. P.L. X col 717-8 (c) and (e).
19. P.L. X col 901-2 § 20.

Series A IV, 1. Letter of the Eastern bishops at Sardica, 342.

SUMMARY. (1) This letter from the 80 Eastern bishops at Sardica is addressed directly to several bishops whose sees and names are given, and then generally to all the bishops, presbyters and deacons of the Church. It opens with an affirmation that the tradition of the Church, particularly with regard to the appointment and deposition of bishops, should be preserved. (2) Then it launches an attack upon Marcellus who is condemned as a heretic for denying the eternity of the Son and His eternal Kingdom in personal utterances and in his infamous book; included in this condemnation are his supporters Protogenes of Sardica and Cyriacus of Naisus. (3) To add weight to their action they cite the example of the council held at Constantinople under Constantine in 336 where Marcellus was deposed and Basil substituted as bishop of Ancyra.

(6) Similarly, all the old accusations against Athanasius are brought forward and use is made of his condemnation by the councils of Tyre and Antioch.

(9) In the original letter there followed a section on Paul of Constantinople and the terrible acts he committed after his return from exile, but this part is now lost. When the text resumes, it is again dealing with Marcellus. (10) Then, after brief mention of the evil deeds of Asclepas at Gaza and Lucius at Adrianople, the Easterns return to the attack on Athanasius, assert that a conciliar decree against him cannot be altered and that Julius and the/

the Italian bishops, previously deceived into accepting him into communion, are now, because of their own rashness, unwilling to abandon him. (11) The judges who worthily condemned him, however, were not deceived, and their decision is confirmed by the fact that Athanasius and Marcellus are now in league with men like Asclepas, Paul and Lucius, whose evil acts are known to all. The Easterns declare that these men are now cunningly demanding a new trial, not in the lands where they committed their crimes but in foreign parts, and (12) trying to introduce a new law that Eastern bishops should be judged by Westerns. Not that these men had always been in accord with each other. (13) Athanasius, while still bishop, had condemned the deposed Asclepas, and Marcellus too had not communicated with him. Paul also had subscribed Athanasius' deposition. But now they are all united in one conspiracy. (14) In the hope of securing a fresh and more favourable judgment after the death of some of his accusers and judges, Athanasius had gone into Italy and Gaul, obtained the support of Julius, Maximinus, Ossius and others, and through their efforts the council had been summoned at Sardica. On the command of the Emperor, they themselves (i.e. the Easterns) hastened to Sardica, but, when they found Ossius and Protogenes in communion with Athanasius and Marcellus, (15) they demanded that the latter, as condemned bishops, should be excluded from the assembly and the former decisions concerning them heard again. This request was refused. (17) They made repeated pleas to them, but they would not listen. (18) They offered to send an embassy to inquire into the charges/

charges brought against Athanasius, but they were afraid to adopt this plan. (20) Then they give a list of men formerly condemned and now present at Sardica - Dionysius of Elis, Bassus of Dioclecianopolis, Actius of Thessalonica - (22) and accuse their opponents of trying to terrify them into joining the council by means of Imperial letters. (23) In view of these circumstances they declare their resolve to return home and to write from Sardica their account of what has happened, for they could not receive Athanasius and Marcellus as bishops again. (24) They request the bishops to whom they write not to have communion with Ossius, Protogenes, Athanasius, Marcellus, Asclepas, Paul, Julius and their associates and neither to write them nor receive letters from them. (26) They repeat that the old custom of the Church should be preserved, that Westerns should have no power to overthrow decisions taken by Eastern bishops and vice versa. (27) According to the most ancient law the whole council has condemned Julius, Ossius, Protogenes, Gaudentius and Maximinus as leaders in advocating communion with Marcellus, Athanasius and the other criminals, condoning the cruel acts of Paul of Constantinople and (28) introducing a new heresy of Marcellus mingled with Sabellius and Paul. In conclusion they ask the addressees to give their consent and subscription to these decrees.

COMMENTARY. A IV, 1,2,3 have been preserved only in this collection although a short account is found in Socr. H.E.II,20. In addition to the Faber-Constant edition and Bar. ad ann. 347 n.LXXV sqq., A IV, 1 is found also in the following conciliar collections, Binius I, 448 sq., Labbe-Cossart II, 699-710, Harduin I, 671-681, Coleti II, 731-741, Mansi III, 126-137.

p.48 L.9 sinodi Orientalium - this synod is mentioned by Socr.II,20, $So_z$. H.E.III,11, Nicephorus Call.E.H. IX, 12, Aug. c.Cresc.3,34: 4,44, Ep.44 c.3 §6; its importance lies in the fact that here, for the first time since Nicaea 325, the Eastern Eusebians (called thus from their leader Eusebius of Nicomedia) come forward in open opposition to the Nicene party as such.

Apud Serdicam - this form of the name is found only here in this collection. In the Fragments as a whole, four forms are found: Sardica, Serdica, Sardicia, and Serdicia. Turner[1] states that "Serdica" is the form generally used in the fourth century. There has been some controversy as to the actual place of composition of this letter. According to Socr. II,20, the Easterns separated themselves from the Westerns, met at Philippopolis, and there wrote and issued their letter, rejecting the Nicene watchword "homoousios" and adopting the Arian "anomoios" formula. But for several reasons this evidence of Socrates is suspect.

First/

Notes.

1. J.T.S. XII, 1911, p.275sq.

first of all, the Easterns themselves address their letter from Sardica[2]. On the assumption that p.60 L.28,29 "quique vulgo omnibusque GENTIBUS id quod inter nos fuerat referebant" refers to the encyclical of the Westerns, Tillemont[3] and Ceillier[4] maintain that the Easterns here contradict themselves because this encyclical speaks of the previous departure of the Easterns from Sardica[5]. But this assumption is by no means certain; and indeed the better reading is"GENTILIBUS," which agrees with what precedes and with a previous statement that Athanasius had promoted heathens to bishoprics.

Secondly, in his "De Synodis" 34, Hilary makes no criticism of Sardica as the place from which the creed was issued, and in his c. Const.25 he calls this Eusebian assembly expressly the Sardican synod.

Thirdly, Soz.H.E.III,11,12 states clearly that the Easterns issued their letter from Sardica[6].

Fourthly, Socrates is wrong in saying that they condemned the "homoousios" and adopted the anomoian formula in their letter. So far from this being the case, they actually anathematise the chief point of the Anomoean doctrine viz: that the Son is "ex alia substantia" from the Father (p.72 L.4). Their creed has scarcely even/

Notes.

2. p.63 L.2.
3. Mem VI, art.39 p.142 ed.Brux.
4. Hist. gen. IV, 699sq. 1733 ed.
5. cf. B II, 1 § 2, 3.
6. He makes the Philippopolitan synod precede the one at Sardica. B II, 1 § 7 gives evidence for the Easterns holding synods on their way to Sardica.

even a trace of Semiarianism in it, and Hilary in his "De Synodis" 34sq. interprets it in an orthodox sense.

Fifthly, the assertion[7] that the Easterns intended to deceive the readers of their encyclical by representing it as the genuine product of Sardica, and that this was particularly successful in Africa where, as a result of this deceit, only a Semiarian council of Sardica was known, is unfounded. It is true that to counter the presence of the orthodox bishop of Carthage, Gratus, at Sardica, the Easterns sent their encyclical to the Donatist bishop of Carthage and the Donatists later referred to this, asserting that the synod of Sardica had recognised them. Then Augustine[8] states that "Sardicense concilium Arianorum fuit", and Coustant and the others conclude from this that he knew only of an Eusebian synod of Sardica and nothing of an orthodox one. But even if this was the case, it certainly was not the result of the Eusebians' cunning in dating their letter from Sardica, for in the contents of the letter itself the fact of a Western assembly meeting simultaneously at Sardica is by no means concealed. Furthermore, a canon of the council of Carthage I gives evidence of the Africans having knowledge of/

Notes.

7. cf. Coustant P.L.X col.658 (k); Bar ad ann.347 n.LXII c 72-4, 96-98. Ceillier IV p.698-9. Till.l.c.
8. c. Cresc.III,34, IV, 44. Ep.44 ad Eleusium c 3 § 6.

of a Western synod of Sardica[9].

The evidence then seems in favour of the view that the Easterns drew up this letter before they left Sardica[10] and they inscribed it thus, considering themselves to be the true synod of Sardica[11]. Sardica (today Sofia in Bulgaria) was the chief city of the province of Lower Dacia in the Prefecture of Eastern Illyricum. Philippopolis (so-called today and also in Bulgaria) lay a short distance south-east of Sardica and was for some time metropolis of Northern Thrace.

p.48 L.10 a parte Arrianorum - this phrase shows that the title is not an integral part of the letter but has been added by the editor/

Notes.

9. Lauchert "Die Kanones der wichtigsten altkirchlichen Concilien p.154 Carthage I Canon VI:- Nicasius episcopus Culusitanus dixit: Credo placere suggestionem meam sanctitati vestrae, et displicere vobis, ut qui serviunt deo et annixi sunt clero, accedant ad actus et administrationem vel procurationem domorum Gratus episcopus dixit: Et apostolorum statuta sunt, quae dicunt: Nemo militans deo ingerit se negotiis saecularibus; proinde aut clerici sint sine actionibus domorum, aut actores sine officio clericorum. Universi dixerunt: Hoc observemus.cf. p.68 Sardica Canon XVIII:- Ianuarius episcopus dixit: Illud quoque statuat sanctitas vestra ut nulli episcopo liceat alterius episcopi civitatis ministrum ecclesiasticum sollicitare et in suis parochiis ordinare. Universi dixerunt: Placet, quia ex his contentionibus solet nasci discordia, et ideo prohibet omnium sententia, ne quis hoc facere audeat.
10. They might even have planned it on their way to Sardica and had it ready for publication on arrival in Sardica cf. Soz. III, 11,12.B II, 1 § 7.
11. Fuchs "Bibliothek der Kirchensammlungen: Zweiter Theil p.150sq. (Leipzig 1781) takes a similar view.

editor. At this stage in the controversy supporters of Arianism would not dare make open profession of their true faith but had to be content with a rather insipid Eusebianism.

L.10 11 quod miserunt ad Africam - the Easterns would probably send out several copies of this letter. In dispatching one to Africa their main purpose would be to try and gain the support of the Donatist group[12]. That there was public rumour of this can be concluded from Aug. Ep.44, 6. Their leader, Eusebius, had indeed already sought a similar union with the Meletians in Egypt[13]. [14].

L.12sq. Gregorio Alexandriae episcopo etc. - it appears that in the address of the copy circulating in Carthage, the names of the bishops were given without mention of their sees[15]. Faber, in his edition, gives bishop and see together but Coustant[16] and Feder prefer the MS order and keep them separate.

Gregorio - Gregory was the rival of Athanasius from 339-345. He was born in Cappadocia and is mentioned often in the works of Athanasius[17].

This letter would be sent to Alexandria in order to strengthen the position/

Notes.

12. cf. Aug.c.Cresc.3, 34.
13. Ath. Apol. c.Ar.59sq. Soz.II, 21.
14. No definite reason can be given for Hilary having used this African copy in his collection - perhaps it was the one most easily obtained in Gaul.
15. Aug. c. Cresc. 3, 34; 4, 44.
16. col. 658-9 P.L.X.
17. e.g. Hist. Ar. 9sq., 74. Encycl. Ep. ad Episc.2.

position of the Arian party there and combat Athanasius, the principal object of attack at this time. One of the main purposes of the council of Sardica was to settle the dispute concerning Athanasius and in this letter the Eusebians give their solution, issuing it as from the true council of Sardica whose decisions would be binding on all churches.

L.15. Amfioni - Amfio of Nicomedia in Bithynia had been elected to his see on the deposition of Eusebius after the council of Nicaea 325[18]. Baronius[19] identifies him with the Amphion of Epiphania in Cilicia Secunda, who was a confessor in the persecution of Maximin and who attended the councils of Ancyra and Neocaesarea in 314 and Nicaea in 325. Tillemont[20] doubts this because (1) a Nicene canon had frowned upon this kind of change and it was not likely to happen so soon after. (2) it would be unfair to the memory of Amphion (3) Athanasius in 356 praises Amphio of Cilicia, not Bithynia, for combating the Arians with his writings[21].

Donato - Donatus of Carthage is the famous schismatic (c.313-355). Augustine[22] thought that because the names of the sees were not given in some copies, there could be some doubt as to whether the Donatus here mentioned was the bishop of Carthage. It seems reasonably/

Notes.
18. Ath. Apol.c.Ar.7, Theod.I,19.
19. ad ann.325 n XXXIV and LXXVII.
20. Mem. VI, p.356 c.1 and 2 note 5.
21. Ath. Disput. prima c. Ar.
22. c.Cresc.3,34; 4,44.

reasonably certain, however, that as Gratus, the orthodox bishop of Carthage, was present at Western Sardica, his rival, Donatus, would be interested in and a supporter of the Easterns.
The recognition of Donatus as a bishop "in ecclesia catholica" is interesting, springing as it does, not from theological reasons, but simply from a desire to gain additional support.

Desiderio - nothing is known of Desiderius of Campania in central Italy. The Easterns would send their letter to Italy specially to win support there against Julius who, by his synod at Rome, had shown himself to be one of the ablest and strongest supporters of Athanasius.

Fortunato - Feder[23] thinks that Fortunatus of Neapolis in Campania was successor of bishop Calepodius who subscribed the synodal letter of the Westerns at Sardica[24] and who must have died between its composition and that of the present letter (A IV,1) because the latter is already addressed to his successor. In defence of his opinion he asserts that the naming of the bishop in the address of the Easterns' letter does not allow any conclusion to be drawn as to his theological sympathies because the letter is addressed to all the churches.
But (1) there is no definite evidence that the Westerns' letter was written before that of the Easterns. (2) it seems more reasonable to presume that the Eusebians would primarily address themselves/

Notes
23. Stud. II, p.114-5.
24. B II,2.

themselves to their own supporters - no advantage could be gained from any other course of action - that the purpose of addressing the churches generally was a secondary one, viz: to counteract any "ecumenical" claims made by the Westerns, and that just as Donatus was rival to Gratus and Gregory to Athanasius, so Fortunatus would be rival to Calenodius, though whether as an Arian or on some other ground, it isimpossible to say.

p.48 L.14 Ariminensi clero - the text is corrupt and various readings have been given. A[25] reads "ariminiacleno" (perhaps from "arimiñ clero"). C gives "ariminiaclino", Y Ariminiadeno[26]. Thes. ling. lat. 2 p.575 takes it as the name of a bishop "Ariminiadenus". Tillemont[27] and Savio[28] break up "Ariminiadeno" into "Arimini" and "Adeno" (or "Athenio"). Feder[29] points out that the text of A, which Tillemont and Savio had not seen, is against this conjecture. Again, if it be taken as an adjective i.e. Ariminiadeno Campaniae episcopo, the following cities have been proposed as the see:- Acerrae in Campania[30] and Aesernia in old Samnium[31].

Feder[32] has shown that arbitrary changes on the part of the copyist can not be proved in A, and so it is only by an error of reading or writing/

Notes.
29. The MS. usually followed by Feder.
26. the one adopted by Coustant P.L.X col.659 a.
27. Mem VI, 1704, art. 39 p.334.
28. in Rivista di scienze storische VII, vol. I (1910) 25.
29. Stud. II, 113.
30. Ughelli VI, 216sq.
31. Ughelli VI, 366sq.
32. C.S.E.L. LXV Pref. p. XXVII

writing that the present form "Ariminiacleno" has occurred. Feder suggests that the first part refers to Ariminum and the second to "clerus". Many strange names, he continues, have arisen in A through false solution of the shortened forms; there is such a false solution in this case ('arimin̄) and the word "ariminiacleno" can be easily dissected into "ariminensi clero". This form was used probably because the see was vacant at this particular time. There is another instance of this form in Hil. De Syn. 1, where Hilary addresses the bishops of Gaul and Germany thus:- "coepiscopos provinciae Germaniae primae et Germaniae secundae... et ex Narbonensi plebibus et clericis Tolosanis". The see of Toulouse was vacant because of the exile of bishop Rhodanius, and so Hilary says in his address "people and clergy".
Bishop Cyriacus is sometimes assigned to the see at the time of the Sardican council, but wrongly, because the Cyriacus concerned was bishop of Naissus[33].

L.15,16 Euthicio, Maximo, Sinferonti - little is known about these three bishops, Euthicius of Campania, Maximus of Salona in Dalmatia and Sinferon.

The confusion existing in the text between the names of the bishops and their sees may be explained by the fact that not all the copies of the letter contained the names of the sees[34] and consequently these were added later to the text.

Notes.
33. cf. Fed. Stud.II. Introd. 2,9 and p.113-114.
34. Aug. c. Cresc. 3,34; 4,44.

p.49 L.1sq. a diversis Orientalium provinciis etc. - this list of provinces is preserved also in Hil. De Syn.34, in the Cod.Ver.LX (Latin version) and in the Syrian version of the Easterns' creed in Cod. Parisin. syr.62[35].

The list in A IV, 1, is the shortest of the four, having only twenty four names, including Isauria, not found in the other lists, and Arabia, which also occurs in De Syn.34 but not in the other two lists. Among the names of bishops given in A IV, 3, no mention is made of a bishop from Isauria, though bishops from Egypt and Pannonia, not given in A IV, 1, are mentioned.[36]

L.8sq. Est quidem etc - at the very beginning of their letter the Easterns defend themselves against the charge of schism. They assert their eagerness to preserve the unity of the Church, to hold fast to its traditions and rules, and to eschew all new sects and traditions. The "new traditions" refer to the acquittal of Athanasius and Marcellus by the synod of Rome under Julius despite their previous condemnation at Tyre. In his letter[37] Julius had already anticipated such an objection and unveiled the hypocrisy of the Easterns in this matter.

L.9sq. ut sancta domini etc - like the council of Nicaea 325, the synod of Sardica had, as one of the reasons of its inception, the removal/

Notes.

35. cf. Feder p.68-69.
36. Mysia, Pannonia and Dacia could have been omitted in A IV, 1 as being more correctly Western provinces, but inserted quite accurately in the other versions because they yet had representatives at Eastern Sardica.
37. Ath. Apol. c. Ar. 20sq.

removal of all dissensions and the restoring of peace to the Church. The Easterns here pay lip-service to this aim.

L.14sq. ut ecclesiae regula etc. - cf. note on L.8sq.

L.17 maxime in... exponendis - another aim of the synod was to settle the vexed question of the deposed bishops, cf. the Westerns' letter[38] and their letter to Julius[39].
The word "exponere" is used often in this letter in the sense of "depose" e.g. p.60 L.12; p.61 L.13,14; p.63 L.5. It may be the influence of the Greek ἐκβαλλω.

L.22,23 Marcellus quidam Galaciae - the Easterns could be expected to begin their letter with a preliminary attack on Marcellus of Ancyra.[40] Even among the Westerns opinion was divided about him. The charges brought against him are that he tries to divide, or put limits to, the perpetual, eternal and timeless kingdom of the Lord Jesus Christ, saying that He began to reign 400 years before and that His rule will end with the end of the world; he asserts that in the conception of the body He became the image of the invisible God and then was made the bread, the door and the life; thus mingling the false assertions of Sabellius, the wickedness of Paul of Samosata and the blasphemies of Montanus. In §9 the Easterns also refer to the outrages which took place on the return of Marcellus from exile after the death of Constantine.

Nothing/

Notes.
38. B II, 1.
39. B II, 2.
40. cf. B II, 9.

Nothing very definite is known about Marcellus. Even his own generation found it difficult to reach a satisfactory conclusion upon him and our task today is made all the more difficult by the fact that his writings have reached us only through the work of his opponent, Eusebius of Caesarea[41].

While the Eusebians were consistent in their condemnation[42], the Nicenes at first declared in his favour[43] but later changed their opinion because of his connection with Photinus. Athanasius, questioned by Epiphanius[44], would give no decided opinion; indeed, according to B II, 9, Athanasius had broken from Marcellus shortly after Sardica. Hilary, Basil the Great, Chrysostom judged him more severely.

There seems little doubt that the diversity of opinion on Marcellus has arisen from the fact that, although he affirmed the principal tenets of the Nicene creed, and thus gained the support of the Nicene party, he was not completely satisfied with it. In particular he tried to work out further the problem of the relation of Father and Son in the Trinity, and in so doing gave the Eusebians opportunity to condemn him on theological grounds without directly affecting the authority of the council of Nicaea. Zahn[45] has shown that Marcellus adopted much of the traditional theology/

Notes.
41. adv. Marc. II and De Eccles. Theol. III.
42. e.g. at Constantinople 336, Eastern Sardica.
43. e.g. at Rome, Western Sardica.
44. Haer. 72.
45. Marcellus von Ancyra p.216-245.

theology of Asia Minor, especially as seen in the writings of Irenaeus, and represented a reaction against the philosophical ideas of Origen and a return to Scriptural teaching, in particular that of St. John. But for Marcellus, as indeed for all the Nicene leaders, the idea of personality was a very difficult one and even with his renewed emphasis on Scripture he gained no clear perception of the inherent personal distinctness of the Father and the Son. Like Arius, Marcellus thought that the idea of Sonship involved a beginning and an inferiority, so that a Son of God is neither eternal nor equal to the Father. This is not to say - as the Arians did - that the Son is a creature; Marcellus affirmed the Lord's true deity. On the basis of St. John's Gospel he asserted that in the beginning was not the Son but the Logos, and that the latter is the proper term to denote the Lord's relationship with the Father. The Logos is not only the silent, thinking principle which is in God, but also the active, creating principle which comes forth from God and yet remains with God. It was only when the Logos came forth and was invested with human nature that He became Son of God and Image of God. Thus it might be inferred that it was only when the Logos descended into true, created, human flesh and became separated from the Father that He acquired a sort of independent personality. But the Logos can not wear a servant's form for ever, it must be laid aside; the Son of God shall deliver up the Kingdom to the Father that the Kingdom of God may have no end, and then the Logos shall return and be immanent as before.

It seems safe to presume that Marcellus did not succeed in securing/

securing a satisfactory answer to the problem he had set himself, and the resultant confusion gave a certain plausibility to the charges brought against him of Sabellianism, the doctrine of a single divine essence under a triple name, and of following the errors of Paul of Samosata in conceiving an impersonal Logos descending into human flesh, while his connection with Ancyra would give rise to the accusation of being involved in the errors of the Montanists.

The Easterns had therefore an abundance of material from which to construct a good case for the charges brought against him.

It is interesting to note that Eusebius[46] states that Marcellus at one moment descends into the utmost pit of Sabellius, at another attempts to revive the heresy of Paul of Samosata, and at yet another reveals himself as a downright Jew.

p.49 L.26 ante quadringentos annos - in the Oratio syn. Sard. ad Const. I § 5 p.183 L.21,22 we find another instance of the number 400 occurring where 300 would seem to us to be more natural.

p.50 L.6 libro...pleno - Marcellus' book is no longer extant[47] but Hilary had it in his possession.[48]

L.11 Sabelli - for note on Sabellius see A I p.44 L.5,6.

Notes.
46. Eccl. Theol. 3. 6. 4.
47. see note p.49 L.22.
48. B. II, 9 p.146 L.8, 9.

Pauli Samosatenis - Paul of Samosata asserted that the Logos was not a substantive Person, but an impersonal Utterance of God, and that Christ was an earthly man, indwelt impersonally by divine influences, to which he responded with obedience so complete that He was exalted to fellowship with God.[49]. Paul was condemned by the Origenist council of Antioch 268.

L.12 Montani - Montanus, a native of the village of Ardabau in that part of Mysia which borders on Phrygia,[50] in the latter half of the second century originated the first schism on record. His sect proclaimed the new dispensation of the Paraclete which was to supersede that of the Old Testament and that of the New Testament, and so to be the final stage of revelation in view of the nearness of the second Advent. A section of Asiatic Montanists who followed Aeschines inclined to Modalism[51] but, on the whole, in doctrine Montanism was no heresy.

L.19sq. condicitur namque etc - according to Socr.I, 36 the Eusebians began to consider the case of Marcellus at Jerusalem in 335 but had to postpone this because of a summons from the Emperor to come to Constantinople. They then held a synod in this city/

Notes.
49. Robertson "Athanasius" p.XXVII, XXVIII argues strongly for a connection between Paul and Arius through Lucian the Martyr.
50. Eus. H.E. V, 16 7.
51. Ps.-Tert. Adv. Omn. haer VII.

city and asked Marcellus to fulfil the promise he had made at Jerusalem of burning his book against the Arian sophist, Asterius of Cappadocia, because it was infected with the errors of Paul of Samosata. This Marcellus now refused to do. In their letter to the Emperor, the Eusebians further accused Marcellus of having insulted Constantine by refusing to attend the consecration of the church in Jerusalem. On these two accounts the synod deposed him and requested all the bishops in his province of Galatia to destroy his book[52].

In this part of their letter, the Eusebians are at great pains to show that they acted at Constantinople in a regular fashion and in accordance with the traditions of the Church. First of all, they had tried to teach Marcellus the error of his ways, and, after several vain attempts, had condemned him in ecclesiastical fashion (probably referring to the procedure adopted by the Church with regard to heretics in the past). Then they had preserved his errors in the Archives of the Church for the sake of posterity and a protection to Scripture. Thirdly a book refuting his opinions had been drawn up by the bishops (that is the one written by Eusebius of Caesarea c. Marc. I & II) and this had been subscribed by two men who are now supporting him, namely, Protogenes of Sardica and Cyriacus of Naisus.

The great importance placed on tradition at this time is shown by their repeated emphasis on the fact that these acts have been done by "their parents and elders" (even though they took place only

s/

Notes.

52. Socr. I, 36. Soz. II, 33.

8 or 9 years before!) They feel their case strengthened whenever they have tradition (no matter how recent!) as a basis for their argument[53].

In this case, however, it carries no weight because, though they complain that the Nicenes overthrow the tradition of the Church by receiving Athanasius and Marcellus despite their previous condemnation, they themselves had been guilty of this offence in the first place by receiving the Arians condemned at Nicea[54].

p.51 L.2 post unam et secundam multasque corruptiones - cf. Titus 3, 10.

L.6 actis..ecclesiasticis - see note on p.50 L.19sq.

L.10,11 in archivo ecclesiae - the old Christian churches seem to have reserved a room for the preservation of liturgical books and documents relative to the administration of the Christian communities, but nothing definite is known about this. By the third century there are more numerous and precise references to libraries such as those at Jerusalem and Carthage, which contained both canonical and uncanonical books. A great many libraries were destroyed in the persecution of Diocletian, but with peace they gradually/

Notes.
53. see also §§ 23,26.
54. cf. the letter of Julius in Ath. Apol. c.Ar. 20sq.

gradually recovered and extended until in the fourth century every church of importance possessed one.

L.16 liber sententiarum - i.e. the c. Marc.I & II written by Eusebius of Caerarea[55].

L.18 Protogenes - in 316 Constantine addressed a letter concerning manumission in church to Protogenes, bishop of Sardica in Dacia[56]. He occupied a prominent place at the council of Nicaea and was entrusted with the duty of making its decress known throughout Dacia, Calabria, Dardania and the surrounding regions[57]. As bishop of Sardica he naturally played a leading part in the council there[58]. There is no other record of the incident mentioned by the Easterns.

Cyriacus a Naiso - this is the reading adopted by Feder on the basis of A IV, 1 p.66 L.9, 10 "Gaudentium autem ut inmemorem decessoris sui Cyriaci", BII, 4 n 32 "Gaudentius a Dacia de Naiso" and Soz.H.E.III,11 "τον δε Γαυδεντιον ὡς ἐναντια σπουδασαντα Κυριακῳ, ὁν διεδεξατο." Coustant[60] suggests Cyriacus Ariminensis, but this conjecture is paleographically untenable.

As/

Notes.
55. see p.50 L.19sq.
56. Cod.Iust. I, XIII, 1; Kriegel Corp. Iud. Civ. cI,13 p.89-90.
57. Gelasius Cyz. De Act. Nic. Conc.II,27,36.
58. Socr. II, 20. Ath. c.Ar.II.
59. see also p.66 L.5sq.
60. P.L.X,661 b.

As the Easterns knew that Cyriacus was already dead before the council of Sardica met[61], they must mean the bishop to stand for the see here.

p.52 L.1 qui se ecclesiasticos volunt - i.e. they wish to be known as church-men but, by receiving a heretic into communion, their acts show that they are not.

L.3 illis - i.e. those at the council of Constantinople.[62]

L.4-6 etenim Marcellus..requisivit - Marcellus seeking help in foreign parts is undoubtedly a reference to the synod held at Rome under Julius, which acquitted Athanasius and Marcellus. The Easterns make it appear as if Marcellus had made the first approach but it was actually the Eusebians who had sent a deputation to Rome with charges against Athanasius, and, when hard pressed, had asked Julius to convene a synod. Only then had Athanasius and Marcellus set out for Rome to defend themselves against their accusations. On their imminent arrival, the Eusebians, knowing their case to be hopeless, had given all sorts of pretexts for refusing to attend the synod[63]. But the synod was held despite their withdrawal, full inquiry made into the charges, and Athanasius and Marcellus declared unjustly deposed and admitted to the communion of the Church of Rome.

Notes.

61. cf. A IV, § 27 p.66L.9.
62. see note p.50 L.19sq.
63. cf. Julius' letter Ath. Apol.c. Ar.22sq.

It is the oft-repeated complaint of the Easterns in their letter[64] that it was only in foreign parts, where they and their acts were not intimately known, that their opponents could gain acquittal. It is obvious that in this particular instance at least their complaint carries no weight. Athanasius, too, had already shown that it was without foundation because shortly before the council of Rome he had held a synod in Alexandria specially to disprove the charges brought against him and the Egyptians had sent out a circumstantial letter in his defence[65].

L.9sq. quique sub praetexto etc. - see note on p.49L.22.

p.53 L.10,11 sed propter... Marcello - according to Faber and Coustant[66] this sentence is an interpolation, though they give no reason for this opinion. Feder[67] takes it as genuine. There seems no reason why it should not be a genuine part of the text, rounding off the section before a new attack is launched, this time on Athanasius.

L.12 Athanasio - the Easterns had attacked Marcellus on doctrinal grounds but different tactics had to be adopted against Athanasius. By remaining firm to the Nicene Creed, he had given them no scope for a charge of heresy. Their method therefore, was to accuse him/

Notes.
64. cf. p.56 L.21,24sq.
65. Ath. Apol. c. Ar.1sq.
66. P.L. X col. 663.
67. Praef. XXVII.

him of conduct and acts prejudicial to and unworthy of the episcopal office.

Through general confessions of allegiance to the Nicene Creed, the Eusebians had been able to secure the return of those who had been exiled at, or soon after, the council of Nicaea, but Athanasius refused to receive them into communion.

Because of this, the Eusebians represented his attitude to the Emperor as one of contentious obstinacy, disturbing the peace which Constantine was so eager to secure[68]. With the help of the Meletians they were able to bring forward accusations in support of this against Athanasius[69]. The latter was able to baulk their first attempts, but some time later the Meletians were again bribed to make further accusations[70]. Then in 334 at Caesarea in Palestine[71] the Eusebians convened a synod and summoned Athanasius to it. He refused to come and made his defence to the Emperor who accepted it and ordered Eusebius and his friends, already hastening to Caesarea, to return. In 335, however, the Eusebians and Meletians persuaded Constantine to call a synod at Tyre, to which Athanasius was summoned by the Emperor. According to A IV, 1 § 7, bishops came to Tyre from Macedonia, Pannonia, Bithynia and all the parts of the East. At this council the Meletians accused Athanasius/

Notes.

68. Ath. Apol. c. Ar. 59.
69. Ibid, 60.
70. those concerning Ischyras and Arsenius - see Ath. Apol. c. Ar. 63 ff.
71. A IV, 1 § 7.

Athanasius of disturbing the peace and unity of the Egyptians by his oppressive measures[72]. His priest, Macarius, again accused of the destruction of the chalice, was brought in chains to Tyre[73], and Ischyras was incited, by the promise of a see from the Eusebians, to return to the attack[74]. When the accusation concerning Arsenius was made, however, Athanasius threw everything into confusion by producing him before the council[75]. The Eusebians covered their embarrassment by appointing a thoroughly biased commission[76] to go to Ischyras' own country, Mareotis, and make further inquiries. That the accusations were without foundation is proved by the two letters of the clergy of Mareotis[77] who assert that with the help of the prefect, Philagrius, and by threats and violent treatment the truth had been suppressed and false testimonies encouraged. In addition the Egyptian bishops at Tyre openly confronted the Eusebians with their conspiracy against Athanasius and their biased selection of the deputation to Mareotis[78]. By this time it was evident that all chance of securing a fair sentence from the synod of Tyre had disappeared and Athanasius now left the council, hoping in this way to put an end to its proceedings for he declared it

to/

Notes.

72. Soz.II,25. Soz.II,31 states that disturbing the peace was in the eyes of the Emperor the greatest offence.
73. Ath. Apol. c. Ar.71.
74. ibid.85.
75. Theod. I, 30. Socr.I, 29sq. Soz II, 25.
76. Its members were Theognis of Nicaea, Maris of Chalcedon, Ursacius of Singidunum, Valens of Mursa, Macedonius of Mopsuestia and Theodorus of Heraclea.
77. in Ath. Apol. c. Ar. 74,75.
78. Ath. Apol. c. Ar. 77sq.

to be an acknowledged rule that whatever was determined by one party alone was invalid[79]. But this did not deter the Eusebians; having received their deputation from Mareotis with their false statements and accusations, they deposed Athanasius, and, to prevent all disturbances, forbade his return to Alexandria. Meanwhile Athanasius had gone to the Emperor at Constantinople[80] and requested him to allow him to make his defence before the bishops from Tyre. This was granted, and this time the Eusebians brought a new charge, namely, that Athanasius had threatened to hinder the yearly import of corn from Alexandria to Constantinople[81]. According to Athanasius, Theodoret and Socrates, the Eusebians now said nothing about the chalice and Arsenius, though Sozomen[82] states that they did bring the accusation concerning the chalice and the Emperor probably believed it. It would seem that Athanasius was given no opportunity to make a further defence but was exiled to Treves by the Emperor c.335/336, the real charge probably being that he threatened the peace of the Church. Nevertheless Constantine refused to allow the Eusebians to appoint another bishop for Alexandria.

Only on the general amnesty given by Constantine's sons in 338 was Athanasius/

Notes.

79. Ath. Apol. c. Ar.82. In their letter (A IV, 13 7 p.54 L.13sq) the Easterns assert that Athanasius was still present when the sentence was passed.
80. in a letter to Athanasius, preserved in Ath. Apol. c.Ar.68, Constantine admits the falsity of the Meletian accusations.
81. Socr. I,35. Theod. I,31. Ath. Apol. c. Ar.87.
82. II, 28.

Athanasius able to return from exile[83] and even then it was in face of strong opposition from the Eusebians. In 339 the latter set up a a bishop of their own in Alexandria in opposition to Athanasius. He was the former priest, Pistus, who had already been deposed for his Arian views by Athanasius' predecessor and by the council of Nicaea, but was now consecrated bishop by Secundus of Ptolemais, who had also been deposed at Nicaea[84]. Not only did they bring forward all the old charges against Athanasius but invented new accusations about the violences and persecutions occasioned on his return to Alexandria[85]. These complaints were presented to the three Emperors and an embassy was sent in 339 to Julius of Rome comprising the presbyter Macarius and the two deacons Martyrius and Hesychius. The copy of the false accusations contained in the Mareotic Acts and delivered by the embassy to Julius was now in turn sent by the latter to Athanasius who immediately sent envoys on his own behalf to Rome and to the Emperors Constantine and Constans[86] and assembled bishops from Egypt, Libya, Thebes and Pentapolis[87] to a synod in Alexandria where the accusations of the Eusebians were disproved. On the impending arrival at Rome of the envoys from Athanasius, Macarius withdrew and the two deacons tried to evade an awkward situation by demanding a synod. Julius acceded to their request and sent letters both to Athanasius and to the Eusebians/

Notes.
83. Ath. Hist. Ar. ad mon. 8.
84. Ath. Apol. c. Ar. 19,24 Encycl. ad episc. epist. 6.
85. Ath. Apol. c. Ar. 3sq.
86. Ath. Apol. c. Ar. 22,24, 83. Hist. Ar. 9.
87. Ath. Apol. c. Ar. 1sq.

Eusebians[88]. While Athanasius was hastening to Rome for this purpose, the prefect of Egypt, Philagrius, published a decree to the effect that a certain Gregory of Cappadocia had been appointed as successor of Athanasius. The latter had no doubt that this action had been instigated by the Eusebians and it occasioned fresh tumults[89].

After Athanasius had waited a long time in Rome for his defence[90], the Eusebians at last replied to Julius, giving various reasons for not attending the synod[91]. Athanasius stayed on in Rome until Constans summoned him to Milan and then sent him to Gaul to meet Ossius and the Gallican bishops in preparation for the synod of Sardica.[92]

p.53 L.12 de Athanasio quondam Alexandriae episcopo - thus designated because of the intrusion of Gregory of Cappadocia into his see[93].

Notes.

88. Ath. Apol. c. Ar. 20,22, 24. Hist. Ar. 9.
89. Ath. Epist. Encycl. ad Episc. 3sq.
90. 18 months according to Ath. Apol. c. Ar. 29.
91. e.g. that the Council of Tyre had already deposed Athanasius and therefore a new inquiry would undermine the authority of councils. Julius answered this in his letter by saying that even the Fathers of the great Nicene Council had given their permission for the decisions of one council to be tried by another. The Eusebians themselves had already gone beyond Nicaea in welcoming back the Arians exiled there.
92. Ath. Apol. ad Const. 4.
93. Ath. Epist. Encycl. 2sq.

L.14 propriis manibus - it was actually Macarius who had been accused of this in the first place[94]. But he was a presbyter under the command of Athanasius to whom, therefore, the responsibility for the act could conceivably be attributed. In a letter to Athanasius[95] Ischyras confesses that this accusation was false.

L.19. Scyram - for Ischyras see note on Athanasius p.53 L.12, also Ath. Apol. c.Ar. 63sq. In Apol. c.Ar. 63 Athanasius denies that Ischyras was a clergyman[96] and indeed as early as the Alexandrian council 324 his ordination by Colluthus had been pronounced null and void[97].

The Easterns here accuse Athanasius of violence but, according to his account in the Apol. c. Ar., it is they who have supported their accusations by threats of violence and the use of military power. There is no record in the Apol. c.Ar. of Ischyras being handed over to a military guard, but Socrates[98] relates the arrest of Arsenius at Tyre, an event which effectually destroyed that particular accusation against Athanasius. The Easterns may have deliberately confused the two.

p.53 L.20 episcoporum internicione - Athanasius had already been accused of murdering Arsenius, but had thrown his accusers into complete/

Notes.
94. Ath. Apol. c.Ar. 60.
95. Ath. Apol. c. Ar. 64.
96. contrast p.53 L.18 "presbiterum vero ipsum".
97. see also Ath. Apol. c.Ar.12, 74 etc.
98. I, 29.

complete confusion by producing him alive at the council of Tyre[99].

L.21sq. quique etiam diebus etc. - at the council of Tyre 335, Callinicus, former bishop of Pelusium, charged Athanasius with having used violence to secure his deposition, acted unjustly and despotically, and attempted, by false information, to gain the favour of Hyginus, the governor of Egypt.[100] This section in the letter might refer to these charges, though we have no exact information to explain the reference to Easter nor any definite proof of Athanasius having used the imperial power. cf. § 7.

L.22 ducibus atque comitibus - this phrase is probably a duplication of the same idea for the sake of emphasis. At this time "duces" were sometimes given the honorary rank of "comites".

L.25,26 necatus..fuerant - it is probably correct to take this as part of the original text of the letter. cf. the note on p.53 L.10,11. This applies also to L.29,30 "erant quidem..obiecta".

§ 7. For the councils at Caesarea Palaestina and Tyre see note on Athanasius p.53 L.12.

p.54 L.8sq. sed suo de concilio etc. - i.e. the deputation sent from Tyre to Mareotis. cf. p.53 L.12 note.

Notes.
99. Theod. I, 30. Socr. I, 29sq. Soz.II, 25.
100. Soz.II, 25.

L.13, 14 in praesentem Athanasium - Athanasius[101] accused the Eusebians of sending their deputation to Mareotis simply for the purpose of achieving at a distance and in his absence what they had failed to accomplish in his presence at the council of Tyre. He felt it was only an excuse to repair their plans which had been sadly disorganised by the weight of evidence brought against their accusations. Again, from the account given in Apol.c.Ar.82, it would appear that Athanasius had left the council while the inquiry in Mareotis was still being pursued and not after sentence had been passed, as the Easterns try to make out. It is obvious that the Easterns have in mind Athanasius' argument that by leaving the council he had thus automatically brought the proceedings to a close because it was an acknowledged rule that whatever was decided by one party alone was invalid[102]. In Theod.II,13, Liberius supports Athanasius' account by asserting in his conference with Constantius that "no judgment has ever been passed on Athanasius in his presence".

L.17 in exilium deportavit - he was sent to Trèves in Gaul[103].

L.19sq. sacrilegus in deum etc. - in the course of time the story concerning Ischyras gradually improved in detail. In the first account, Macarius had been accused of using violence and breaking the chalice. The next version was that Ischyras had been actually celebrating/

Notes.
101. Apol. c. Ar. 72.
102. Apol. c. Ar. 82.
103. see p.53 L.12 note.

celebrating the Eucharist in church when Macarius had burst in upon him and not only broken the chalice but overturned the Holy Table. The third step was to lay all this to the account of Athanasius himself.

In his Apol. c. Ar. 74,75,76,83, Athanasius points out the various discrepancies between the different accounts, shows that Ischyras had never been a minister of the Church, nor had he ever had a church, that no cup was broken nor table overturned.

L.22,23 auctoritas legis.. traditio - these expressions seem to be nearly synonymous."Canon ecclesiae" will refer to the rule of the Church in general.

L.25, 26 post plurimum tempus - Athanasius was in exile a little over two years[104]. On his release from exile, he seems to have taken the indirect overland route to Egypt[105].

L.26sq. quique praeterita etc - Athanasius,in his Festal Letter XI, and Socrates,II, 3,15,speak of tumults after his return from exile, but there is no evidence elsewhere of the charges made here. According to Socr. II, 24 the same kind of charge was brought against Athanasius after the synod of Sardica.

Notes.

104. cf. Theod. II, 1; also the evidence of Athanasius' Festal Letter for 338.
105. cf. Ath. Apol. ad Const. 5. see further note on p.55, L.26,27.

This type of general statement giving no specific details, mentioning no particular persons or places, weakens the Easterns' case, especially when contrasted with the lengthy accounts of episodes and events known to all, which are given in the other parts of their letter. The natural presumption is that if the accusations had been true, they would have followed their customary style of giving lengthy, complete details about the various bishops and churches concerned. The charges made here are indeed refuted in the letter of the Egyption bishops[106].

p.55, L.6 ex iudicio concilii - according to Julius[107], an Antiochene synod had deposed Athanasius and nominated Gregory of Cappadocia in his place. As Athanasius' Festal Letters XII and XIII give evidence for Gregory being in the see before 340, this cannot be the "in Encaeniis" synod but an earlier one held at Antioch.

L.8, 9 clam exul... profugiit - with the recall of the prefect Theodorus in the course of 338 and the reappointment of Philagrius, the Cappadocian, the Arian cause in Alexandria was strengthened, and in the Festal Index XI, it is recorded that Athanasius had to flee in the night from his persecutors.

§9 This section on Paul of Constantinople would seem to be misplaced, coming as it does in the midst of the diatribe against Athanasius and Marcellus.

Notes.
106. Ath. Apol. c. Ar. 3sq.
107. Ath. Apol. c. Ar. 29,30.

p.55 L.10,11 de Paulo...episcopo - Paul seems to have been a Thessalonian by birth and probably came as a new-citizen to Constantinople in 330 when Constantine was increasing the size and population of the old town of Byzantium in order to make it his capital city.[108] It is not known exactly when Paul became bishop but it must have been before autumn 335 when he participated in the council of Constantinople and joined in the condemnation of Athanasius[109]. That his election had not been unanimously received can be gathered from the accounts given in Socr. H.E.II, 6,7. $So_z$. H.E. III, 3, 4. In particular the eunuch, Eusebius, who then wielded great influence in the palace, had caused much trouble by setting up the presbyter, Macedonius, as rival to Paul[110]. Attack was also made against Paul for having himself made bishop without the consent of his metropolitan, Theodore of Heraclea, and Eusebius of Nicomedia. His enemies eventually persuaded Constantine to exile him and, meeting in a council at Constantinople in February 336, they passed their own sentence against him[111]. After a 15 months exile in Pontus, he returned to Constantinople under the amnesty proclaimed by Constantine II and was able to recover his see, which had not been filled in his absence. In their letter, the Easterns accuse him of fresh atrocities on his return[112]. His triumph was short. With the transference of the city/

Notes.
108. cf. Socr. H.E.II,16.
109. cf. § 13 p.57, L.20sq. also W. Telfer "Paul of Constantinople" in Harvard Theol. Review Vol. XLIII p.49sq.
110. cf. Ath. Hist. Ar. 6.
111. Euseb. c. Marc. II, 4.
112. § 9.

city of Constantinople to Constantius, under the agreement reached at Viminacium, June 338, Paul's supremacy came to an end. Towards the end of 338 a local synod met in the capital, deposed him and elected Eusebius of Nicomedia in his place[113]. Like so many other Easterns, Paul spent the next two years travelling in foreign parts and seeking support for his cause[114]. It was natural for him to take refuge in the West[115] and he is probably included in the "bishops from Thrace" mentioned in Julius' letter[116] as being among those against whom no charge had been received, and who were thus acquitted from any ecclesiastical accusations. When the bishop Eusebius died[117], Paul returned to Constantinople accompanied by Asclepas of Gaza. At the end of the Dedication council of Antioch his metropolitan, Theodore of Heraclea, and some other leading Eusebians, came to Constantinople to make peace with Paul, but on his rejection of their offer, the Eusebians elected Macedonius as the successor of Eusebius[118]. Though the Easterns in their letter attack Paul so fiercely, they make no mention of Macedonius as the rightful bishop, probably because the latter, while nominated, was still not consecrated at that particular time.

Paul did not attend the council of Sardica, giving as reason that his people, fearing a plot, would not allow him to leave the city, and indeed the Easterns' letter[119] witnesses to further disturbances in/

Notes.
113. Ath. Apol. c.Ar. 6.
114. cf. AIV, 1 § 11.
115. cf. A IV, 1 § 27.
116. Ath. Apol. c. Ar. 33.
117. before the winter of 341.
118. Socr. H.E. II, 12.
119. e.g. § 20.

in the city, though they place all the blame on the supporters of Paul, including those in the West who had communicated with him, and especially on Asclepas[120]. Constantius himself had to deal with those riots in his capital and one of the consequences was the expulsion of Paul from the city, though his supporters retained control of the Churches. If Athanasius[121] is to be believed, Paul was taken in chains to Singara[122], and then transferred to Emesa. But another change was taking place in the political field. Through the circumstances of the time, in particular the Persian war, the Western bishops were gaining increased power and Constantius was being compelled to submit to their demands. Paul at Emasa realised that events were turning once more in his favour when he heard of the fall of Stephen of Antioch, and he ventured to return again to Constantinople about the middle of 344. But again his stay was short. On the appointment of the new Praetorian Prefect of the East, Philip, towards the end of 344, Paul received an imperial warrant banishing him for ever from the domains of Constantius. While his rival, Macedonius, was consecrated in Constantinople, Paul had once again to seek refuge in the West. Socrates[123] tells of Paul's last return to Constantinople, probably in 346, fortified with letters of Constans and of a synod.[124] There he was received by officials acting under the instructions of/

Notes.

120. cf p.61 L.23 sq., p.66, L. 4sq. L.30 sq.
121. Hist. Ar. 7.
122. Socrates, on the other hand, supposes that Paul had gone to Rome.
123. H.E. II, 23.
124. probably Milan 345 suggests Telfer p.86.

of Constantius and again restored to his see, though Macedonius still retained one Church. This state of affairs lasted until Constans' protection was removed through his overthrow by Magnentius in 350 and Constantius became supreme ruler after Mursa 351. Following these events, the Prefect, Philip, returned to Constantinople, put an end to Paul's reign and had him banished to Cucusus[125]. There, Athanasius reports, he died a violent death.[126] According to Socrates[127], his remains were brought from Ancyra and placed in his name-church in 382. After Paul's last departure, Macedonius remained as bishop in Constantinople for almost 9 years before he was replaced by Eudoxius.

L.13 Marcelli - see note on p.49 L.22. Similar accusations are now made against Marcellus as were made against Athanasius in § 8, and probably against Paul in the section now lost.

L.20 Asclepas - According to Epiphanius[128], Asclepas of Gaza in Palestine was one of the bishops to whom Alexander of Alexandria sent an encyclical before the council of Nicaea, warning them about Arius. He is mentioned in Ath. Apol. c. Ar. 47 and in

B II/

Notes.
125. Ath. De Fuga 3; Hist. Ar. 7.
126. Sozomen H.E. IV, 2 states that he could find no confirmation of this.
127. H.E V, 9.
128. Haer. 69, 4. P.G. 42 col. 207-210.

B II, 1 § 6[129] as having been deposed at an Antiochian synod, and Tillemont[130] thinks this might be the same one as deposed Eustathius. H. Chadwick[131] has shown that this council of Antioch took place probably late in 326 or early in 327, and this agrees reasonably well with the statement in the Easterns' letter (§ 11) that Asclepas had been deposed 17 years before. Mention has already been made of his close relations with Paul of Constantinople[132] and the Easterns (§ 20) speak of Asclepas as in some way representing Paul at Western Sardica. He was declared innocent of all charges by the Western bishops at Sardica[133].

L.21 Lucius - according to Tillemont,[134] Lucius of Adrianopolis was made bishop c.335 - he succeeded Eutropius whom Athanasius[135] calls "that lover of Christ" - and was exiled soon after, but returned under the general amnesty granted by the sons of Constantine. Socrates[136] and Sozomen[137] state that he was present at the synod of Rome under Julius, where he was absolved. His name appears among the bishops present at Western Sardica[138]. He seems to have suffered exile several times and indeed died in exile[139].

The/

Notes.
129. the letter of the Western bishops at Sardica.
130. Mem. VII, 21[1] note 11 on the Arians in VI.
131. J.T.S. XLIX (1948) p.27 sq.
132. see note p.55, L.10,11 on Paul.
133. B II, 1 p. 122, 6. B II, 2 p. 130, 9.
134. VI, p.119, 131.
135. Apol. de fuga 3.
136. H.E. II, 15.
137. H.E. III, 8.
138. B II, 4 p.134, L.6.
139. Ath. Apol. de fuga 3. Hist. Ar. 19.

The accusation made here is not confirmed in any other source.

p.55, L.26,27. Athanasius peragrans.. terrarum - this will be a reference to his homeward journey from Trèves after the general amnesty. He did not return immediately to his see but accompanied Constantine II to Viminacium where the brothers met for the division of the empire. Then he took the overland route to Egypt, using his journey as an opportunity to strengthen the Nicene cause and overthrow the decrees of the Eusebian synods[140]. He reports[141] that he had a second interview with Constantius at Caesarea in Cappadocia, where the latter had his headquarters at that time in his campaign against the Persians.

L.29 Egyptios.. - i.e. the synod of nearly 100 bishops[142] who assembled at Alexandria c.339 from Egypt, the Thebais, Libya and Pentapolis, denounced the accusations of the Eusebians, and pronounced Athanasius innocent. The Easterns, however, refuse to recognise the judgment of those who were not at Tyre[143]. Their inconsistency in this matter is apparent from the fact that it was their representatives at Rome, and not Athanasius, who requested a council to discuss again the whole question.

Notes.
140. cf. Ath. Apol. ad Const. 5, A IV, 1§§ 8,10.
141. in Apol. ad Const. 5.
142. Ath. Apol. c. Ar. 1sq.
143. thus making themselves guilty of the charge laid against Marcellus in § 4 of seeking judgment in foreign parts and not in his own country!

p.56 L.1 scripta a singulis - this probably refers to the writings of Alexander of Thessalonica[144], of Macarius and others[145], of Ischyras[146], and of the council of Alexandria[147], which Athanasius brought to the council of Rome.[148] Coustant[149] would seem to be wrong, therefore in placing this after the third exile.

L.2 ipse sibi NOVAS.. fingebat - the Eusebians could also be accused on this account because they induced the Emperor to build a church for Ischyras as a reward for his services at Tyre; they had also caused trouble by their intrusions e.g. Pistus, Gregory in Alexandria[150].

The phrase "Novas (ecclesias) fingebat" could also mean the appointment of a bishop, as a schismatic, where there was already a bishop in charge.

L. 3, 4 ad iudicium...consecratum - i.e.the judgment pronounced against Athanasius by the council of Tyre.

L.4 iudices - Telfer[151] thinks the use of this word is indicative of/

Notes.

144. Ath. Apol. c. Ar. 28,80.
145. ibid. 27,83.
146. ibid, 28, 64.
147. ibid. 1 sq, 27.
148. cf Julius' letter. Ath. Apol. c.Ar. 27sq.
149. P.L. X col. 665 (a).
150. Ath. Epist. Encycl. 5, 6.
151. Harvard Theol. Rev. XLIII (1950) p.69.

of the difference in Christian political theory between East and West. The Easterns at Sardica apply it to the bishops who tried Athanasius at Tyre while to the Westerns it means civil magistrates. cf. p.181 L.14.

L.4sq. qui nec in concilio etc. - i.e. their favourite, but impossible argument that only those who had participated in a particular synod had the right to change its decisions[152].

L. 8 ad Iulium Romam perrexit - so far from this being the case, it was the Eusebians who had appealed to Julius in the first instance.[153] It was to answer their charges that Athanasius summoned an Egyptian synod at Alexandria and sent a circular letter to Julius[154] and only at the invitation of Julius himself had Athanasius gone to Rome[155].

L.8, 9 sed et ad Italiae.. episcopos - the documents now available give no information as to the names of the bishops who were present from Italy. In his letter, Julius speaks only in general terms[156].

L.9 per epistularum falsitatem - i.e. those letters which came to Rome/

Notes.
152. cf notes on p.53 L.12. p.55 L.29, p.56 L.9, and Ath. Apol. c. Ar.22.
153. Ath. Apol. c. Ar. 20sq.
154. Ath. Apol. c. Ar. 2sq.
155. Ath. Apol. c. Ar.22.
156. Ath. Apol. c. Ar. 26.

Rome in defence of Athanasius from the Alexandrine synod[157] and from Macarius and others[158], and those showing his innocence from Alexander of Thessalonica, Ischyras[159] and others from Egypt[160]. The Easterns give three reasons for rejecting the authority of these letters (a) their falsity - But (i) the fact that the letters in question agree with the testimony of Athanasius who had from the first disproved the accusations[161] is an argument in favour of their authenticity. (ii) This is also supported by the presence at the Roman council of some of the persons who had written the letters cf. Apol.c. Ar. 27,33. (iii) The very fact that they had to give two other supporting reasons also points to their authenticity. (b) They did not proceed from those who had been judges or had been present at the council of Tyre - But (i) in his letter[162] Julius asserts that in the council of Nicaea it was agreed that the decisions of one council could be examined by another. (ii) The Eusebians themselves had overturned the council of Nicaea by securing the return of the Arians condemned there (ibid.). (iii) It was the Eusebians who had specially asked Julius to summon a council to discuss the whole question (ibid.) - their refusal to come could only cast suspicion on the strength of their case. (c) "Ex parte" proceedings/

Notes.
157. Ath. Apol. c. Ar. 1sq.
158. ibid. 27.
159. ibid. 28.
160. ibid.33.
161. cf Apol. c. Ar. 60sq. This had been done even before Tyre, at Tyre itself, and also at the synod held in Alexandria, 338/9.
162. Ath. Apol. c. Ar. 22sq.

proceedings have no authority - This argument had been used by Athanasius when he withdrew from the synod of Tyre[163]. In the case of the Eusebians it was not valid because they had asked for this council and been given every opportunity of coming to Rome to present their case; the excuses given by them carried no weight[164] and it could only be presumed from their non-appearance that their accusations against Athanasius were false.

L.12sq pertemere credendo.. temere - Julius had forestalled this charge. In his letter[165] he accuses the Eusebians of having recklessly received the Arians whom all had condemned and contrary to the decisions of the judges[166] and[167] disproves the charge of having rashly received Athanasius into communion.

L.19 ante decem et septem annos - see p.55 L.19sq. note.

L.21sq circumeuntes simul etc. - see notes on p.52 L.4,5; p.56 L.24sq.

p.57 L.3sq. scientes enim de iudicibus etc - Julius disposes of this argument by showing that the Eusebians had been guilty of this with regard to the council of Nicaea[168].

Notes.
163. Apol. c. Ar. 82.
164. ibid. 22, 25.
165. Ath. Apol. c. Ar. 23.
166. cf p.56 L.16,17.
167. in § 27.
168. Ath. Apol. c. Ar. 22sq.

But even in itself their argument is not convincing because the council of Tyre took place only in 335 and it is not too audacious to assume that the majority of the witnesses and judges would still be alive a few years later. The Easterns admit in their letter[169] that five out of the six legates who went from Tyre to make investigations at Mareotis, were present at Sardica.

L.8sq. Voluerunt autem etc. - in this section the Westerns are charged with altering the law of the Church by interfering in Eastern affairs and attempting to pass judgment on Eastern bishops. But the letter of Julius proves that it was the Easterns who had taken the first steps towards this through their appeal for a council at Rome. Only when their attempt to gain support in the West failed, did they claim that it was the Westerns who had introduced this "new law". After their approach to Julius, however, it was quite impossible to think that the West should abstain from further participation in the controversy, even though it was essentially an Eastern one.[170]

L.9 pro iudicibus..rei - "pro iudicibus defensores" refers to Julius and the Italian bishops. According to the Easterns, they had/

Notes.
169. § 18.
170. It was perhaps natural that the Eusebians should have appealed to Rome in the first instance because in such a dispute as this the whole Church was bound to become involved sooner or later and be forced to take sides. There is no doubt that their conduct provided the Roman Church with a new and great opportunity of extending her power, and Julius with his masterly letter took full advantage of this.

had set themselves up as judges in the case of Athanasius and Marcellus whereas in reality they ought to have been defending their own action in granting communion to men who had been already condemned at Tyre. "Pro defensores rei" refers to Athanasius and Marcellus. Although they had been pronounced guilty at Tyre, they now appeared as defenders i.e. as men still to be tried.

L.12,13 novam legem..iudicarentur - while the tendency would be for East and West each to judge their own affairs, there was nothing to prevent an Eastern bishop appealing for a Western judgment and vice versa. As a rule the decision of a just and impartial council would be accepted by the whole Church. Only where there were alleged irregularities would appeal be made to another council; and that there was some doubt about the decision of Tyre concerning Athanasius was shown even by the appeal of the Eusebians to Julius. Their appeal indicated that even they themselves were dissatisfied with the judgment given at Tyre.
The insincerity of their protest is revealed by their condemnation of the Western bishops at the end of their letter[171].

L.14,15 actibus suis - i.e. the action of the Westerns in receiving Athanasius into communion after the Council of Tyre.

L.18sq. Etenim adhuc etc. - there is no confirmation elsewhere of these/

Notes.
171. § 27 p.65.

these statements. The Antiochene synod 326/7 is excluded because Athanasius was not then a bishop. According to Coustant[172] it is very doubtful that Athanasius condemned Asclepas in view of the praise he bestows upon him in his works, and this leads him to consider in the same light what is said about Marcellus and Paul. In his Hist. Ar.7 Athanasius relates that he was present when the presbyter, Macedonius, laid accusations against Paul. This would seem to refer to the events which took place towards the end of 335 in Constantinople, whither Athanasius had fled from Tyre in order to appeal to the Emperor in person. Probably the Easterns here make reference to the same events.

p.58 L.1 Maximinus - i.e. the famous bishop of Trèves, with whom Athanasius would have close relations during his exile there.

L.2 Ossius - see note A II p.46 L.14.

L.3sq. occurrimus ad Serdicam etc - Walch[173] argues that equity demanded that Athanasius, Marcellus and Asclepas should be excluded at first from the council, and indeed, if the Eusebians had not requested a council at Rome, more weight might have been attached to their claim. To a certain extent they had some legal case in having Constantine's approval of the decision of the council of Tyre. But they themselves had removed all authority from the synod of Tyre by their approach to Julius for it showed that the question

Notes.
172. P.L. X col. 667 (b).
173. Historie der Kirchenvers. p.176.

had not been finally settled there. Having thus been asked to call a council, Julius was right to continue despite the subsequent refusal of the Eusebians to attend. In his letter he makes no claim that his action is authoritative for the whole Church, but only for Rome, and only because the Eusebians had first appealed to him. The decision of the council of Rome was, of course, generally accepted by the Nicenes, and Athanasius and his companions had therefore justification for their claim to be received among the Western party at the council of Sardica. To have excluded them at first from the council would have been in fact an admissal of their guilt. Moreover the Emperors had given permission to the council of Sardica to make a new investigation into the whole affair[174], thus suspending all former judgments, and it was but right that Athanasius and the others should have been present to defend themselves. Their expulsion could come only if and when the Eusebians were able to prove that the council of Rome had been mistaken and that their accusations were just and true.

L.7 cum Ossio et Protogene - Ossius and Protogenes are always mentioned together by the Easterns as being joint-presidents of the orthodox party at Sardica[175]. Ossius would occupy this position because of his age and the honours already conferred upon him at Nicaea, and Protogenes because he was bishop of the place where the council was being held. Athanasius[176], Theodoret[177], and Sozomen[178] speak

Notes.
174. cf B II, 1.
175. cf p.58 L.16 p.59 L.4 p.60 L.14,26.
176. Hist. Ar.15,16.
177. II, 15.
178. II,12.

only of Ossius as president. It seems to have been Ossius who proposed the various canons[179] and signed the acts before all the others[180].

p.58 L 8sq. nec confundebatur etc - there is no other record of Protogenes having condemned Marcellus. His case may have been similar to that of bishop Maximus of Jerusalem who later repented of his condemnation of Athanasius at Tyre where he had been misled by the Eusebians[181], though this is very doubtful in view of the distinguished part Protogenes had always played in the Nicene party. cf.p.51 L.18 note, p.61 L.10 note.

L.10 sectam - cf L.24. It probably refers to the clergy coming under the influence of Marcellus at Ancyra. e.g. his pupil Photinus.

L.10,11 quater sententiis episcoporum subscribens - Marcellus had evidently been condemned on four accounts and the bishops in the council were required to subscribe to each of these. The four accusations would include his theological errors[182], his having insulted Constantine by refusing to attend the consecration of the church in Jerusalem, his violent conduct[183].

Notes.
179. cf. Mansi III, 5sq. Harduin I, 637sq.
180. B II, 4 p.132. Ath. Apol. c. Ar. 49,50.
181. Socr. II, 8 Soz.III, 6.
182. cf.p.50 L.12,12.
183. cf.§ 9.

L.15sq. mandavimus illis etc - if the Westerns had obeyed this command, they would automatically have made the decision of the council of Rome invalid; in which case the Easterns would have taken full advantage of the argument from tradition[184] and stressed that full inquiry had been made at Tyre, that the judgment given at Tyre should be accepted and that consequently there was no need for a new investigation.

L.26 nos octoginta episcopi - see notes on A IV, 3.

p.59 §17. Throughout their letter the Easterns protest that they are acting in accordance with the "tradition" of the Church or "the discipline of the ecclesiastical rule" but never give a clear definition of what they understand by such phrases. From certain parts of their letter it is evident that the tradition to which they appeal is that existing only since Tyre 335.

L.14,15 ant Orientalibus..praeponerent - i.e. an assembly of Eastern bishops (such as Tyre or Eastern Sardica) is to be preferred in authority to that of Western bishops (such as Rome or Western Sardica). It is quite probable that Eastern bishops with their different outlook and background regarded their Western brethren as theologically backward and inferior to themselves, but the Easterns would find it difficult, if not impossible, to justify their statement from the tradition or law of the Church.

Notes.
184. cf. notes on §3.

L.23,24 eorum qui iam cum deo sunt - i.e. some of those who had participated in the proceedings at Tyre cf. note on p.57 L.3sq.

§18. With the failure of their first scheme to overthrow the decision of the council of Rome by having Athanasius and the others removed from the assembly at Sardica, the Eusebians changed their tactics and suggested that a new inquiry should be sent to Mareotis presumably in the hope that by so doing they could still make it appear an open question and secure the appointment of a thoroughly biased commission, as they had done at Tyre.

p.60 L.1sq. quinque episcopi etc - i.e. the embassy sent to Mareotis by the council of Tyre[185]. Theognis of Nicaea was the bishop who had died before the synod of Sardica.

L.13 sq. hanc optionem etc - the memory of the infamous commission sent to Mareotis by the council of Tyre would greatly influence the Nicenes in their refusal of this proposal. In addition, the Western synod would probably feel that there was sufficient material at hand to enable a final decision to be taken and that this suggestion of the Easterns was only another contrivance to secure postponement and delay the final solution of the question.

§19. - cf. note on p.54 L.26sq.

Notes.
185. cf. note p.53 L.12; p.57 L.3sq; B II, 1 p.106 L.2sq.

p.61 L.10 sicut supradiximus - for Protogenes and Marcellus, see p.51 L.18, p.58 L.8sq. No specific mention is made "above" of Protogenes anathematising Paul, though it might have been given in the section now lost i.e. p.55 § 9. Only in this letter of the Easterns is Protogenes reported to have anathematised Paul and in view of their theological sympathies it is difficult to believe the statement.

L.12 Dionisium - Dionisius, bishop of Elis in the province of Acacia, is also mentioned in B II, 4 (48). He is probably to be identified with the Dionisios from Leida mentioned in Ath. Apol. ad Const. 3. No document is now available to explain this reference to him.

L.15 Bassum - Bassus from Diocletianopolis in Western Macedonia between Edessa and Thessalonica[186] is among the bishops given in B II, 4 (8).

L.18 Aetio - Aetius of Thessalonica in Macedonia is mentioned in B II, 4 (27) and in the 16th and 18th Greek Sardican canons. From canons 18 and 19 it can be gathered that there had been rivalry for the see of Thessalonica between Aetius, Eutychian and Musaeus, but when Aetius was appointed, peace was restored. Nothing is known of Protogenes' accusations against him.

Notes.

186. Itin. Antonini 330, 6.

L.23sq. Asclepas autem etc - Asclepas accompanied Paul on his return to Constantinople towards the end of 341 after the death of Eusebius, see note p.55 L.10,11. Telfer[187] suggests that by "gentiles" (L.27) we may understand "soldiers" and by "fratres" members of the Macedonian party and gives as his interpretation of the passage that the imperial Chamberlain had sent soldiers to secure a Church for Macedonius, only to find it defended with fanatical courage and obstinacy by the supporters of Paul.

p.61, L.29,30 illi qui.. mittentes - this statement shows that Socrates[188] was wrong in thinking that Paul was at Sardica.

p.62 L.3sq. non enim secundum etc - the text is here deficient. Constant[189] adds "eos" after "secundum" (L.3) and "sumus" after "sumus" (L.5). Another solution would be to insert "est" between "enim" and "secundum" (L.3) or again insert "sunt" before "donantes" (L.5).

The general meaning is clear. The Easterns here protest against the Westerns for forgiving sins (e.g. the sin of blasphemy) which it is not in their power to forgive. There may perhaps be also the suggestion of Eastern superiority over the West. cf. p.59, L.14,15 note, i.e. in certain cases Easterns have a power of judgment, which Westerns do not possess, though, even so, their protest is not based on this but concerns sins which both East and West are powerless to forgive.

Notes.
187. Harvard Theol. Rev. XLIII p.79.
188. II,20.
189. P.L. X col. 670 (c).

L.19 ex scriptis nos imperatorum terrere - according to the letter of the council of Sardica to the churches of Alexandria and Egypt[190], the Eusebians had brought with them to Sardica the counts Musonianus and Hesychius, in the hope of maintaining their former decisions against Athanasius and the others through the aid of the civil power. But in this they had been outmanoeuvred[191], and it was decided that the Council was to be treated as a purely ecclesiastical affair with no counts or soldiers allowed entrance.
So in their letter the Easterns now accuse the orthodox party of attempting to accomplish their wicked designs by imperial authority. The "scripta" of the Emperors probably refers to the imperial letters summoning the council and giving instructions as to its purpose and the subjects to be treated, cf. B II, 1 p.104 L.4sq, p.105 L.1.

L.20sq et spectabant dividi etc - it was a favourite argument of the Eusebians that Athanasius and Marcellus were the real trouble-makers in the Church and that all that was required to restore peace was their deposition. The Westerns on the whole were not deceived by this subtlety and realised that a much more important principle was involved, that behind Athanasius lay the Nicene creed and a threat to the one automatically endangered the safety of the other. cf. B.I.

Notes.
190. Ath. Apol. c. Ar. 36. Hist. Ar. 15.
191. Because of Constantius' preoccupation with the Persian war, Constans had the most powerful influence in arranging the Council and favoured the Nicene proposals against those of the Eusebians.

p.63 L.2 de Serdica scribere - see note p.48 L.9.

L.4 - 6 nos enim Athanasium...honore suscipere - cf. p.64 L.3sq. From the very beginning the Christian Church had realised the need to exclude wicked and unruly persons from its midst in order to preserve and protect its true character(I Cor. V.) but the question arose as to how those thus excluded should be treated if they repented of their sins. Early in the second century the general feeling was that there was only one repentance, namely, that sealed in baptism, and after that the Church could not grant restoration in the case of scandalous sins such as murder, impurity, apostasy, though the penitent might eventually receive forgiveness from God.[192] This attitude persisted in the West even to the time of Ambrose and Augustine. Even where restoration was given, it was only after a prolonged course of penitence and was regarded as something special and extraordinary. In the third century Callistus of Rome gave his approval to principles which many regarded as lax and for which he was attacked by Hippolytus[193]. After the Decian persecution in the middle of this century, the question of the lapsed became one of great moment and the Church was compelled to define its attitude towards them in a more positive manner. The immense number of the lapsed favoured a policy of laxity as did the thousands of "libelli pacis", certificates of restoration, issued by the "confessors"/

Notes.
192. cf. Hermas, Vis 11, 2.
193. Ref. IX, 12.

"confessors" i.e. those Christians who had undergone suffering for their faith[194]. The position eventually adopted on the whole was that the penitent should be restored after serious discipline, open confession and a period of public humiliation which guaranteed their sincerity, but that those who had been under ecclesiastical penance should henceforth be excluded from ordination or, if already ordained, from regaining their clerical status[195].

If the original premise of the Easterns, therefore, had been correct, namely, that the council of Tyre was a true and just assembly of the Church, whose decision concerning Athanasius and Marcellus must be upheld, they would be following the tradition of the Church in their assertion that clerics, once deposed and condemned, can not be readmitted to the status of the episcopate. But they were not always so ready to uphold this tradition e.g. in spite of his exile, Eusebius of Nicomedia was restored to his bishopric and took a leading part in that same council of Tyre; Euzoius, who shared exile with Arius, became (later) bishop of Antioch; Secundus of Ptolemais, one of the two bishops exiled with Arius at Nicaea, was later used by the Arians to consecrate Pistus as bishop of Alexandria. Under these circumstances, even if their original charges against Athanasius were proved true, their appeal to tradition carries no weight.

Notes.

194. cf. Cyprian, Ep. 20.

195. cf. Cyprian Ep. 55, 57, 65, 67, 72. Cyprian's position was later upheld by rigorists like the Luciferians and Donatists cf Jer. Dial. adv. Lucif. 13. Optatus II, 24. Innocent Ep. XXII, 3, 4.

L.8 alter - i.e. Marcellus, see note p.49 L.22.

L.10 alter - i.e. Athanasius, see note p.53 L.12.

L.16 alios - e.g. Asclepas, Paul of Constantinople.

p.64 L.3sq. qui pro criminibus etc - cf. note p.63 L. 4 - 6.

L.19 primatus ecclesiae - cf. p.65 L.5 ecclesiae principatum.

L.24, 25 cursus..publicus - i.e. the state posting service along the great roads, which the bishops would use when summoned by the Emperor to a council.

p.65 L.9sq. propterea hanc novitatem etc - this question has been already touched upon: cf. p.57 L.8sq, L.12-13 notes, p.59 L.14.15, note. Hitherto, as a general rule, all disputes had been settled by local or provincial synods. There had been a few instances of East and West joining together but it was not until Nicaea that the new principle of the ecumenical council was brought into being. From that time onwards, therefore, it was natural that, if only for numerical strength, appeal should be made to the West by the East and vice versa. The Easterns themselves (in § 17) had practically admitted that it was impossible to keep separate the affairs of East and West. In these circumstances their complaint is not of great weight. In any case, as has been pointed out, the Westerns had given their judgment only after appeal had been made/

made to them by the Eusebians, and such a judgment would be quite in accordance with the traditions of the Church.
It is noteworthy that the Easterns now grant equal rights in this matter to the Westerns in contrast to their previous attitude. cf. p.59 L.14,15 note, p.63 L.3sq. note.

p.65 L.16sq. nam in urbe Roma etc - according to Cyprian[196] and Eusebius[197] a council of 60 bishops met in Rome under Cornelius, confirmed the decrees of that of Carthage, and excommunicated Novatus[198] and his partisans.
In Hippolytus[199] Callistus is said to have broken off relations with Sabellius but there is no mention of this having been done at a council. Valentinus was in Rome about the middle of the second century but nothing is known of a council held there concerning him.

L.18 sub Paulo a Samosatis - see note p.50 L.11. When Paul was condemned at Antioch, an encyclical letter was sent regarding him to Dionysius of Rome, Maximus of Alexandria and to the bishops of all the provinces[200]. That these bishops agreed with the decision can be gathered from the letter of Felix (successor of Dionysius) to Maximus and from the reply of the Emperor to the appeal of the orthodox/

Notes.
196. Ep.52.
197. H.E. VII, 43.
198. i.e. Novatianus. It is worthy of note that both Eusebius and the Easterns' letter make the same mistake with his name.
199. Ref. IX, 11.
200. Euseb. H.E. VII, 30.

orthodox against Paul that the episcopal house at Antioch be given to those to whom the bishops of Italy and of the city of Rome should adjudge it[201].

The impression here given by the Easterns, that the case of Athanasius and his companions is in the same category as that of Novatus, Sabellius and Valentinus, is a false one because, while the heresy of the latter was obvious and agreed upon by the whole Church, the charges brought against Athanasius were, to say the least, highly debatable and had the support only of a minority in the Church. Underthese circumstances, the comparison is unjust and in no way supports their argument.

L.31sq. unde Iulium urbis etc - it is difficult to reconcile this action of the Easterns in condemning these Western bishops with their previous protests about interference in each other's affairs. cf. p.57 L.12 p.59 L.14,15 p.63 L3sq. p.65 L.9sq. By their action they admit the impossibility of East and West remaining as it were in separate compartments, each trying to deal purely with matters affecting itself. The controversy transcended geographical boundaries and involved the whole Church.

p.66 L.1 Gaudentium - Gaudentius from Naissus in Dacia is mentioned among/

Notes.
201. Euseb. ibid.

among the bishops present at Western Sardica[202] and his name is found in several of the Greek canons 4, 18, 20. His predecessor was Cyriacus[203] who seems to have been a supporter of the Eusebians. cf. p.66 L.9 "inmemorem decessoris sui"

L.4sq - cf. p.51 L.17sq. p.55 L.10, 11 note.

L.12 ut principem et ducem malorum - i.e. because of his council at Rome and his brilliant letter.

L.17 Marcum - nothing is known of this person.

L.20,21 Paulino.. Daciae - nothing definite is known about this bishop.

L.24,25 Machedonius.. a Mobso - Machedonius from Mobsus (or Mopsuestia) is the second known bishop of that place, Theodore being the first. He was one of the commission of inquiry sent to Mareotis by the council of Tyre 335[204] , was present at the Dedication council of Antioch and had also joined in the epistle to Julius of Rome in whose reply his name is mentioned[205]. He appears in the list of Eastern bishops at Sardica[206], and also among the bishops present at Sirmium 351[207]. According to A VII, § 4 p.91 L.19, he had also taken part in the synod of Milan c.345.

Notes.
202. BII, 4 (32).
203. p.66 L.9, 10 cf p.51 L.18 note.
204. Ath. Apol. c. Ar. 13,72.
205. Ath. Apol. c. Ar. 20.
206. A IV, 3 (7).
207. B VII, 9 p.170 L.7.

L.25, 26 Eustasio - this is probably the Eustasius (or Eustathius) who was deposed by the Eusebians at an Antiochene council 326/7. He was first of all bishop of Beroea in Syria and came to Antioch c.324. Theodoret[208] calls him "The Great" and he seems to have been venerated for his learning and virtues and admired for his eloquence[209]. At Nicaea he showed himself an uncompromising opponent of Arianism, and Athanasius[210] recognises him as a worthy fellow-labourer and sufferer in the cause of the orthodox faith.

L.26 Quimatio - he is probably the Quimatius of Paltos in Coele - Syria mentioned several times in the works of Athanasius[211] as having been deposed by the Eusebians.

p.67 L.1 episcopos, quos ad Gallias miseramus - according to Athanasius De Syn. 25, 90 bishops who had been present at the Dedication council of Antioch 341, not satisfied with the previous creeds drawn up, formulated a new one[212], and dispatched Narcissus of Neronias, Maris of Chalcedon, Theodorus of Heraclea, and Mark of Arethusa into Gaul with it to the Emperor Constans[213].

Notes.

208. H.E. I, 7.
209. Soz. H.E. I, 2: II, 19. Theod. H.E. I,20.
210. Hist. Ar. 5.
211. Hist. Ar. 4. Tom. Ad Antioch, 1,10. Apol. de fuga 3.
212. Socr. H.E. II, 18 declares that this newform was made to deceive Constans into thinking that this was the creed of the council, thus trying to hide the real creed.
213. the latter having demanded an explanation of the grounds of the deposition of Athanasius and Paul of Constantinople. Socr. H.E. II, 18.

When exiled from Constantinople at the end of 338, Paul had sought refuge in the West. He would naturally approach Maximinus, the most important bishop in Gaul at that time, in order, through him, to seek an audience with the Emperor Constantine II. This probably explains the reference to Maximinus as being the first Western bishop to communicate with Paul. Paul was able to return to his see on the death of Eusebius towards the end of 341, and in this would have the support of the Western orthodox bishops. cf. p.55 L.10,11 note.

L.15 novam sectam Iudeo couniti Marcelli - with his difficulties over the relations of Father and Son in the Godhead, Marcellus gave ample scope for a charge such as this. cf. p.49 L.22 note[214].

Notes.

214. "couniti" is a reasonable conjecture of Feder from the corrupt "croniti".

A IV, 2. The Creed of the Eastern synod of Sardica.

SUMMARY. The Easterns assert their belief in one God the Father and in His one begotten Son our Lord, begotten from the Father before the world, God from God, Light from Light, and in the other articles found in most creeds, A few anathemas are placed at the end of the creed.

COMMENTARY. Ever since the Council of Nicaea, the real aim of the Eusebians had been to replace the Nicene creed with a confession of their own composition but not until the Dedication council of Antioch 341 had they dared to attempt this. At that council they put forward the four Antiochene creeds, the last of which formed the basis for the one issued by the Easterns at Sardica[215]. This combined creed was in turn adopted by the fifth council of Antioch.

The Eusebian character of these creeds is evident from the skilful way in which they have been composed so that while they can not be accused of Arianism[216], yet neither are they "Nicene" because they avoid the crucial "homoousios" and make no mention of "ousia". How far they were successful in their aim is questionable. Hilary[217] in reviewing the second of the creeds issued at Antioch 341, judges it quite favourably and interprets it in an orthodox sense.

Notes.
215. This is obvious from a comparison of both creeds.
216. because in them the unity is not declared to be "of will" only.
217. De Syn. 29.

Athanasius[218] , on the other hand, seems to have perceived more clearly the deception plotted by the Eusebians.

Hilary gives this creed in his "De Synodis" 34. It has been preserved also in the Cod. Ver. LX (58) and Cod. Par. syr. 62.

Because there are differences between the creed as given in A IV, 2 and Hil. De Syn. 34, Stilting[219] asserts that the two can not have come from Hilary who would have given the same text in both. The differences, however, are slight and can be explained from the diversity of the Greek archetypes for it is almost certain that Hilary would use one copy in Gaul when translating it from the Greek, and a different one when writing his "De Synodis" in exile in the East.

Hil. De Syn 34, Cod. Ver. LX (58) and Cod. Par. syr. 62 all attach a list of provinces to the creed. It is similar to the one given in A IV, 1 p.49 L.1sq.

Comparison of the creed as given in A IV, 2 with Hil. De Syn. 34, the 4th Antioch[220] and the 5th Antioch[221] gives the following results:- p.69 L.2 creatura: Hil. De Syn. 34 has "paternitas" Ant.IV and Ant.V

Notes.
218. De Syn. 22sq.
219. Acta S.S: II Jan 13th.
220. Ath. De Syn. 25.
221. Ath. De Syn. 26.

p.70 L.6 in dextera patris: Ant.IV has the singular, Ant.V the plural.

p.71 L.2 incessabile: Ant. IV has ἀκατάλυτος (indissoluble)
Ant.V has ἀκατάπαυστος (that can not cease)

p. 71 L.2, 3 est sedem: Ant. IV has ἐστὶ καθεζόμενος. Ant.V καθέζεται.

p.71 L.4 credimus: Ant.IV omits this. Ant.V inserts πιστεύομεν.

p.71 L.5 caelum: Ant.IV οὐρανοὺς Ant. V οὐρανόν. suam: Ant. IV αὐτοῦ
Ant. V omits.

p.72 L.2 sanctam: Ant. IV. καθολικήν. Ant. V. καθολικὴν καὶ ἁγίαν.

From this it appears that Hil. De Syn 34 is nearer to the 4th Antioch than is A IV, 2 which bears a closer resemblance to the 5th Antioch.

The creed itself is less opposed in substance to Arianism than the Lucianic 2nd. Antioch because it does not have the direct attack on Arianism contained in the words: ἄτρεπτον τε καὶ ἀναλλοίωτον, τὴν τῆς θεότητος οὐσίας τε καὶ δυνάμεως καὶ βουλῆς καὶ δόξης τοῦ πατρὸς ἀπαράλλακτον εἰκόνα ("unable to change or alter, the unvarying image of the essence of the Godhead and the might and glory of the Father". ἄτρεπτον καὶ ἀναλλοίωτον is a direct denial of the Arian τρεπτὸς καὶ ἀλλοιωτός. οὐσίας ἀπαράλλακτον εἰκόνα emphasises the absence of any change of essence in the transition from the Father to the Son (cf. Hil. De Syn. 33 discussing "essentiae incommutabilem imaginem") and could be taken as equivalent to "homoousios").

On/

On the other hand, as a safeguard against the charge of heresy, the 4th Antioch included the anathemas of the Nicene creed, albeit in weakened form[222].

Both anathemas in the 4th Antioch were directed against the Arians (1) ἐξ οὐκ ὄντων etc. is diametrically opposed to ὁμοούσιος the Son is made a creature, not begotten of the substance of the Father. (2) ἦν ποτε χρόνος etc.:-with the orthodox, Arius admitted that the term "begotten" was the one safeguard of the personal existence of the Son against Sabellianism, but he conceived the divine generation in terms of the idea of time which governs every human generation and concluded that the Son could not be coeternal with the Father.

In addition to these anathemas, A IV, 2 and Ant.V added five others. (3) "There are three Gods" :- Epiphanius[223] relates that the Sabellians used to say to plain, pious people: "Well, my good friends, what are we to say? - Have we one God or three?" with the effect in many cases of winning them over. Sabellius removed all reality and distinction of persons in the Godhead by explaining away the Three as transient phases of One. Arius went to the other extreme and by his subordinationism not only distinguished the three Persons but separated them. (4) "Christ is not God":- the Dynamic Monarchians, such as Paul of Samosata, represented our Lord as primarily and properly a human person, but elevated to exceptional/

Notes.

222. Gwatkin "Studies" p.122 thinks the insertion of χρόνος in the anathema against ἦν ποτε ὅτε οὐκ ἦν was a loophole expressly made for the escape of the blasphemers.

223. Haer. 62.

exceptional place and power, even to an attributive Godhead, by divine influences which descended on him. cf. Ath. De Syn 26 (4),[224] (5). "Before the ages He was neither Christ nor Son of God":- cf. Marcellus, Photinus[225].

(6) "Father, Son and Holy Ghost are the same":- cf. the Sabellians.

(7) "The Father begat the Son not by choice nor will":- cf. Ath. Orat. III, 62. It is noteworthy that the text in Cod. Ver. LX (56) and Cod. Par. syr. 62 is significantly changed to accord with Nicene orthodoxy. Instead of the negative "not by choice nor will" as in A Iv, 2 and Hil. De Syn. 34, the affirmative expression is used "either by will or choice".

Notes.

224. Arius held that He who became incarnate preexisted as the Logos, but this Logos, though thus exalted, was not within the sphere of Godhead; was not therefore divine in the proper and primary sense, but was only the first and greatest of the creatures.

225. see notes on them. Also Ath. De Syn. 26 (5).

A IV, 3 List of Eastern bishops.

(1) Stephanus - Tillemont[226] thinks he may have become bishop of Antioch on the death of Flacillus c.340. He and Acacius of Caesarea seem to have taken a leading part at Eastern Sardica. He was deposed shortly after Sardica by an Antiochene synod because of a dastardly plot against the legates of the Western synod of Sardica[227].

(4) Menofantus was already bishop of Ephesus at the council of Nicaea[228] and was always prominent in the struggle against Athanasius.

(6) Eulalius of Amasias - according to Feder[229] this is probably the see in Helenopontus, already represented at Nicaea[230].

(7) Machedonius - see note p.66 L.24, 25.

(8) Thelafius of Calchedonia - Because Chalkedonia in Bithynia was represented at Sardica by Maris, Le Quien[231] suggests that the city referred to here is Chalkis in Syria. Feder[232] points out that there/

Notes.
226. Mem. VII, 270.
227. Ath. Hist. Ar. 20.
228. Pat. Nic. V, 120.
229. Stud. II, 72.
230. Pat. Nic. I, 109.
231. II, 785.
232. Stud. II, 72 basing his opinion on Pauly- Wissowa III, 2090sq.

there were two cities in Syria with the name of Chalkis, at Belos and at Libanon and that it is the former which is meant.

(9) Acacius of Caesarea in Palestine was the pupil, biographer and successor of Eusebius, the Church historian. He was made bishop c.340[233] and became leader of the Arian party at court after the death of Eusebius of Nicomedia. He was at Antioch 341[234] and along with the other leading Eusebians was deposed by the Westerns at Sardica[235]. According to Jerome[236] it was he who persuaded Constantius to appoint Felix in place of the exiled Liberius. At the Ariminum - Seleucia synods he took an important part but after the confirmation of his deposition at Seleucia by the council of Macedonian bishops at Lampsacus, no more is heard of him.

(10) Theodorus of Heraclia in Thrace had already played a notable part in Eusebian affairs, having been associated in the letter to Julius, been present at Antioch 341, and taken part in the embassy sent by Constantius to Constans to explain the deposition of Athanasius and Paul of Constantinople[237]. He was deposed by Western Sardica[238].

(11) Quintianus took possession of Gaza after the banishment of Asclepas[239].

Notes.
233. Socr. H.E. II, 4 Soz. H.E. III, 2.
234. Soz. III, 5.
235. B II, 1 p. 123 L.5sq.
236. De vir. ill. 98.
237. Ath. De Syn. 25. Socr. II, 18.
238. p.123 L.5sq.
239. B II, 1 p.123 L.2.

(12) Marcus of Arethusa was also one of the leading Eusebians in the controversies raging about the middle of the fourth century. He was the author of the "Dated" creed of Sirmium[240].

(17) Dianius of Caesarea in Cappadocia was present at Antioch 341.[241] Later he subscribed the decrees of Constantinople 360. Basil the Great, who was baptised by him[242], excused his subscription of these decrees by saying that he had done it with simple heart and had intended no harm against the Nicene creed[243].

(19) Eudoxius of Germanicia was another of the Eusebian leaders. He was a disciple of Aetius, a friend of Eunomius, and subsequently the leader of the Anomoean party. He had already been present at Antioch 341. On the death of Leontius, he became bishop of Antioch, c.357 and was present as such at Seleucia, where Hilary says he was shocked by his teaching[244]. He was bishop of Constantinople from 360 to 370. At the council of Lampsacus 364 he was deposed by the Macedonians but this was made of no avail because Valens refused to confirm their action.

(23) Basil of Ancyra was later to be one of the outstanding exponents of Semiarianism. On the deposition of Marcellus by the Eusebians at/

Notes.
240. B VI p.163 L.17sq.
241. Soz. III, 5.
242. De spiritu sancto 29 P.G. XXXII, 201A.
243. Ep. 51 P.G. XXXII, 390 c.
244. c. Const. 13.

at Constantinople 336, Basil had been appointed to the see, and though deposed by the Westerns at Sardica in favour of Marcellus,[245] he soon regained his place[246].

As a Semiarian, he attacked both extremes: for example, his attack on Photinus at Sirmium 351 and later his attack on Aetius, the Anomoean[247]. He exercised his greatest influence at the synod of Ancyra 358 and the time following, when he persuaded Constantius to call the general council of Ariminum and Seleucia to settle the various problems disturbing the Church. His power, however, was short-lived, and he soon found that the control of the council lay in the hands, not of his party, but of the Acacians[248]. After the Acacian victory at Constantinople, Basil was deposed along with Cyril of Jerusalem, Eustathius of Sebaste and others, and exiled to Illyria[249]. He appealed to Jovian on his accession in 363, but in vain, and he seems to have died in exile[250].

(34) Squirius of Mareotis, better known as Ischyras[251], was the centre-point of the accusations raised against Athanasius with regard to Mareotis[252].

(41) Eudemon of Tanis in Egypt was one of the earliest opponents of Athanasius/.

Notes.
245. B II, 1 p.123,L.1.
246. Socr. II, 20,26.
247. Epiph. Haer. LXXI, LXXIII. Socr. II, 30. Philost. H.E.III,16. Greg. Nyss. in Eunom. I, p.289,296.
248. Theod. II, 17.
249. Soz. IV, 24. Philost. V, 1.
250. Socr. III, 25.
251. cf. Socr. II, 20.
252. Ath. Apol. c. Ar. passim. and notes on A IV, 1.

Athanasius. With Ision of Athribis and Callinicus of Pelusion he went in an embassy c. 328 to Constantine and raised suspicions about Athanasius[253].

(56) Narcissus of Irenopolis (or Neronias) in Cilicia was also prominent in the controversy from a very early date. c.314 he attended the councils of Ancyra and Neocaesarea[254]. According to Athanasius[255] he was a supporter of Arius before Nicaea, but at Nicaea he subscribed the creed. He was one of the bishops who, after the deposition of Eustathius, offered the see of Antioch to Eusebius of Caesarea[256], and he was probably one of the eminent Cilician bishops at Jerusalem 335[257]. He was at Antioch 341 and with Theodore of Heraclia, Maris of Chalcedon and Marcus of Arethusa took part in an embassy from Constantius to Constans[258]. He is mentioned in the address of the letter of Julius[259] and was deposed by the Westerns at Sardica[260]. Writing about the middle of the century Athanasius calls him one of the then prominent Eusebians[261] and, as such, he joined in the composition of the creed of Sirmium 351[262]. On hearing that Narcissus was accusing him of cowardice/

Notes.
253. Ath. Apol. c. Ar. 60.
254. Mansi II, 534, 548.
255. De Syn. 17.
256. Eus. V.C. III, 61sq.
257. Eus. V.C. IV, 43.
258. Ath. De Syn. 25.
259. Ath. Apol. c. Ar. 20.
260. B II, 1 p. 123 L.5sq.
261. Apol. c. Ar. 48.
262. B VII, 9 p.170 L.5.

cowardice for his flight from Alexandria[263], Athanasius[264] asserts that Narcissus had been accused of many crimes and degraded three times by various synods.

(69) Demophilus of Beroea in Thrace is probably the same person mentioned in Liberius' letter to Constantius[265] as having been unwilling to condemn the Arian heresies at Milan and in B VII, 9 p.170 L.4 as having influenced Liberius to sign a heretical creed. He was one of the Arian bishops deposed at Ariminum 359 but this deposition was never carried into effect[266]. After the death of Eudoxius in 370, Demophilus was elected as his successor at Constantinople by the Arians[267], but their opponents set up Evagrius as bishop. Valens intervened in favour of Demophilus and banished Evagrius. In 380, with the reign of Theodosius, came a change in the fortunes of Demophilus. On his refusal to subscribe the Nicene creed, he was ordered to give up his churches[268].

(73) Valens - see note A I p.45 L.18.

The list shows that this synod was almost purely an Eastern one, the majority of the bishops coming from the prefecture of the East; the westernmost/

Notes.
263. Apol. de fuga 1.
264. ibid. § 26, written c.357.
265. A VII, 4 p.91 L.18.
266. Socr. II, 37.
267. Socr. IV, 14. Soz. VI, 13.
268. Socr. V, 7sq.

westernmost province mentioned is Pannonia, where Arius spent his exile. The Western synod[269] had a larger and wider representation, including a few bishops from areas where the Eusebians were strongest and on this basis alone might claim superiority as being more fully representative of the Church.

According to Sabinus' account, the number of Eastern bishops present at the council was 76[270]. The Easterns themselves give the number of participants as 80[271]. In the subscription list[272], 73 bishops are mentioned, and if the two "Eusebius a Pergamo" in (27) and (43) should be the same person, 72 names still remain. Moreover, some provinces, which should have been represented, do not appear in the list, though, of course, they might have had representatives among the bishops who are given without the name of their see. That the list is incomplete can be gathered from the fact that, while the Easterns[273] assert that five out of the six legates who went to Mareotis were present, Maris of Chalcedon and Ursacius of Singidunum who were in this embassy, are missing from the list. If the Easterns' statement[274] is accepted, this would leave only five or six names still unknown.

Notes.
269. cf. B II, 4.
270. Socr. II, 20. Soz.III, 12.
271. A IV, 1 p.58 L.26.
272. A IV, 3.
273. A IV. 1 § 18.
274. A IV, 1 p.58 L.26.

CONCLUSION. With the formulation and subscription of the Nicene creed 325, Constantine might have been excused for thinking that he had at last succeeded in bringing peace and unity to the Church. Only 3 persons, Arius and the 2 Egyptian bishops Theonas of Marmarica and Secundas of Ptolemais with their priests, had refused to sign and thus suffered exile in Illyria. But the shallowness of the victory soon made itself evident in subsequent events. Not only was there dissatisfaction and anxiety about the creed itself, but the manner in which the subscriptions had been gained - simply by fear of the imperial presence and threat of exile - was not conducive to any real or lasting harmony. Many bishops could not be classed as extreme Arians, though they held subordinationist views, but neither were they by any means supporters of the "homoousios"; indeed the past associations of that word were not at all assuring to these "conservatives" whose primary desire was to preserve the traditional beliefs of the Church. Nevertheless, they signed the creed, principally from fear of the Emperor, though at the same time making their own mental reservations, putting their own meaning on the words and accepting the "homoousios" because it seemed the only possible way to exclude Arianism. It would not be rash to conclude that this was the position of the majority at the Council; on the one extreme would be the thorough-going Arians, on the other the convinced supporters of the "homoousios", and in the centre the great mass of bishops, conservative at heart, but swayed in one particular drection for the moment by the Imperial presence; and/

and such being human nature, when this constraint was removed, the harsh persecutions directed against the Arians would be more inclined to arouse their sympathy than to confirm them in their new position[275]. That this was what actually happened can be seen from the events occurring in Egypt some three months after Nicaea. When several Alexandrians were banished from Egypt for having falle from the Nicene faith, Eusebius of Nicomedia and Theognis of Nicaea came out openly in their support; for this they in turn were exile to Gaul by Constantine[276]. Far from suppressing Arianism, Nicaea had only driven its supporters temporarily underground. Soon they were plotting new schemes to overthrow their opponents and win over the Emperor to their side.

Their first move was to secure the recall of the exiled Arian leaders by means of general confessions of allegiance to the Nicene council. Then they adopted a bolder attitude and began attacks on the leaders of the Nicene party, Eustathius of Antioch, Athanasius, Marcellus. Finally they aimed to replace the Nicene creed by confessions drawn up by themselves and first attempted this at the Dedication council of Antioch 341.

When this stage was reached, it was apparent that recourse would have to be made again to a council, in order to heal the divisions a settle the credal questions. Thus was convened the synod of Sardica and according to the synod itself[277] its two main objectives were/

Notes.

275. This seems best to account for the resurgence of the Arian cause so soon after Nicaea.
276. Theod. I, 20.
277. B II, 1. BII, 2.

were, first of all, to give an united decision, both by East and West, on the question of Athanasius and the others, and secondly to settle the credal problem caused by the Eusebians formulating several creeds in addition to the Nicene. Though the Eusebians had set off for Sardica without delay on receipt of the imperial summons[278], the Westerns were the first to arrive there. There is no doubt that the former came basing their whole case on Constantius' protection and relying on the two officers of high standing, Musanius and Hesychius, whom he had sent with them[279], but in this they were outwitted. Then, when they came to the council, they found Athanasius and his companions having free intercourse with the Nicene party, and on the refusal of the Westerns to treat these men as excommunicate, they withdrew from the council.

It might be argued that there was something in the complaint of t Easterns and that it was putting a definite bias on the case for Athanasius and the others to be treated on so friendly terms by t Westerns; on the other hand, to treat them as the Easterns wishe namely, as excommunicate, would have been to give tacit assent to decisions made at Tyre and Constantinople (as opposed to that of Rome) and thus place the bias on the other side. The crux of th matter was that, though theoretically it was to be regarded as an open question, both sides found it impossible to adopt a neutral position. Before coming to the council, both East and West had decided/

Notes.
278. A IV, 1 p.58 L.3sq.
279. Ath. Apol. c. Ar. 36 and Hist. Ar.15. A IV 1, p.62 L.19 note

decided what attitude they were going to take. The Easterns saw that acceptance of Athanasius meant the complete reversal and ruin of the plans they were so carefully laying to secure the dominant position in the Church. On the other hand, the Westerns saw just as clearly that condemnation of Athanasius would ultimately lead to doubts being cast on the Nicene creed. Even at this stage, it must have been evident that the struggle against Athanasius was really a struggle against the Nicene creed, that what was at issue was not simply a personal attack on Athanasius, but that his condemnation was a major step towards the ultimate aim of the Eusebians, namely, the overthrow of the Nicene creed.
Both parties were aware of this situation, and in view of this and of the nearequality of numbers, if the Easterns had been sure of their case against Athanasius and their charges against him had been true, they would have remained at the council. The natural conclusion was that it was only because of the hopelessness of their case that the Easterns gave this as excuse for their departure. Their letter (A IV, 1) written as an "apologia" for their withdrawal, is a typical example of Eusebian diplomacy, attempting to cover up former mistakes and forestall future charges, and full of slander about their opponents. They had put themselves in a false position at Rome, and so now they say nothing of their own share in the proceedings there but accuse Athanasius as the instigator of the appeal to Julius! Again, by coming to Sardica, they actually proved/

proved that the question concerning Athanasius had not yet been satisfactorily settled, but they had come only because they had high hopes of managing the council by means of imperial support and thus securing a decisive sentence against Athanasius. When this plan was thwarted, they immediately accuse their opponents of trying to frighten them by "imperial missives"[280]. Further, to defend themselves against a future charge of causing division in the Church by their withdrawal from the council, they make a rather nebulous appeal to tradition. But the Westerns were entitled to make at least an equal claim to tradition; and it could not be denied that by fostering charges against Athanasius without daring to justify them before a fairly constituted council, they had frequently disturbed the peace of the Church since Nicaea, and that their withdrawal now widened the division in the Church.

The letter, therefore, gives an interesting revelation of the position and standpoint of the Eusebians and of the tactics employed by them at this time. Here their manoeuvres and deceits are evident for all to see; here, too, is evident the weakness of their cause when not supported by the imperial power; too frightened to remain at a council where there was almost equal representation, where strength of argument, rather than strength of arm, was to be the deciding factor, the falsity of their accusations against Athanasius is disclosed by their flight. Their main line of action, too was the negative one of slandering their opponents, and their one positive contribution, namely, the formulation of their creed, served/

Notes.

280. A IV, 1 § 22.

served only to reveal their true aim of overthrowing the Nicene creed.[281]

Altogether it was an invaluable document for the collector because it amply illustrated his own arguments[282] and provided him with a damning piece of evidence supplied by the Eusebians themselves. In the letter as preserved today, there seems to be some confusion in order and arrangement; this will be partly original through constant reiteration of the accused and the various accusations but may be also partly caused through accidents in transmission; for example, § 9, in which the section on Paul is missing, seems misplaced.

Notes.

281. The Westerns at Sardica did not follow them in this mistake but clung steadfastly to the Nicene creed.

282. cf. B I, § 4 sq.

Series A V, 1 Letter from the synod of Ariminum to Constantius. 359

SUMMARY. (1) Ursacius and Valens, encouraged by Imperial favour, had come to Ariminum, hoping to win over the Council to their opinion. How unsuccessful they were is revealed in this letter sent by the Council to the Emperor. In it, the Council affirms its belief in, and loyalty to, the decisions taken at Nicaea 325 in the presence of the Emperor Constantine, and asserts that, if anything is removed from these decisions, then a way is opened for the influx of heresies. (2) It was for this reason indeed that Ursacius and Valens had come under suspicion some time before and been suspended from communion; but they had asked pardon, as their writings testify, and this had been granted at a council of Milan in the presence of the Roman legates.

Then follows another reference to the Council of Nicaea, part of which is missing in the Latin text, but is still preserved in Greek in Ath. De Syn. 10. When the Latin text again resumes, it is concerned with Ursacius and Valens.

Armed with a letter from the Emperor, which ordered the synod to treat of matters of the faith, Valens, Ursacius and their associates, Germinius and Gaius, had put forward a heretical creed, which the council had rejected; whereupon Valens and his friends had decided to rewrite it, in the hope of gaining a more favourable reception: this was indeed typical of their numerous vacillations/

tions in a short space of time. But the change had no effect. The council reaffirmed the old statutes and then sent envoys to the Emperor with their letter to inform him of their decision and to show him that Valens and his group could not bring peace to the Church with their propositions.

(3) The letter ends with a request that the Emperor may look favourably upon their embassy and grant the bishops a speedy dismissal to their dioceses, which were in desperate straits through their absence.

COMMENTARY. In addition to Faber-Coustant, the letter has also been edited by Harduin I, 715-718, Coleti II, 905sq. and Mansi III 305-308. The title given in MS. C.[1] is a combination of the subscription of the letter and the title of the following document A V, 3.

Its authenticity has never been questioned. Socrates[2] states that this letter was originally written in Latin, and if that is so, the text as given in A V, 1 probably represents the original one[3]. But its transmission has been faulty and the text is rather corrupt. The letter is found also in Greek in Socr. H.E. II, 37, Ath. De Syn. 10, Soz. H.E. IV, 18, Theod. H.E.II, 19 and/

Notes.

1. Sequitur epistola Ariminensis concilii ad Constantium imperatorem, ubi episcopi praevaricati sunt a fide vera.
2. H.E. II, 37.
3. This is the opinion generally accepted, though Parmentier supposes Hilary's text to be a version from the Greek. cf. Feder p.84 L.12 app. crit.

and Nicephorus Callistus H.E. IX, 40. Comparison of the Greek text shows that all these versions are dependent on the one translation and any differences have arisen only through MS.. variants. cf. Feder p.84 L.12 app. crit on ἀπιστησασιν.
The Latin text differs in several respects from the Greek: for example, in construction p.82 L.1; in p.80 L.5 the Latin uses stronger language than the Greek; in general the Latin is shorter than the Greek and sometimes a better understanding of the Latin can be gained from reference to the Greek e.g. p.80 L.3, 4, 5, (though there are exceptions. cf. p.83 L.6 where the Latin inserts "Germinius et Gaius"), p.82 L.4 Latin omits "Auxentius", p.84 L.1, 2, the Latin text has "But also the unbelieving are forbidden to come to belief", the Greek has "fill the believers with distrust and the unbelieving with cruelty."

p.78 L.13 Augusto Constantio - Constantius, the second, and ablest of the sons of Constantine, had always shown himself inclined to favour the anti-Nicenes, though, particularly susceptible as he was to the persuasions of the various intriguers at court, his allegiance often wavered between the various sections in that group[4]. While making their protest in this letter, the Westerns would have very little hope of gaining Constantius' favour - too often already he had proved the enemy of Athanasius and of Nicaea - but at least through it they indicated their own

Notes.
4. cf. his momentary swing over to Basil and the Semiarians after the synod of Ancyra 358 and then his return to the Acacians at Seleucia and Constantinople.

position, justified themselves and showed that Valens and his followers could not bring true peace to the Church with their proposals.

L.13, 14 synodus Ariminensis - according to Socrates[5], Constantius' purpose in calling a synod was to try and restore harmony among the various sections into which the Arian party was then divided, to secure a common basis whereby their several differences could be minimised and peace restored to the Church.
At the very beginning the Arians gained two concessions which were to influence profoundly the course and outcome of the council. First of all, they persuaded the Emperor to summon two separate synods, one for the Westerns at Ariminum in North Italy, the other for the Easterns at Seleucia, near the Cilician coast, thus preventing any possible union between the Nicenes and Semiarians against themselves and setting effectual limits to the powerful orthodox Western influence. Secondly, in order that the formulation of a creed should not be left to chance at the general meetings of the synods, the Arian court bishops, such as Valens and Ursacius, in collaboration with some of the leading Semiarians drew up an ambiguous formula, designed to please both parties to the alliance, and known as the Dated creed[6]. This creed gained the Emperor's approval/

Notes.
5. H.E.II, 37.
6. cf.B VI, § 3 Epiph. Haer. 73, 22. Ath. De Syn. 7.

approval and was signed by all the court bishops[7]. Valens took a copy of this creed with him to Ariminum and the letter A V, 1 describes how it was received. The Ariminum synod was the first to meet in May 359[8]. Valens and the others who had been present at the conference at Sirmium, which issued the Dated Creed, would probably arrive after the opening of the Synod.

L.15 praecepto pietatis tuae - cf.A VIII.

L.16 ad Ariminensium locum - Ariminum was situated near the border of Cisalpine Gaul in North Italy.

L.16,17 ex diversis..episcopi - the Council at Ariminum was a Western one, with authority to deal only with Western affairs[9]. As no episcopal lists have survived, it is now impossible to say which provinces were represented.

p.78 L.17 - p.79 L.1 ut fides..noscerentur - cf. A VIII p.94 L.4sq.

p.79 L.7 sanctorum - sancitorum. cf. L.16 ὡρισμενων.
The Latin is awkward here because "sanctorum" refers to things and "eorum" to persons. The Greek text has a different construction.

Notes.
7. cf. B VI.
8. A VIII § 2.
9. cf. A VIII.

L.8 Nicheno - i.e. the Council of Nicaea 325.

p.80 L.4 aliquid demtum - i.e. particularly the word "homoousios".

L.6 Ursacius et Valens - see note AI p.45 L.15.

L.7 suspensi erant a communione - cf. B II, 1 p.123-4.

L.8 scripta - this will refer to their letter to Julius[10] and also to the "liber" mentioned in B II, 6 p.144 L.9.

L.8sq. rogaverunt veniam etc - cf. BII, 6 p.144 L.10. In B II, 5 and B II, 6 nothing is said of the Roman legates but it is most probable that the bishop of Rome would be represented. The reason for their special mention here is probably that, since Liberius of Rome was neither present in person nor represented at Ariminum, the Western bishops would be anxious to show that, so far as Valens and Ursacius were concerned, the Roman Church was in agreement with the decision of the rest of the West.

p.81 L.1 Constantino praesente in hoc (sc. concilio Nicaeno) - perhaps the Western bishops emphasise the favour of the Emperor Constantine towards the Nicene creed in order to counteract the Arian reliance on Constantius at the synods of Ariminum and Seleucia; it might also be in a vain effort to recall Constantius to the faith of his father.

Notes.

10. B II, 6 p. 143 L3sq.

"In hoc" refers, not to the Milan synod (p.80 L.9), but to the council of Nicaea at which Constantine was present. cf. p.79 L.8.

L.2, 3 baptizatus..commigravit - according to Eusebius[11], Constantine was baptised during the feast of Pentecost 337 and died on the last day of the feast. Jerome[12] states that Eusebius of Nicomedia performed the baptismal ceremony. The custom of postponing baptism until nearing the end of one's life had been condemned by the synod of Neocaesarea, canon 12 (314 A.D.), though Eusebius of Caesarea[13] saw no harm in the practice. There is no doubt, however, that it indicates a lower level of Christian faith and practice. "By refraining from the sacrament of baptism till his last illness, Constantine acted in the spirit of men of the world in every age who dislike to pledge themselves to engagements which they still intend to fulfil, and to descend from the position of judges to that of disciples of the Faith"[14]. On the other hand, it must be admitted that in many ordinary instances baptism was regarded as bringing certain forgiveness and was therefore postponed for this reason. In Constantine's case, there was the added complication of his imperial position in a pagan empire. As Emperor, he would be required to do things for which the Church would have had to discipline a baptised member. His compromise avoided a difficult situation both for the Church and for himself.

Notes.
11. Vit. Const. LXII, LXIII, LXIV.
12. Chronicle P.L. XXVII, p.499-500.
13. V.C. IV, 61-63.
14. Newman "Arians" p.262 (1833 ed.).

Some[15] have thought this section p.81 L.1-9 misplaced and requiring to be transposed to follow p.80 L.5. But the Greek copies have the same order and there is no reason why it should not be accepted as the original order if p.80 L.6 - p.81 L.1 is considered as a digression from the main course of the argument. From past experience, the Westerns would be anxious to attack Valens and Ursacius on the slightest pretext and the "si aliquid demtum fuerit" etc." (p.80 L.4sq) gave the opportunity for a quick thrust at them, though the main attack comes later.

p.81 L.9 - p.82 L.1. This part of the Latin text is missing but fortunately it can be reconstructed from the Greek. "Once more then the pitiful men of wretched mind with lawless daring have announced themselves as the heralds of an impious opinion, and are attempting to upset every summary of truth". The "pitiful men" are Valens, Ursacius and their followers and the "impious opinion" their revised version of the Dated Creed.

p.82 L.1sq tunc etiam conabantur etc - this gives an insight into the tactics adopted by the Arians at the synod. The Emperor's letter, in which the bishops were advised to discuss matters of faith and unity, gave Valens and his party an opportunity to introduce the Dated/

Notes.
15. for example, Valesius in his notes on Socrates II, 37.

Dated creed[16] right at the very beginning of the council. But the had sadly misjudged the temper of the assembly; the Westerns refused to have anything to do with their "perverse doctrine" and the Arians were eventually compelled to change their tactics and try another plan[17].

L.2 quod fuerat positum ratione - i.e. by the council of Nicaea.

L.2,3 cum pietatis..de fide - cf. A VIII.

L.3 a supradictis turbatoribus - i.e. Valens and his followers.

L.4 Germinio - see note on Germinius in A III, p.47 L.16.

Gaio - see note A I p.45 L.15.
The Greek versions here add the name of Auxentius[18]; it is quite probable that, as a prominent Arian, he would be present but no definite proof can be given of this.

L.4, 5 novum nescio..continebat - i.e. the Dated Creed[19],

L.5 - 7 at vero..conscribendum - it is not known what changes they proposed/

Notes.
16. cf.p.78 L.13,14 note. Soz. IV, 17. Theod. II, 18.
17. cf.A V, 2,3.
18. see note A I p.45 L.15.
19. see notes on it in B VI.

proposed to make, but they would certainly not be those imposed later at Nike[20].

L.7, 8 equidem haec...manifestum est - "Ursacius and Valens would appreciate this"[21] cf.their conduct at the synods of Milan 346,355 and Sirmium 357, 359. Many examples of their changes are to be found in the various documents. Athanasius[22] indicates a similar accusation against the Arians in general.
The Westerns write in like vein in A IX, 3 p.97 L.1sq.

L.9 statuta vetera - i.e. the Nicene decrees. The Greek text adds to this "and that the above persons should be separated from our communion".

p.83 L.1, 2 "legatos nostros...nuntiarent" has to be supplied from the Greek text. legatos nostros - see also A V, 2. In his letter[23] Constantius had asked the synod to send 10 legates to treat with the Easterns, but had overlooked the possibility of a rift occurring whereby both sections send 10 legates, each embassy claiming to be the true representatives of the synod.

p.83 L.3 sq. ut non aliter etc - Constantius' desire was to have peace in the Church - that was one of his reasons for summoning this council/

Notes.
20. cf.this revised creed in Ath. De Syn. 30.Socr.II, 41.Theod.II,21.
21. Gwatkin "Studies" p.174.
22. De Syn.§§ 21-32.
23. A VIII.

council.cf.A VIII. Valens and his associates had evidently suggested that it was the Nicene decrees which were the cause of the trouble in the Church and that their new creed, by removing those decrees, would at the same time remove all the dissensions.
At this stage in the council, the Westerns still remain loyal to their past heritage and to the Nicene creed, assert that Valens' proposals can bring no real peace[24] and instruct their legation accordingly.[25]
It might be argued that the weakening of the Westerns at Arles and Milan must have given Constantius some hope of securing a compromise peace; and to a certain extent this would be true. But in actual fact, two different issues were involved. At Arles and Milan most Westerns were willing to surrender Athanasius for the sake of securing peace, while still confident of their allegiance to the Nicene creed. Admittedly there were at that time also those[26] who realised that the Arians were using Athanasius only as a screen to conceal their real intentions viz.the destruction of the Nicene creed But by the time of the council of Ariminum, the Arians had cast aside all pretexts and it was evident to the Westerns that what was really at stake was the Nicene creed; hence their unanimous insistence on the preservation of the "old statutes".

Notes.
24. Their search for this new creed indeed revealed how unsuccessful the previous Arian creeds had been as substitutes for the Nicene.
25. It will be seen later in A V, 3 that their embassy failed to carry out these instructions.
26. e.g. Hilary cf B I.

L.6 Germinius et Gaius - these two names are omitted in the Greek texts, probably because they were minor characters, of less interest to the Easterns.

si aliquid rectorum sublatum fuisset - cf. p.80 L.4 si aliquid demtum fuerit.

L.8 et ecclesiae Romanae - Liberius of Rome was neither present in person nor represented at the council, probably because of his experiences in the years immediately preceding Ariminum and his desire to avoid further trouble. Nevertheless, by this special reference to the Roman Church, the Council signifies that, despite its non-appearance, Rome can not escape being involved in the decisions and results of Ariminum. cf. also p.80 L.8 note.

L.13 sine spiritu sancto dei - they thus claim divine authority for their acts and imply that the Holy Spirit would be absent from the councils of their enemies i.e. only the orthodox can claim to have the aid of the Holy Spirit. cf. A IX, 2 p.96 L.13, Iren. Haer. III, XXIV, 1. Cyp. Ep. LXV.

p.84 L.1 novitate - i.e. the innovations proposed by Valens and his associates.

L.1/

L.1, 2. verum etiam..accedere - i.e. the unbelievers will be confused and repelled by the differences in the various creeds.

L.2sq oramus etiam etc - the Westerns can not be complaining of the actual length of their stay at Ariminum, because the council had begun only in May 359[27] and this letter must have been written before the signing of the revised Dated creed at Nikê on 10th October 359[28]. But many bishops had travelled a long way to the council (for example, the three British bishops) and when they realised that the Arians were concerned, not with peace, but with the furtherance of their own deceitful schemes, they would naturally feel that their long journey had been in vain. Already it would be evident that the Arians with the Emperor's protection were in control and determined to use the council for their own purposes, already its outcome would be apparent. In these circumstances, the Western bishops seem to have been of the opinion that the sooner the council was dissolved, the better.

L.1, 2 cf L.11,12 Parmentier, who supposes Hilary's text to be a version from the Greek, explains the discrepancy existing between the Greek and Latin texts by saying that the translator has wrongly taken the word ὠμότητα as the equivalent of σκληροκαρδίαν or σκληρότητα (cf. Mark 16,14 , Rom. 2,5) and that the Latin originally had "duritiam" But/

Notes.
27. A VIII § 2.
28. A V, 3.

But Valesius[29] gives a more satisfactory explanation by saying that the Greek translator had read "crudelitatem" instead of "credulitatem"

p.85 L.3 legati nostri - their names are given in A V, 3 p.86 L.1sq.

L.4,5 sicut idem.. prudentiam - Feder[30] rightly refers the "alia scriptura" to the document contained in A IX, 1. Schiktanz[31] on the other hand, prefers to rely on the Greek text and reads "as (the legates) will also inform your piety from the Holy Scriptures themselves", though he admits that it is not improbable that this "alia scriptura" is the "Definitio" of A IX, 1.[32]

A V, 2 Narrative text.

SUMMARY According to the narrative text, the catholic bishops sent ten legates with this letter to the Emperor. But the heretics also sent 10 legates and these had the more favourable reception. Wearied by the long delay and terrified by imperial threats, the catholic legates eventually condemned the Nicene creed and accepted the Arian perfidy, as will be seen from what follows.

Notes.
29. in his notes on Socr. II, 37.
30. Stud. I, 75.
31. p.49, 50.
32. see also note on A VIII p.93 L.22,23 "litteris..datis".

COMMENTARY Sulpicius Severus[33] asserts that the orthodox had sent young men of but little learning and little prudence, whereas the Arians had sent old men skilful and abounding in talent, thoroughly imbued with their old unfaithful doctrines, and these easily got the upper hand with the prince. But it must be admitted that the relative difference in merit and experience between the two sets of legates, was not of as much importance as the fact that from the beginning Constantius' sympathies lay with the Arian legation. cf. p.85 L.14,15[34]. Sulp. Severus[35] also states that the legates had been ordered not to enter into any kind of communion with the Arians and to reserve every point in its entirety for discussion. A V, 3 reveals how miserably they failed in this.

p.85 L.15 longa dilatione fatigati - the orthodox deputies had been ordered by Constantius to await his return at Adrianople as he was too busy through the renewal of hostilities with Persia. It was only after they had been kept waiting there for some time that they received the summons to come to Nike[36].

p.85 L.17 'perfidiam - i.e. the revised Dated Creed.

Notes.
33. c. XLI.
34. see A VIII p.94 L.13 also.
35. ibid.
36. Ath. De Syn. 55. Socr. II, 37. Soz. IV, 19. Theod. II,19.

A V, 3 Document describing the events at Nikē, 10th October 359.

SUMMARY. (1) Restutus, bishop of Carthage and spokesman of the catholic embassy, states that there had been dissension and discord at Ariminum about matters of the faith, and that he and his followers had separated Valens, Ursacius, Germinius and Gaius from communion because of their heresy. (2) But when everything had been discussed again at Nikē, they found that Valens and the others held the catholic faith according to their profession, which all subscribed, and had never been heretics. For the sake of concord and peace, therefore, all resolved to annul the decisions of Ariminum and receive them into communion. All the bishops present gave their consent to this and subscribed.

COMMENTARY, This document has been preserved only in Hilary's work. In addition to the Faber-Coustant edition, it is also found in Bar. ad ann. 359 n.XXXIII, Binius I, 479, Ed. regia III, 199, Labbe-Cossart II, 802sq. Harduin I, 719sq. Coleti II, 913sq. Mansi 314sq.

p.85 L.22 Eusebio..Octobris - i.e. 10th October 359[37].

L.23 - p.86 L.1 mansionis Nichaea..vocabatur - Nikē had become the name of this town after the victory of Constantine over Licinius at Adrianople in 323. The first mention of Nikē is found in Itin. Hieros 569[38].

Notes.
37. Clinton Fasti Romani I p.440.
38. "mutatio Daphabae mil XI mansio Nicae mil VIII"

Nikê in Thrace had probably been selected in the hope of causing confusion because of the similarity of the name with Nicaea[39],

p.86 L.lsq. Restutus..Solutor - little information is available on the legates mentioned here. Feder[40], Hef.[41], D.C.B.[42] suggest that Restutus (or Restitutus) of Carthage was probably president of the Council of Ariminum. He seems to have changed over again later for he died orthodox and his name occurs in the Calendar of Carthage under IV Kal. Sept. "depositio Restituti". Augustine preached a sermon on his feast day (Possidius, Indiculus 8) "De depositione Restituti episc. Carth." (This is not extant). He was bishop of Carthage from c.350 until nearly 390 when Genethlius is first heard of, but it is rather odd that there is no actual mention of Restutus except as above.

Gams[43] identifies Gregorius (L.2) with Gregory of Elvira[44].

In B VIII, 1 a Justinus is also mentioned among the legates of the Ariminum synod at Constantinople.

The fact that A V, 2 states that 10 legates were sent from the catholic side while in this section 14 are mentioned has caused some difficulty, and various explanations have been given. Ceillier[45] conjectures that ten were first sent, then later another four to bring a reply to another letter. This is also Coustant's opinion[46].

Notes.

39. Socr. II, 37, Soz.IV, 19. Theod. II, 21
40. Stud. II, 106.
41. Councils II, 251
42. IV, 543.
43. Kirchengeschichte von Spanien p.281.
44. see criticism of this in notes on A II.
45. Hist. gen. V, 531, 1735 Paris ed.
46. P.L. X col 702 (f).

Feder[47] similarly is of the opinion that the synod might have later increased the original number because of more recent and urgent news. A possible reason for the addition is that, since the first group of legates were kept waiting by Constantius, various letters might have passed between Constantius, or the legates, and the bishops at Ariminum about this[48] and the envoys thus sent with the letters would stay on with the rest, waiting for a reply.

Again the two parties might also have been trying to increase their numbers in order to gain a numerical advantage.

On the other hand, there is no reason to suppose that all the legates mentioned here belong to the catholic party. It is most probable, indeed, that they include some of the Arian legates. The phrase (L.8) "et pars episcoporum quae sequebatur" supports this contention. If all the aforementioned legates had belonged to the catholic party, there would have been no need for this distinction between those who had formerly condemned Valens and his associates, and those now joining in this "act of vindication"[49].

p.86 L.6 sq. ut de sacerdotibus etc - cf. A IX, 3.

Notes.

47. Stud. I, 76.
48. cf. notes on A VIII p.93 L.16.
49. It would not be an objection to this that B VIII, in naming the legates of Ariminum at Constantinople, gives a different set to those in A V,3, for it does not follow that the same set would be sent both to Nike and to Constantinople.

L.14,15 fidem in his..omnes - this formula of faith signed by all the legates is to be found in Ath. De Syn. 30 and Theod. H.E.II,21; it follows the form of the 4th Sirmian creed but omits the important "in everything"[50] and is more strictly Arian in tone.
The signing of this creed by the Western legates was the real turning point in the synod. A few men, with a definite purpose and carefully laid plan, had been able to impose their will on a majority who, though giving allegiance to the Nicene creed, had neither the leadership nor the will to make this allegiance effective. It was in vain that this majority protested against the action of their legates; they themselves had failed those legates by not giving specific enough injunctions and instructions as to how to counteract the course of action pursued by the Arians. Now that the legates had signed, it was only a matter of time before the Arians, with the help of the imperial power, secured the subscriptions of the rest of the synod to their creed.

L.16 quia pacis..maxima - cf. A VIII.

Notes.
50. cf. the Germinius group of letters.

A V, 4 Narrative text.

SUMMARY. The confession of faith, which they afterwards subscribed, and which Valens also brought with him to Ariminum, can be recognised from what follows.

COMMENTARY. The actual creed is probably that found in Ath. De Syn. 30 and Theod. II, 16. Its main points are illustrated in the following document[51], though the confession of faith itself is not preserved in Hilary's work[52].

CONCLUSION. In A V, VI, VIII, IX, B VIII is given a record of some of the happenings at the joint synod of Ariminum and Seleucia. These are evidently the documents on which Jerome relied when entitling this work of Hilary "Liber adversum Valentem et Ursacium historiam Ariminensis et Seleuciensis synodi continens"[53].
Two of these documents, A V, 1 and A IX, 3 have been transmitted also in Greek and there is substantial agreement between the Latin and Greek text[54].
No date is affixed to the letter A V, 1, but its close correspondence to A VIII shows that it must be placed shortly after 27th May 359. A comparison of both letters indicates that the writers of A V, 1 have/

Notes.
51. A VI.
52. cf.note p.87 L.2.
53. De vir. ill.100.
54. This gives a small proof of Hilary's trustworthiness as collector and transmittor.

have already received A VIII. Again, while making the same insistence on preservation of the old decisions and adherence to the Nicene creed as in A IX, 1, it reveals a more advanced situation than the latter because (1) a heretical creed had now been proposed by the Valens group and (2) as a result of this there was now a definite breach between catholic and Arian. On the other hand, the catholics had not yet condemned Valens and his supporters as they did later cf A IX, 3 written on 21st. July 359. A V, 1 must therefore have been written sometime between 27th May 359 and 21st. July 359.

In this letter, the Westerns once more show their simple, steadfast reliance on the creed of Nicaea. A V 2 and 3 give some indication of the tactics employed by the Arians to overcome this, and it seems most probable that the long delay, the threats of exile and imperial pressure[55] would be much more influential in this respect than the reasonings of Valens and his group[56].

Notes.
55. cf.p.85 L.15,16.
56. cf.p.86 L.12sq. Soz. IV, 19. Sulp. Sev.II, 43.

Series A VI. Letter to Constantius from the Arians at Ariminum.359.

SUMMARY (1) Valens and his associates at Ariminum thank the Emperor for his instructions on the conduct of the synod, which indeed correspond with their own tenets, and rejoice that a restraint has been placed on those who are wont to use the words "usia" and "omousius", terms formarly unknown to the Church of God and nowhere found in Scripture. (2) Now that their answer has been given, however, they feel that those who uphold catholic truth and pure doctrine with the Easterns, should no longer be detained at Ariminum but allowed to return to their peoples, and (3) they request Constantius that he should instruct his prefect Taurus to dismiss those bishops who have already subscribed. Finally, they state that they have written to their Eastern fellow-bishops, informing them about all this.

COMMENTARY. This letter has been preserved only in this work. In addition to Faber-Coustant, it has been edited by Bar.ad ann.359 n. XXXIV sq., Binius I, 480, Ed.regia III, 200 sq., Labbe-Cossart II 803 sq., Harduin I, 719-722, Coleti II, 914-916, Mansi III, 315sq.

p.87 L.2 Fidei - this word seems out of place, and probably denotes that the section containing a copy of the creed has been lost. cf. A V, 4.

L.3 perfidis episcopis - i.e. Migdonius, Megasius, Valens, Epictetus and the others. cf. L.5,6.

L.5 synodus Ariminensis - according to Coustant[1], Valens and the others had by this time returned to Ariminum from Nikē and secured the signatures of ALL the other bishops there before writing this letter. But this does not seem very probable, nor is it necessary to suppose that this had taken place. When the catholic legates at Nikē capitulated[2], the bishops, who formed the two embassies, could claim to represent the whole synod, without implying that the catholics at Ariminum had signed their creed. The note "id est.. consenserunt"(L.5,6) seems to indicate that this at any rate was the opinion of the compiler of these documents. This view is also supported by the complaint made by Valens and the others that they should be delayed at the synod even when their legates have already taken their reply to the Emperor, and the request that they who support the catholic truth (i.e. the Arians) should be detained no longer with those who are infected with perverse doctrine (i.e. the catholics). The only reason for this delay would be that at least fifteen bishops still refused to subscribe the creed of Nikē cf. Sulp. Sev. Hist. Sacr. II,43 where it is said that the prefect Taurus had orders to dismiss the council only when those who refuse to accept the creed of Nikē were reduced to fifteen.

L.25 Orientalibus consentiens - the Acacians at Seleucia had signed a creed similar to that of Nikē, though the Semiarians there had refused to subscribe, and their synod was declared closed on 30th Sept.359 by the Emperor's representative, Leonas[3].

Notes.
1. P.L. X col 703(b).
2. cf. A V, 3.
3. Ath. De Syn 29. Socr. II, 40 Soz IV, 22.

The news of the acceptance of the creed by the Acacians had already reached Ariminum, therefore, before the composition of this letter[4]. As at Ariminum, so at Seleucia a minority with clear aims, definite policy and imperial favour, gained victory over a majority whose recognised chiefs had compromised themselves by their signing of the Dated Creed, 22 May 359, and had consequently to hand over the lead to less able men.

L.5,6 id est.. consenserunt - the conclusion of the address is obviously an addition, probably from the hand of the writer of the narrative text in order to make quite clear who had written this letter.

A Magdonius and Megasius are mentioned in B VIII,Iamong the legates sent from Ariminum to Constantinople and are probably to be identified with the Migdonius and Megasius mentioned here; nothing more is known of them.

Valens - see note on him A I p.45 L.15.

Epictetus - Epictetus of Centumcellae was a through-going Arian and a favourite instrument of Constantius in his persecution of the catholics. Athanasius[5] describes him as a novice, a bold young man, ready for wickedness, who assisted at the consecration of Felix in place/

Notes.

4. see further B VIII notes.
5. Hist. Ar. 75.

place of the exiled Liberius. This statement finds some confirmatio in his relations vis-a-vis Liberius. cf. B III, 2 p.155 L.25sq., B VII, 10 p.172 L.8sq.

L.6 ceteri qui haeresi consenserunt - this would include the other members of the Valens group, possibly also the catholic legates, but not all the catholic bishops at Ariminum, otherwise this qualification to the words "synodus Ariminensis" has no meaning.

L.7 scriptis - these writings would probably include the letter of Constantius given in A VIII[6] and the one mentioned on p.94 L.14[7]. They would contain regulations as to the conduct of the synod, the subjects to be discussed and the command to secure peace and harmony in the Church[8].

L.8 sq. quod nos beaveris etc - not only has the Emperor summoned the synod, his power extends over the subjects to be discussed. The statements made here with regard to "usia" and "omousius" resemble those of the Dated Creed. The latter says "they give offence as being misconceived by the people and are not found in Scripture"; in the letter they are "unknown to the Church of God, wont to cause offence among the brethren (p.87 L.10,11) and not found in Scripture" (p.88 L.6).

Notes.

6. cf. p.93 L.17 note.
7. see note here.
8. cf. Sulpl. Sev.II, 41 sq.

After the Arian-Semiarian alliance at Sirmium, May 359, Constantius would naturally be inclined to place his trust in this policy as the one likely to restore peace to the Church[9].

L.13 ceteri - this suggests that not all the bishops had yet subscribed, cf. also L.20sq.

L.16.17 obtinuit victoriam - i.e. at Nikē, 10th October 359, when the catholic legates were induced to renounce their former attitude and sign the revised Dated Creed.

L.19,20 in eo loco.. dedimus - after the signing of the creed at Nikē, the legates returned to Ariminum and from there sent Constantius information about what had taken place.

p.87 L.20 responsum - this is not extant.

L.20,21 adhuc detinemur - in his letter[10], Constantius advised the council to deal swiftly with the various matters under discussion. The bishops had tried to comply with this command. So there could be only one reason for this delay in terminating the council, namely, that several of the catholic bishops still refused to give their consent to the heretical propositions put forward by Valens and his associates. cf. Sulpl. Sev. Hist. Sacr. II,43 [11].

Notes.
9. On "usia" and "omousius" see A I p.44 L.1sq. notes.
10. A VIII.
11. see note on p.87 L.5.

The Arians feel that the bishops who have fulfilled the Emperor's wishes and have subscribed the creed of Nikē should be allowed to return home, while the others could be detained at Ariminum until they consent to sign. So it was not only the orthodox legates who were wearied with the long delay. cf. p.85 L.15.

L.21,22 qui integram.. retinemus - cf. note on L.5 Orientalibus consentiens.

L.23 deo non mutant nomen - i.e. do not change it from that found in Scripture, as opposed to "usia" and "omousius", which are not found in Scripture. cf. p.87 L.10, p.88 L.5sq.

p.88, L.1 suscripsimus sanae doctrinae - i.e. the revised Dated Creed.

L.6,7 quae in divinis..scripta - i.e. the argument of the Dated Creed. cf. p.87 L.8,9 note. This was also one of the arguments used to secure Semiarian acceptance of the creed of Nikē at Constantinople[12].

L.9 sq. qui PER Christum..nisi deum patrem PER dominum.. filium - this was the typical Western formula. cf. p.43 L.14,15 note.

L.12 sq. et praecipe etc - the Emperor has complete control over the/

Notes.
12. Soz. IV,23.

the council; he opens it, directs its course of action, and only with his permission can it be terminated.

L.13 Taurum - Taurus had been placed in complete charge at Ariminum (just as Leonas was at Seleucia) when Constantius left for the Persian wars, and had been promised the consulship if he succeeded in bringing the council to a successful conclusion and secured the subscriptions of all the bishops to the creed of Nike[13].

L.14 Orientalibus - this is another indication of the Emperor's desire to secure a policy which would restore peace, not merely to one part, but to the whole of the Church. cf. Socr. II,37, and note on p.87 L.5.

L.16,17 de hac autem re.. dedimus - this letter to the Easterns is no longer extant. Because the Semiarian legates at Constantinople revealed ignorance of what had happened at Ariminum[14], "Orientales" must refer to the Acacian party, whom Valens and the other Western legates joined on arrival at Constantinople. This letter shows a close collaboration existing between these two groups while still at their respective synods.

Notes.
13. Sulp. Sev. II,41; Jer. Adv. Lucif. 18:
14. cf. B VIII, 1.

CONCLUSION. Again no definite date is given for the composition of this letter[15] but from the context it is obvious that it must have been written shortly after the return of Valens and his supporters to Ariminum, following their victory at Nikē, 10th Oct. 359. It is a typical courtier's letter, full of adulation and flattery, one written in a mood of exultation after their overthrow of the catholics, though one senses also a feeling of disappointment and resentment that, in view of the events at Nikē, the Emperor should prove so awkward in refusing to terminate the synod until all the bishops have submitted.

Note.

15. cf. A V, 1.

Series A VII Letter of Liberius to Constantius. 353/4.

SUMMARY. (1) Liberius craves a more favourable hearing than hitherto, declares that he seeks true peace and that now, because of the affair of Athanasius and many other things, there is need of a council. (2) He accuses many of stirring up trouble within the Church, and asserts that he is innocent of the charge of having suppressed letters of the Easterns and Egyptians in order to conceal the accusations they contained against Athanasius. He states that he has intimated receipt of the Easterns' letter, read it to the church and council, and answered the Easterns. The reason for his refusal of the Easterns' demands was that at the same time he possessed a contrary opinion from 80 Egyptian bishops concerning Athanasius. These documents had been delivered by Eusebius, and Vincent afterwards brought them all to Arles. (3) There follows another protestation of good faith and determination to hold fast to the apostolic decisions. (4) He declares it impossible to have peace with men who 8 years before at Milan had been unwilling to condemn the heresy of Arius and says that what they are putting forward now under pretext of the person of Athanasius is no new thing. (5) He protests at the way in which the Westerns had been deceived into condemning Athanasius at the council held recently at Arles, and asserts that this is added reason for a thorough and careful discussion of his case. (6) The letter ends with another plea for a council, and for this purpose the bishop Lucifer, the presbyter Pancracius and the deacon Hilary are sent to Constantius.

COMMENTARY. This letter has been preserved only in this collection. Its authenticity has never been questioned.

p.89 L.2 Legatorum - i.e. bishop Lucifer of Cagliari (or Caralis), the presbyter Pancracius and deacon Hilary. cf. p.93 L.10,11. Liberius also requested Eusebius of Vercelli to join the embassy, and on his acceptance, sent a letter of thanks and informed him tha he had asked Fortunatian of Aquileia to go with them.

L.3 Liberio - Liberius succeeded Julius as bishop of Rome in 352 at a very difficult time, because, with their master, Constantius, gradually gaining control of the whole Empire, the Arians were once more bringing forward new accusations against Athanasius and hoping thus to renew the struggle against the Nicene creed. In order to reach a settlement on the Athanasius question, Liberius had first of all sent Vincent of Capua and Marcellus, another Campanian bisho to Constantius to request the holding of a council at Aquileia[1]. As Constantius was then staying at Arles, the council was held ther but it proved a dismal failure from the orthodox point of view; th legates of Liberius failed to stand firm, the Arians secured a condemnation of Athanasius, and Paulinus of Trèves was exiled for his staunch adherence to the Nicene creed[2]. Undismayed by this result Liberius/

Notes.
1. cf. B VII, 6.
2. cf. B. I. Hil. c. Const. 11. Or. Syn. Sard. N.T. § 3. In letters to Ossius and Caecilianus ( B VII, 4, 6), Liberius laments Vincent's weakness.

Liberius sent a second embassy to Constantius to request a council[3]. This request was again granted and the council met at Milan in 355. But his hopes were once more doomed to failure; imperial pressure proved strong, and the bishops with few exceptions again consented to the condemnation of Athanasius. Liberius then wrote the exile bishops a letter of consolation[4] and soon after found himself more directly involved. Because of his firm adhesion to Athanasius, he was exiled to Beroea in Thrace in 355 and Felix was intruded into the see of Rome[5]. Soon after Liberius' return from exile, Felix was compelled to resign. At the council of Ariminum, Liberius was neither present nor represented[6]. Later, Liberius was to share th views of the Alexandrine council with regard to the reconciliation of the bishops who lapsed at Ariminum and Seleucia[7]. In 366, when union was being proposed between the Nicenes and Semiarians, an embassy[8] came from the latter to Liberius, seeking communion and showing their willingness to accept the "homoousios". After careful consideration, this was granted but their attempt to establish Nicene orthodoxy in the East came to nothing[9]. Liberius died in autumn 366.

Notes.

3. cf.A VII.
4. i.e. B VII, 2.
5. cf.appendix on the Liberian letters for events during his exile
6. In a letter from a synod of Italian and Gallican bishops held a Rome under Damasus (Theod.II, 22),it is said that the bishop of Rome did not give his assent to the formula of Ariminum.
7. cf.B IV.
8. Its members were Eustathius of Sebaste, Silvanus of Tarsus and Theophilus of Castabala.
9. Socr. IV, 11 12. Soz. VI, 11.

Luciferum - Lucifer, bishop of Cagliari in Sardinia, first came into prominence at the council of Milan 355. After the ignominious defeat of the orthodox at Arles, Lucifer took upon himself the responsibility for the defence of the Nicene Creed and offered Liberius to go and intercede with Constantius. The bishop of Rome gladly welcomed this offer and gave him Pancracius and Hilary[10]. The council was duly held at Milan and, because of his firm adherence to Athanasius, Lucifer was sent into an exile which lasted from 355-361 and the greater part of which was spent at Eleutheropolis in Palestine, where he suffered the persecutions of the Arian bishop Eutychius. It was during his exile that he composed his pamphlets dealing with the controversy: Pro sancto Athanasio Libri II; De regibus apostaticis; De non conveniendo cum haereticis; De non parcendo in Deum delinquentibus; Moriendum pro Filio Dei. In these writings the intrepid spirit of the later Luciferians is already apparent; he shows himself fearless before the imperial power. Towards the end of his exile, he was transferred to the Thebaid where he remained till the death of Constantius in 361. While he was there, Athanasius wrote him two letters full of adoration and praise. Lucifer and Eusebius of Vercelli were both in the Thebaid when, on the accession of Julian, the exiled bishops were permitted to return home, and Eusebius wanted Lucifer to accompany him to Alexandria, where a synod was to be held to settle the schism in/

Notes.
10. cf.A VII.

in the church of Antioch. He, however, preferred to go straight to Antioch, and the result was that when Eusebius arrived there armed with the synodal letter of the Alexandrian council, he found himself baulked by the previous measures of Lucifer who had consecrated the priest Paulinus as bishop of Antioch, and retired immediately. But the bishop of Cagliari declared that he would not hold communion with Eusebius or any who supported the moderate policy of the Alexandrine council whereby it was decided (1) that actual Arians, renouncing their heresy, should be pardoned but not invested with ecclesiastical functions (2) those bishops who had merely consented to Arianism under pressure should remain undisturbed. Lucifer took offence especially with this second condition and became leader of those who asserted that anyone who had yielded to any Arian compromise should not be allowed to hold an ecclesiastical office[11]. Lucifer eventually returned to Sardinia and Jerome, in his Chronicle, places his death in 370.

L.6sq Obsecro etc - Liberius used the flattering, laudatory tone common in addressing Emperors at this time cf Or. Syn. Sard. Hil. ad Const.II.

p.89 L.6 Tranquillissime - the word "tranquillitas" was used in the fourth century almost exclusively in addressing the Emperor.[12]

Notes.
11. Ruf. I, 30. Socr. III, 11.
12. cf.Souter p.425.

L.7"Clementia" was thus used in classical times. "Mansuetudo" was used in this respect from the fourth century onwards.

L.9 filio Constantini - Constantius was the second of Constantine's three sons.

L.10 sq. sed in eo etc - i.e. he had already requested a council to settle the affairs of the Church but for certain reasons, given later in the letter[13], he was not satisfied with its decisions. He feels himself in rather an embarrassing position in having to make the same request a second time.

satisfactione - i.e. a satisfactory explanation of and judgment on the case of Athanasius.

L.11 placabilem etiam circa reos - this might refer to Athanasius, Paulinus and the other exiled bishops, but it seems better to regard it just as a general statement.

L.12 sermo pietatis tuae - the contents of this "sermo" are not definitely known. It could be (1) one made at Arles demanding the condemnation of Athanasius (2) one upbraiding Liberius for condemning his legates who fell at Arles, and thus refusing to accept the decisions of the council. The personal reference L.12sq. supports this/

Notes.
13. cf. § 5.

this view. (3) one giving credence to the rumours about Liberius cf.§§ 2,3.

L.14 qui lenitati semper vacat - this, of an Emperor in whose reign "the executioner had a busy time and the assassin was always in reserve".[14]

L.16 indignationem - indignation probably at Liberius requesting a council and then refusing to accept its decision. This would be further inflamed by the knowledge that if Liberius could be won over, it would be a great victory for Arianism and probably lead to the conquest of the whole of the West.

religiosissime - this word is used in the titles given to Emperors and bishops from the end of the fourth century.[15]

L.17 veram pacem - i.e. true peace as opposed to the false schemes for peace put foward by the Arians who were trying at this time to persuade the Emperor that it was Athanasius who was the real cause of the trouble in the Church and that, if he were condemned, peace would once more reign. Liberius and other orthodox bishops, such as Hilary[16], recognised the superficiality of this belief, and declared that what divided the orthodox and the Arians was not simply a person (viz: Athanasius) but a creed (viz: the Nicene).

Notes.
14. Gwatkin Studies p.114.
15. Souter p.348.
16. cf. B I.

L.17 sq. quae non sit...fallaciae - a reference to the deceits of the Arians, e.g. dissembling the heresy of their creeds by equivocal words.[17]

L.19, 20 sed multa alia in medium venerunt - Liberius probably inserts this vague statement both to apologise for making this secon request for a council and to protect himself from Constantius' obvious reply that the council of Arles had already delivered judgment on Athanasius. His plea is that only the case of Athanasius had been handled at Arles, whereas many other questions requiring attention had been left untouched.

p.90 L. 1 fueram deprecatus - i.e. the request made by Vincent of Capua which resulted in the council of Arles 353.

L.2, 3 cum fidei causa...tractata - at Arles the orthodox had asserted that the faith must first be discussed, and then, after that, the council could deal with the case of Athanasius[18]. To this, Valens and his supporters would not agree but summarily demanded condemnation of Athanasius. The orthodox agreed to this or condition that their opponents pronounced an anathema on Arianism. But, after Athanasius had been condemned, Valens and his associates refused to fulfil their part of the agreement.

Notes.
17. cf. B II, 9 § 4sq. Ath. Ad Episc. Aeg. 5.
18. cf. Sulp. Sev. II, 39.

L.3, 4 negotia eorum - i.e. the Arians' desire to deal with Athanasius and his supporters.

L.10 eius - the context shows that this refers to Athanasius[19].

L.10 sq. me litteras subpressisse etc - the letter of the Easterns might be identified with that mentioned in B III, 1 p.155 L.7,8, and would be similar to those criticised in Ath. Hist. Ar. 1, 32, Apol c. Ar. 1, 2. His reply (L.15) may be conjectured from the details given in B III, 1. Both letters must have been sent to Liberius before the synod of Arles[20]; they are not now extant.

L.14,15 Orientalium litteras..concilio - there are three stages in the communication of the letter (1) general intimation to the diocese (2) reading in the church of which he is bishop (3) reading in council; for such an important matter a council of the nearer Italian bishops would be summoned[21].

L.16,17 eodem tempore - i.e. at the same time as the receipt of the Easterns' letter.

L.17 octoginta episcoporum Aegyptiorum - Tillemont[22] states that almost always there were 80 bishops in Egyptian councils and accounts/

Notes.
19. cf. L.12,13.
20. cf. L.23-25.
21. cf. L.18,19.
22. t.VIII (1713) p.74 and in this he is followed by Robertson "Athanasius" p.100 n.10.

accounts for this by saying that, as there were about 90 bishops in Egypt and Thebaid and Libya and they were so united together in their sentiments, they were accustomed to sign for each other when some were absent. cf. BII, 2 p.127 L.16.

p.90 L.18 similiter - this shows that he has also intimated the letter of the Easterns to the Italian bishops, probably at the council mentioned on L.15.

L.19,20 cum episcoporum..existeret - is Liberius simply relying on numerical superiority without entering into the respective merits of either side? or is he still afraid to decide either way and is using this numerical superiority as an excuse for delay? The latter seems preferable. He would not wish to decide in favour of Athanasius just yet because that would prejudice his plea for a council, and the numerical superiority gives him sufficient grounds for temporarily refusing to give a direct answer to the Easterns. [23]

L.21 haec scripta - the "quae omnia scripta" of L.23 indicates that by "haec scripta" is meant either the letter of the Easterns or the "sententia" of the Egyptians; from the grammatical construction of the passage, it seems necessary to refer it to the latter.

Notes.

23. Chrysostom had the case of Athanasius in mind when protesting that he could not resume his see until he was acquitted by a council greater than that which had deposed him. cf. Palladius, Vita § 9. Socr. VI, 16.

L.21,22 si deo fidem debet Eusebius - i.e. Liberius calls Eusebius, the envoy of the Egyptians, to witness before God concerning the delivery and proper treatment accorded the documents which he had left at Rome.

L.22 festinans ad Africam - Eusebius would be hurrying back to Africa after the completion of his mission.

L.23 quae omnia scripta - i.e. both the letter of L.10 and the "sententia" of L.17.Vincent and the other envoys had evidently taken these documents with them to the Emperor in order to strengthen their case for the holding of a council.

L.23 Vincentius - Vincent, bishop of Capua in Campania, was a prominent figure on the orthodox side in the fourth century. He is thought to be the same as the priest Vincentius who was one of the two legates of Silvester, bishop of Rome, at the council of Nicaea. It is quite probable that he would attend the synod of Rome 341. Later he was sent by the council of Sardica to persuade Constantius to recall the exiled bishops[24]. It was during this embassy that a foul trick was played on Vincent and Euphrates of Cologne by Stephanus of Antioch[25]. In 353 Liberius commissioned Vincent and another/

Notes.
24. Ath. Apol. c. Ar.50. Hist. Ar. 20.
25. Ath. Hist. Ar. 20. Theod. II, 9,10.

another Campanian bishop, Marcellus, to request the council at Aquileia. In B VII, 6 Liberius laments Vincent's fall at Arles, but Athanasius[26] excuses him by saying that it was only after severe treatment that he renounced communion with himself. In 357, Liberius in exile wrote to Vincent requesting him to call an assembly of Campanian bishops and to write to Constantius in order to procure his release[27]. According to an epistle of Damasus of Rome[28], Vincent was one of the few who remained firm at Ariminum.

L.24 cum ceteris - for example, Marcellus of Campania.cf. B VII, 6 p.167 L.8.

L.25 Arelatum - after the death of Magnentius, Constantius made his headquarters at Arles from October 353 till the spring of 354.

L.26 prudentia - this title is used from the fourth century onwards

p.91 L.2, 3 ita ut..praecepit - for example, Matt. 6, 24sq.

L.4, 5 in alio ministerio ecclesiasticus vivens - i.e. his position in the Church prior to becoming bishop[29]. Irenaeus and Tertullian had already used the word "ecclesiasticus" in this way.

Notes.
26. Apol. ad Const. 27.
27. B VII, 11.
28. Theod. II, 17.
29. cf. Cyp. Ep. 67, 4.

L.6 ad legem - sc. of the Church.

ad istud officium - i.e. the office of bishop.

L.7 invitus accessi - cf. the election of Ambrose.

L.9 numquam mea statuta, sed apostolica - "statuta apostolica" can refer to the decrees laid down both by the apostles and by those in the apostolic succession (i.e. the orthodox bishops).
Liberius' main assertion is that he has not made any innovations an has therefore incurred no risk of error; but he also implies that he has apostolic authority for his actions while the Arians have not[30] and brings near the assumption that if there is anyone in the Church qualified to say which things are apostolic, it is the bisho of Rome. cf. similarly L.11sq "et illam fidem servans etc".

L.10sq. secutus morem etc - often the principle but not always the practice either of some of his predecessors or of his successors. This phrase gives an insight into Liberius' character. His is a policy of consolidation, rather than of advancement, probably the wisest course of action in view of the privileges gained for the Roman see under his immediate predecessor Julius.

L.10 secutus morem ordinemque maiorum - cf. B III, 1 p.155 L.9 secutus traditonem maiorum.

Notes.
30. cf. Tert. De Praescr. haer. XXXII.

L.13 plures martyres - e.g. Telesphorus (126-37) martyred under Hadrian[31]; Fabian (236-50) martyred at the beginning of the Decian persecution[32]; Sixtus who was martyred on 6th August 258 under the Valerian persecution[33].

p.91.L.15 causam - i.e. the case concerning Athanasius.

L.16 Orientales - i.e. the Eusebians (not necessarily those mentioned on p.90 L.12sq.).

L.18 ex partibus ipsis - i.e. from the Easterns.

quattuor episcopi etc - at the end of the Macrostich synod of Antioch, 344[34], which adopted almost literally the formula of Eastern Sardica, i.e. the 4th Creed of the Dedication council of Antioch, and the additional anathemas, with more detailed explana - tions directed against the Arians, Sabellians, Marcellus of Ancyra, Photinus and Athanasius, the Eusebians dispatched four bishops, Eudoxius of Germanicia, Martyrius, Macedonius of Cilicia, and Demofilus[35], to the West with this new formula. They seem to have arrived just as the Western bishops were holding a council at Milan. cf.B II, 5 p.142 L.17sq. note.

Notes.
31. Iren. adv. Haer.III iii § 4. Lightfoot Apost. Fathers $^{2}$II i 458.
32. Eus.H.E. VI,XXXIX § 1 cf Benson "Cyprian" 65sq.
33. Ep. LXXX § 1 (C.S.E.L. III, ii, 840) and Kidd Doc. No.158.
34. Ath. De Syn. 26 Socr.II,19. Soz.III 11.
35. Ath. De Syn. 26 omits the last named.

Demofilus - see note on him in A IV, 3 p.78 L.2. Athanasius[36] omits his name but it seems quite probable that as a leading Eusebian he would be one of the emissaries.

L.19 Macedonius - see note A IV, 3 p.74 L.10. Eudoxius - see note A IV, 3 p.75 L.7. Martyrius - nothing more is known about this bishop.

L.19 ante annos octo - i.e. c.345/346[37].

L.19, 20 apud Mediolanium - cf. B II, 5 § 4 p.142 L.17sq. note.

It was the favourite test of the orthodox to ask doubtful bishops to condemn the Arian heresy cf. B II, 5 § 4, also their conduct at Arles 353, and at Ariminum 359[38].

L.23 non est novum - cf. B I p.101 L.6,7.

L.23,24 quod nunc subtiliter..adtestantur - cf. B I, p.101 L.15sq.

L.25 Alexandri - Alexander succeeded Achillas in the see of Alexandria c.313. His tenure of office was a stormy one; first he was harassed by the Meletians and then - much more seriously - by Arius. Though/

Notes.
36. De Syn. 26.
37. see Conclusion on date of this letter.
38. cf. Ath. De Syn. 9.

Though he has sometimes been charged with irresolution in his handling of the case of Arius, it seems more charitable to suppose that the reason for his forbearance lay in an anxiety to have the whole affair thoroughly discussed and properly settled. He wrote indefatigably to various bishops to prevent their being deceived by Arius. Epiphanius[39] knew 70 such letters. The letter to Silvester of Rome mentioned here seems to have been of this type. Reference is also made to it in Liberius' letter "Me frater"[40], but it is not now extant.

L.25 Silvestrum - Silvester succeeded Miltiades on Jan.31, 314 and held the see of Rome until Dec. 31, 335. Though possessing the see for so long a time during one of the most critical periods in history, he does not seem to have played any prominent part in the great events of his day. He was represented at Arles 314, by two presbyters and two deacons. Invited to Nicaea 325, he did not attend for reasons of age but sent two presbyters Vitus and Vincentius as his representatives[41].

L.26 ante ordinationem Athanasii - Alexander died on 17th April 328 and Athanasius was ordained bishop of Alexandria on 8th June 328.

L.26 - p.92 L.2 undecim tam..decisse ; cf.Ath. Hist. Ar.71; Depositio Arii.

Notes.
39. Haer. 69, 4.
40. P.L. VIII, 1350.
41. Eus. V.C. iii, 7. Socr. I, 14. Soz. I, 17.

L.4 Georgius - it is difficult to identify this Georgius. Feder[42] thinks it is the Georgius who was later intruded into Alexandria on the exile of Athanasius in 356. This is also the opinion of Valesius[43]. But there is no evidence of this bishop having had any connection with Alexandria prior to his intrusion.

The only other leading Arian bishop of that name at this time was Georgius, bishop of Laodicea. He was a native of Alexandria and had been ordained presbyter by Alexander[44] but later deposed[45]. He had also been condemned in his absence at Western Sardica[46] but still remained one of the Arian leaders[47]. It seems quite possible therefore, that he would still retain some connections with Alexandria and could be the person referred to in this passage.

in Alexandria - this phrase must be joined with the "quibus" and mean that certain of the enemies of Athanasius were still working in Alexandria itself. He was still powerful enough to prevent an opposing bishop of the standing of George of Laodicea from operating within the city.

L.5 "exhibitis" is to be attached to "sententiis" "when they are put forward".

Notes.
42. Stud. I p.79.
43. notes on Socr. II, 37 p.26.
44. Eus. V.C. III, 62. Philost. VIII, 17.
45. Ath. De Syn.17.
46. B II, 1 § 8 p.123 L.6sq. B II, 3 p.131 L.9.
47. cf. Ath. Apol. de fuga, written c.357, shows this.

L.6 ut nunc per Italiam factum est - the Arians would be eager to follow up their victory at Arles 353 by imposing condemnation of Athanasius not only upon Italy - though this, of course, is Liberius' special concern - but upon the whole of the West.

p.92 L.6 sententiis - e.g. the decisions of the Arians at the synod of Arles 353.

§ 5 gives an insight into the happenings at Arles 353. For the sake of the peace of the Church, both sides had made a reciprocal bargain; the orthodox had agreed to surrender Athanasius, their opponents to condemn the Arian heresy. But after the orthodox had excommunicated Athanasius, Valens and his party refused to fulfill their part of the agreement.

L.8 aliud - i.e. another point in his argument for a council.

L.9, 10 manent legatorum..venerunt - this letter from his legates would be sent at the close of the council of Arles to inform Liberius about what had taken place there. It is not now extant.

L.11 omnium ecclesiarum - no record as to the numbers or representation at Arles is extant but it seems improbable that the East was represented. Its jurisdiction would be confined to the West. The phrase "of all the churches" could be either a general statement (cf. p.93 L.12) or mean "all the churches covered by the jurisdiction of the synod of Arles."

L.10,11 sententiis Orientalium - i.e. the condemnation of Athanasius. Liberius is obviously embarrassed by the willingness of the orthodox at Arles to surrender Athanasius because his main reason for requesting another council was on behalf of that very same person. It is interesting to speculate how far he would have acquiesced in the decisions reached at Arles if an appearance of peace had been restored to the Church and Valens and his party had signed a condemnation of the Arian heresy, no matter how superficial and politic. From the evidence now available, it would appear that, only through the deceits of Valens and his group at Arles, did the orthodox realise that the condemnation of Athanasius was the first stage in the Arian attack on the Nicene creed.

L.14 scriptura teste - i.e. a reference to the custom of always trying to find scriptural warrant for their actions.

L.15 concilium - i.e. Arles 353.cf.p.90 L.25.

L.16,17 (quod solum..privandum) - this part of the text is missing in A and has to be supplied from other MSS.

quod solum exigebant - another instance of the subtlety of the Arians; they made it appear as if only the person of Athanasius was at stake. This one demand, however, covered everything and touched the heart of all the issues involved in the controversy.

L.18 recte catholicae religionis iure servato - as opposed to the Arian procedure, cf. B I § 5 p.101 L.19sq; and Liberius' speech to the Emperor in Theod. II, 13.

L.21 eius - i.e. God. This is in similar vein to the speech of the bishops to Constantius at Milan as reported in Ath. Hist. Ar. 33,34 ".. teaching him that the kingdom was not his, but God's, Who had given it to him..."

L.24 sq. haec in coetu etc - because of the irregularities at Arles, Liberius appeals for another council. cf. Liberius in his letter to Eusebius of Vercelli[48] "ut omnia, quae in medium venerunt, in coetu possent sacerdotum Dei tractari"; also his assertion[49] that all ecclesiastical matters should be settled by bishops.

L.25 pacatis..temporibus - at this time Constantius was harassed b troubles on the frontiers of the Empire, e.g. in spring 354 he was a Augusta Rauracorum on the Upper Rhine[50] and in the early summer of 355 he was in Rhaetia dealing with the barbarians on the Danube. Indeed it was only when he had brought peace to the frontiers that Constantius was able to grant Liberius' request for a council.

Notes.
48. P.L. VIII, 1350.
49. in Theod. II, 13.
50. Amm. Marc. Res. Gestae XIV, X, 6.

p.93 L.1sq sic omnia etc - Liberius hopes this time to secure a decision made by bishops, untrammelled by the imperial power, and demands no new creed but simply an exposition of the Nicene creed.

L.4,5 cum exemplo - this probably refers to a copy of the acts of the council.

L.7,8 causam fidei..praeposuisse - Liberius pleads that the spiritual is more important than the material, the cause of faith and peace than affairs of state.

L.10 Luciferum - see note p.89 L.3. Pancracius and Hilarius are also mentioned in Liberius' letter to Eusebius[51]. According to Athanasius[52] Hilarius was first beaten with rods before being sent into exile. Later he seems to have joined the Luciferians and wrote in their interest on the rebaptism of heretics[53].

L.13 posse concilium impetrare - the council was granted at Milan in 355 but again it had disastrous results for the orthodox cause.

Notes.
51. P.L. VIII, 1355.
52. Hist. Ar. 41.
53. Jer. adv. Lucif. 21,27. P.L. 23 col.184, 190.

CONCLUSION. Basing his opinion on the assumption that the George mentioned on p.92 L.4[54] is the bishop who was intruded into the see of Alexandria in place of Athanasius, Valesius[55] places the composition of this letter in 356. But this is much too late a date. From the context[56] it is obvious that the letter was written not long after the synod of Arles, which was held in autumn 353; it might even have been written in this same year. Indeed, not the least interesting point about this letter is that it gives almost all the information we now possess about this synod of Arles.

The tone of apology and flattery adopted in the letter may be accounted for by the fact that Liberius is obviously embarrassed bot in having to request a second council concerning Athanasius and by the attitude displayed by the orthodox at Arles towards the person of Athanasius.

Notes.
54. cf.note on this.
55. see his notes on Socr. II, 37 p.26.
56. cf.§ 5.

Series A VIII. Letter of Constantius to the Synod of Ariminum.359

SUMMARY. (1) In this letter, the Emperor Constantius instructs the bishops on how they are to conduct themselves at the synod of Ariminum. First of all, they have to give attention to matters concerning faith and unity. (2) Then they are not to make any decisions regarding the Easterns but only to consider matters affecting themselves. Finally, they have to appoint 10 legates to send to the court, as a former letter had intimated. These 10 will answer the propositions put forward by the Easterns or treat matters of the faith, so that all ambiguity and dissension may be removed.

COMMENTARY. This letter has been preserved only in this work. It has been edited by Faber-Coustant, Bar. ad ann 359 n.XII, Binius I, 477, Ed.regia III, 190sq., Labbe-Cossart II, 793sq. Harduin I 71sq., Coleti II, 896sq. and Mansi III, 297.

p.93 l.17 exemplum epistulae Constantii - according to its contents, this seems to be the letter referred to in A V, 1, p.82 L.2 and probably to be included in the "scriptis" A VI, p.87 L.7, though, if the Arians are to be believed, the latter seem to have contained more specific instructions than are given here.[1]
It is possible that Constantius issued two types of letter; the one sent to the catholics in the West and written in general terms,

the/

Notes.
1. for example, those regarding the condemnation of the words "usia" and "Omousius"; cf. p.87 L.8sq.

the other intended for Valens and his followers and showing quite definitely where his sympathies lay[2].

L.18 episcopos Italos - "Italos" must here be taken as equivalent to "Western" because the letter itself makes it plain that it is written to the Western bishops in general and not to any particular section at Ariminum.

L.21 priora statuta - this phrase is used here in a general sense for the former decrees and customs of the Church[3].

L.22,23 litteris...datis. - this must refer to a previous letter of the Westerns. From the references made to it in this letter, it seems to have been an enlarged edition of A IX, 1.

p.94, L.1,2 sed res.. existere - as was their custom[4], the Westerns in their letter (L.1 "res") would insist that the Council of Nicaea had settled these matters of faith finally and completely, and that there was no need to raise them again at a new council. Constantius admits this, agrees that the Church has issued decrees on these matters and at the beginning of his letter asserts in general fashion that the former statutes are still binding. Yet, he continues, frequent enactment of these statutes is not superfluous, but/

notes.
2. see also note on p.94 L.14.
3. Just as the sanctity of a law depends on how it is practised, so the importance of the former decisions, such as those of Nicaea, is to be judged from the influence theyexert in the Church.
4. cf. A V, 1. B.II, 1.

but rather, highly advantageous, and therefore it is not wrong for the synod once again to consider matters of faith and unity.

L.4 de fide atque unitate - matters of unity were as important as those of faith to the Emperor, and his policy had always been to accept the creed of that party which seemed most capable of restoring peace to the Church.

L.8 "de huiusmodi" is equivalant to "de talibus rebus"

L.9sq. Resista etc - the Westerns had perhaps made some reference in their letter[5] to the Easterns, for example, a comment on the Arian-Semiarian alliance of Sirmium, May 359, which produced the Dated Creed; or it might be that Constantius gave this instruction at the instigation of his Arian counsellors. The Arians feared an alliance of Nicenes and Semiarians against themselves and indeed it was to prevent this happening that they had persuaded Constantius to hold two separate synods.[6]
The power of the Westerns was further curtailed[7] since their legates could not take the initiative in the discussions with the Easterns but had to wait on the latter. The Western legates could answer and discuss but not propose.

L.13 decemittere - Constantius envisages an united Western council sending/

notes
5. p.93 L.22.
6. Soz. H.E. IV, 16,17.
7. cf. p.94 L.15.

sending 10 legates to court, where they will meet their counterparts from the Eastern synod, which had been given similar instructions.[8] As A V, 2 has shown, the rift in the Western synod delayed this plan, because both sections at Ariminum had sent 10 legates, each embassy doubtless claiming to be the true representatives of the synod. It was only after Valens and his associates had gained the mastery at Nikê that Constantius' plan was fulfilled and the legates of Ariminum came to Constantinople for discussions with the Easterns.

L.14 prioribus litteris - this would be the letter which prompted the Westerns to write to the Emperor[9]. In all probability it was the letter which opened the synod of Ariminum[10].

L.14sq. praedicti enim etc - cf. note on p.94 L.9sq.

L.20 sq. non enim ullas etc - the Emperor bases this command, not on any ecclesiastical rule or custom, but simply on the imperial power.

L.25,26 Datum...conss - i.e. 27th May 359.

notes.

8. Soz. H.E. IV, 17.
9. p.93 L.22.
10. cf. the poximity in date between the signing of the Dated Creed, 22nd. May and the composition of this letter, 27th May.

CONCLUSION. The Westerns had evidently made it clear to Constantius in their previous letter that they had come to Ariminum in no courtly temper, and so he had found it necessary to send them another letter giving fuller instructions as to the conduct of the synod and justifying this further debate on the faith. According to Sozomen[11] similar information had been dispatched to the Easterns at Seleucia.

The Westerns give their reply to this letter in A V, 1, one which must have been very similar to their first and in which they announce their adherence to the old decrees and to the decisions taken at Nicaea.

Note.

11. IV, 17.

## Series A IX. Documents of the Catholic Bishops at Ariminum.359.

### A IX, 1. Statement of Faith.

SUMMARY. This document contains a statement of faith issued by the catholic bishops at Ariminum, prior to their accepting, under imperial pressure, the heretical propositions of the Arians. In it they declare their adherence to the accepted creed and faith of the Church, established by Holy Scripture and kept secure through the apostolic succession up to the time of the Nicene creed. Nothing can be added to this nor anything taken away, and the word and meaning of "substantia" must be affirmed in all its fullness, according to the profession of the catholic church.

COMMENTARY. This declaration has been preserved only in Hilary's work. It has been edited by Faber-Coustant, Bar. Ad ann. 359 n.XVI sq., Binius I, 478, Ed. regia III, 192, Labbe-Cossart II,795, Harduin I, 711 sq., Coleti II, 897sq. and Mansi III, 298sq. In addition to the usual MSS. of the collection, the text has also been preserved in a MS. of the 7th century[1]; this text differs verbally but not substantially from that of A and has lost its ending.

p.95 L.4 priusquam - i.e. before 10th October 359.cf. A V, 3.

Notes.
1. Cod. Bodleianus E. Mus.101. cf.Feder p.95 L.15sq.

L.6 symbolo - i.e. the Nicene creed.

L.11 successionem apostolorum - this seems to be the first occurrence of this actual phrase in Latin writings, but it has close parallels in the earlier Latin and Greek authors while Eusebius has the same wording: Eus. H.E. i, 1, 1; ii, 23, 3; viii praef. cf. Turner (pl99-206 in Essays on the Early History of the Church and Ministry) who, however, does not quote this phrase.

L.12 ad tractatum apud Nicheam habitum - i.e. the Council of Nicaea 325, its creed and decisions against Arianism.

L.14 nec addendum... necminui posse - the "additions" refer to the various definitions issued by the Arians and Semiarians and designed to take the place of the Nicene creed, the "diminutions" to their attempts to omit the vital words "usia" (or "substantia") and "omousius".

p.96, L.1, 2 'substantiae' quoque..mentibus nostris - the Arians argued that the word 'substantia' (or 'usia') was not found in Scripture and should therefore be rejected[2]. The orthodox replied that its meaning was well established in Scripture. Hilary[3] points out that this objection, that the word is not found in Scripture, weighs also against the other watchwords, such as "omoiousios".

Notes.
2. cf. A VI p.87 L.17,18. p.88 L.6,7.
3.. De Syn. 81.

A IX, 2 Narrative Text.

SUMMARY. All the catholics subscribed this statement, and afterwards in the same council unanimously condemned their opponents, as the following document shows.

COMMENTARY. p.96 L.11 postquam - if A IX, 1 corresponds to the letter mentioned in A VIII, p.93 L.22, then this condemnation could not have followed immediately upon the composition of A IX, 1 but only after a considerable interval of time, because A VIII, is dated 27 May 359 and A IX, 3, 21st. July 359.

L.13 spiritali voce - cf. A V, 1 p.83 L.13. In this case, their claim to be inspired might be based on their unanimity.

A IX, 3 Condemnation of the heretics.

SUMMARY. On 21st. July 359, after the synod of Ariminum had dealt with matters of the faith and settled what ought to be done, at the suggestion of Grecianus, bishop of Callis, who thought that the synod had shown enough patience with Valens, Ursacius, Germinius and Gaius, all the bishops again agreed to condemn those heretics because of the confusion they had caused in the Church and because they were now trying to overthrow the Nicene decisions by a heretica creed drawn up by themselves.

COMMENTARY/

COMMENTARY. This document has also been preserved in Greek in Ath. De Syn. 11. It has been edited by Faber-Coustant, Bar. ad ann. 359 n.XVII, Harduin I, 711-714, Coleti II, 898sq. and Mansi III, 299.

p.96 L.16,17 Eusebio... August - i.e. 21st. July 359.

L.20 Grecianus episcopus a Calle - Grecianus of Callis in Umbria is known only from this document. The Greek text does not mention him.

p.97 L.1. The Greek text in Athanasius adds "Auxentius" to these names. cf. A V p.83 L.13. Socrates[4] mentions also Demophilus of Beroea. Geographically, Beroea belonged to the synod of Seleucia, but it is possible that, because of his previous relations with Liberius, Demophilus might have been sent to Ariminum.

L.2sq. omnes ecclesias etc - cf. A V p.82 L.1sq., p.80 L.1sq.

L.5sq. adtulerunt etc - i.e. their version of the Dated Creed.

L.7,8 iam quidem.. conprobatum - they had already been condemned at Sardica and Milan. cf. A V, 1 p.80 L.6sq. B II, 1 § 8.

CONCLUSION. No date is assigned in the text to A IX, 1 but its simple profession of faith makes it appear probable that it was written/

Notes.
4. H.E. II. 37.

written soon after the opening of the synod of Ariminum and before the Arians complicated matters by the introduction of their creed[5]. It probably corresponds, in part at least, to the letter of the Westerns mentioned by Constantius in A VIII, in which they had reminded him that the former decisions were still valid and no further discussion on the faith was necessary. In A IX, 1 is given the typical orthodox Western position, i.e. firm adherence to the Nicene council with its creed and decisions and the assertion that no alteration can be made to these. cf. A V, 1.

A IX, 3 seems the logical outcome of the situation described in A V, 1 p.82 L.1sq. The anger caused among the Westerns by the introduction of the heretical creed would lead to the condemnation of those who proposed it.

The order of composition of the documents and letters arising from the synod of Ariminum would seem to be as follows:- (1) p.94 L.14' the first letter of Constantius. (2) p.93 L.22, 23 the first letter of the Westerns in reply to this. Part of this at least has been preserved in A IX, 1. (3) A VIII the second letter of Constantius in reply to the Westerns. (4) A V, 1 the reply of the catholics to this. (5) A IX, 3[6]. (6) A V, 3 and A VI both documents issued after the Arian victory at Nikê.

Notes.
5. cf. conclusion to A V.
6. see above.

Series B I. Preface.c.356.

SUMMARY. (1) The author begins with a dissertation on I Cor.13,13. He affirms his love for, and true adherence to Jesus Christ, rejecting the society of the wicked and foregoing all worldly honours because of his steadfast devotion to the true faith. (4) Then he gives a description of the subject and purpose of his book. He is attempting to publish a serious and intricate work, which will be difficult to understand because of the diabolical deceit and subtleties of the heretics, to which many will bring minds biased through fear and dissimulation; it will deal with events taking place in foreign parts, events long ago accomplished but for some time passed over in silence under pretence of peace, until recently brought into prominence again by the wicked craftiness of deceitful men, causing distraction to the Emperor and agitation in the palace, bishops and official magistrates bustling around in confusion in their haste to act against apostolic men. He has taken the utmost pains, he continues, to show the iniquity of the sentence passed against himself, for indeed it has long been a scandal that bishops should suffer exile because they refuse to condemn Athanasius. (5) He has to pass over some things, such as the imperial intrusion in ecclesiastical affairs, imperial judgment passed without any reason given, sentence extorted on an absent person, not because they are unimportant, but because he has to discuss weightier matters. For in case anyone might have a wrong impression of what actually took place (sc. at Biterrae), he has taken great care to expound/

expound the whole affair in this book. At that time he had only been able to make a hurried protest against the corruption of the Gospels, the depravation of the faith and a confession which was really a blasphemy of the name of Christ; and his speech was necessarily hurried, disordered and confused because the more he sought an audience, the more his enemies opposed it. (6) He intends, therefore, to begin from the recent events at Arles, when his brother and fellow-minister Paulinus of Trèves refused to associate himself with wickedness and deceit, and he will set forth that decision by which he was judged unworthy of the Church by the bishops and worthy of exile by the Emperor. In this way, it will become apparent, not so much from the actual order of events, but from the purpose lying behind them, that what was at issue was not a person but rather a confession of faith. (7) Finally, he requests the reader not to be wearied with so many epistles and synods but to give his closest attention to the work and, in affairs of such magnitude and importance, to form his own independent judgment.

COMMENTARY. Before the preface in the MSS stands the following title:- "Incipit liber sancti[1] Hilarii Pictaviensis Provinciae Aquitaniae In Quo Sunt Omnia, Quae Ostendunt (Qua Ratione) Vel Quomodo, Quibusnam Causis, quibus instantibus sub imperatore constantio factum est ariminense concilium contra formellam nicheni tractatus, qua universae hereses conpressae erant".

This/

Notes.

1. Feder Stud. I. p.127-8 prefers "secondus".

This title does not cover all the documents in Series B and is obviously now out of place, a result of the confusion existing among the fragments as a whole.

p.98 L.3sq. Sancto spiritu plenus etc - this dissertation on I Cor. 13,13 is rather a striking introduction to a polemical work. As an antidote and reaction against the personal enmities and jealousies between the rival factions in the Church, the author takes this New Testament basis to strike a calmer, more Christian note. It makes even more effective the fiery parts of his work e.g. the anathemas against Liberius.

The author expands St. Paul's phrase and gives an interpretation which would find favour with most modern commentators. Prophecies and gifts valued by men and profitable for mankind will become worthless at the advent of Christ simply because they are useful only for this life, whereas faith, hope and charity retain their value in eternity. Though all things are found only in part in man, nevertheless these three are in themselves perfect and therefore will undergo no change in eternity; they have an intrinsic value which can not be taken away and will give fruit even in eternity.

L.4, 5 consummandae - i.e. on the advent of Christ cf. L.7,8.

veritatis - i.e. the truth of the Christian religion in opposition to the falsity of the heresies.

sacramentum - μυστηριον. It had been thus used by Tertullian[2]. For the word itself cf. P. de Ghellinck "Pour l'histoire du mot "sacramentum" "(Louvain 1924): H. von Soden "Μυστηριον und Sacramentum in der ersten drei Iahrhunderten der Kirche" in Zeitschrift für die N.T. Wissenschaft XII, 1911, p.188-227.

Trans. - "the great mystery of the consummation of the truth is thus embraced by a triple quality of the human mind" i.e. man will attain to the complete truth through the possession of faith, hope and charity; they are the keys unlocking the secrets of the truth still to be revealed. cf. Aug. Ep. CXL, 63; infuturo autem saeculo perfecta et plena charitas sine ulla malorum tolerantia, non fide credit quod non videt, nec spe desiderat quod non tenet; sed in aeternum veritatis speciem contemplatur.

L.11sq. verum fidei etc - cf. Tert De Patientia 12. Irenaeus Adv. Haer. II, 28, 3[3] and modern commentators.

L.20 traduces - a favourite word with Tertullian[4] but otherwise uncommon.

p.99 L.1sq. et singularum etc - Transl. (1) "and the same blessed apostle/

Notes.
2. cf. De Patientia 12 P.L.I, 1268 "nam dilectio summum fidei sacramentum, Christiani nominis thesaurus, quam Apostolus totis viribus Sancti Spiritus commendat, cuius nisi patientiae disciplinis eruditur?"
3. P.G. VII, 806
4. cf. Apol. 7, 12; 9, 17; 21,12.

apostle distinguished between the merits of the individual qualities by means of his own small importance, so that it should be easily understood that when the rest are to be abolished with the advance of heavenly growth, these three alone remain by virtue of their value and effects "i.e. it was an introspective examination of what was worth preserving in himself which led Paul to this conclusion. or (2) "and the same blessed apostle distinguished between the merits of the individual qualities by means of their own small importance... "i.e. Paul thus distinguishes between the "officia" on their own merits[5].

In § 2 the author expounds more fully those 3 virtues on a New Testament basis. First, he extols faith, as exemplified in Abraham and the Canaanite woman and portrayed in St. John's Gospel; then he praises that hope which sacrifices present ease for future gain; but love is placed above all, even above faith and hope, because it is love which binds us solely and completely to God; through love our wills become one with God, we are bound in an union indissoluble by any worldly power.

p.99 L.7 et Cananae.. salvat - the author seems to have confused two incidents in St. Matthew's Gospel, the one (ch.9 v.20-22) where the woman silently touches the hem of Jesus' garment and is cured of an issue of blood, the other (ch.15 v.22-28) where the Canaanite woman after much persuasion secures healing for her daughter.[6]

Notes.

5. It should be noted that L.2 "vi" is a conjecture suggested to Feder by A.Engelbrecht. Some such word is necessary to complete the sense.
6. If "silentio" could be attached to "salvat", then the sentence would refer to Matt.15 v 22-28 without any confusion.

L.8 in Iohanne - i.e. in the Gospel according to St. John (ch.iv 12). cf. De Trin X, 42 per precem in Iohanne. This was a favourite Gospel with Hilary. cf. De Trin. I, 10.

L.9 fidei meritum - cf. Hil. De Trin. VI, 33,47. The reward of faith is explained in what follows. cf. De Trin VI, 48sq; I Peter 1, 9.

In §3 the author adds his personal testimony to that of Paul, and asserts his steadfast adherence to the true faith.

p.100 L.9 iniquorum..respuens - in c. Const. 2, written in Constantinople c.360, Hilary states that five years before, long-foreseeing the danger to the faith, he and the Gallican bishops had, after the exile of Paulinus, Eusebius, Lucifer and Dionysius, separated from the communion of Saturninus, Ursacius and Valens. This action is implied in this section of the Preface. Hilary shows himself fully aware of what will happen because he continues to be true to his principles and to his position of bishop. His adherence to the true faith will entail sacrifice of worldly goods, separation from home and loved ones, loss of imperial favour and of influence in the Church.

L.13, 14 si modo...corrumperem - e.g. accept a heretical creed instead of the Nicene, or prefer the proposals of the Arians to the decisions reached at Nicaea.

L.14,15 conscientiae...consolarer - i.e. accused of accepting something/

thing which he knew to be wrong, he could excuse himself by saying that he had accepted it in all good faith, not perceiving any harm in it. This might easily happen because it was a favourite artifice of the Arians to circumvent their objective, concealing their real aim under a quasi-orthodox guise; for example, their ultimate objective in attacking Athanasius was to overthrow the Nicene creed, but the reason given at this time for their attack on him was that he was the real disturber of the peace of the Church and that unity could be achieved only through his condemnation. cf.A IV, 1, BII, 5.

L.15 iudicii corruptelam - this will refer to the judgment given against the orthodox bishops at Arles 353and Milan 355. The author means that he could easily escape being involved in the question of the justice of their trial by pleading that it was the responsibility of those who had given judgment.

L.16,17 hereseos..tenerer - i.e. ascribing his adherence to heresy, not to his faith, but to simplicity. cf. the simplicity of the Westerns generally with regard to credal statements[7]

Notes.

7. see notes on A I; also Gwatkin, "Studies" p.56sq. Gibbon ("Decline and Fall" II, ch. XXI p.353 ed. Bury) writes:- "The provinces of Egypt and Asia, which cultivated the language and manners of the Greeks, had deeply imbibed the venom of the Arian controversy. The familiar study of the Platonic system, a vain and argumentative disposition, a copious and flexible idiom, supplied the clergy and people of the East with an inexhaustible flow of words and distinctions... The inhabitants of the West were of a less inquisitive spirit.. their minds were less frequently exercised by the habits of dispute, and such was the happy ignorance of the Gallican Church that Hilary himself, above 30 years after the first general council, was still a stranger to the Nicene Creed...".

L.17, 18 probitatem..mentirer - because of the numerous lies and false accounts circulated by the Arians[8], it would be difficult for a person, not present at the particular synods and trials, to get an accurate report of what had taken place. The author could therefore have evaded his responsibilities by making excuse of this uncertainty.

p.101 L.1, 2 non potui.. tolerantiae - Trans. "I could not prefer an obsequious conscience in the silence of guilt to a hurtful suffering for the confession of God" i.e. his conscience would not allow him to remain outside the controversy, despite the sufferings involved, for he knew the bad effects which this policy of neutrality would have on the true profession of God.

L.3 sq. Proferre igitur etc - cf.c.Arrianos I[9].

grave - i.e. because of the subject matter L.4 "multiplex" - intricate because of the many twists and turns of the controversy. "diabolica fraude perplexum" - confused by diabolical deceit: for example, the conduct of Valens and his associates at Arles 353, where they promised to condemn Arianism if the orthodox would condemn Athanasius, and after the latter had done so, refused to fulfil their part of the agreement. "hereticorum parte subtile" - for example, the way in which they were able to use for their own purposes phrases in/

Notes.
8. cf. also § 4 p.101.
9. B. Marx p.392sq. On its author, see A II p.46 L.11 note on Gregory of Elvira.

in creeds which on the surface seemed quite orthodox.

L.5 "dissimulatione..praeiudicatum - as in every controversy, it was difficult to remain neutral and to secure an impartial verdict both because many disguised their true feelings and others were swayed through fear of the imperial power. L.5,6 "locorum.. peregrinum" - the main sphere of the Arian controversy was in the East; the West on the whole was but little affected[10]. Marx[11] is of the opinion that the distinction made here between the places in which the events took place and the place where the author is living signifies only the synods held recently at Arles, Milan and Biterrae (or Beziers) as opposed to the quiet of Poitiers. But it would be strange for any author to use the word "peregrinus" of places within his own country. It seems more natural to suppose that the distinction is that between East and West. Moreover Marx's view of "synods held RECENTLY" does not suit the next phrase "tempore antiquum". Hilary is thinking of the synods held from Nicaea onwards.

L.6,7 tempore antiquum - cf.A VII, § 4 p.91 L.23,24 "non est novum quod nunc subtiliter et sub occasione nominis Athanasi adtestantur".

L.7 silentio novum - this is probably a reference to the Arians at this time/

Notes.

10. This is an indication that the author of the Preface is a Western and still living in the West.
11. p.398sq.

time concealing their true colours and not yet daring to come out in open opposition to the Nicene Creed.

p.101 L.7 pridem...praeteritum - from 345 until 351 (except for a few minor synods), there had been a period of uneasy peace. The struggle so far had ended in an unsatisfactory compromise. The Nicenes, for their part, had had their chief cause of complaint removed by the restoration of the Nicene confessors[12], while the strength of the Arian party had been temporarily removed through Constantius' preoccupation with the Persian war and his struggle against Magnentius, a state of affairs ended by the victory of Mount Seleucus in the summer of 353.

L.8 proxime..renovatum - after Constantius' victory over Magnentius in353, the Arian party could again rely on imperial support and were thus able to renew their attacks on Athanasius.cf.the synods at Arles 353, Milan 355, Beziers 356.
proxime - cf. quae PROXIME gesta sunt p.102 L.8.
Impia.. calliditate - cf. the action of Valens and his followers at Arles (see note on p.101 L.4).

L.9sq. quo etiam etc - cf. Athanasius' description of the discussions, events and confusion at the Emperor's palace during the synods of Arles and Milan[13].

Notes.
12. e.g. Athanasius to Alexandria in 346.
13. Hist. Ar. 31.

L.11 adversus apostolicos viros - i.e. orthodox bishops.

L.13 huius adsertionis - i.e. the sentence delivered against the orthodox bishops. cf. p.101 L.24; p.102 L.11sq.

L.13-15 enimvero... non ferunt - on the revival of Arianism a few years after Nicaea, the centre of Arian attack was Athanasius. Councils were held to secure his condemnation[14] and the Easterns at Sardica condemned several bishops because of their refusal to break off relations with him[15]. But not until Arles 353 did any bishop suffer exile for refusing to condemn him. The "iamdiu" goes back therefore to that date. The bishops who suffered exile on this account were Paulinus of Trèves, Eusebius of Vercelli, Dionysius of Milan and Lucifer of Cagliari[16].

This sentence shows that the author of the Preface is not in exile; the phrase "versari in sermone hominum" is also an indication that he had not been present personally at Arles and Milan.

L.16-18 et hic error.. arbitrentur - the Arians had long put forward the plea that it was expedient that one man should be condemned rather than the whole Church kept in turmoil: that with the removal of Athanasius peace and unity would return to the Church and all factions/

Notes.
14. e.g. at Tyre 335.
15. A IV, 1.
16. Two legates of Liberius were also in exile because of this. cf. A VII, § 6.

factions, jealousies and strife cease: that the issue concerning Athanasius was not so important that bishops should suffer exile for it[17].

That many had been deceived by this propaganda is evident from the author's comment L.16 "hic error prope omnium mentes occupavit". Nevertheless a remnant held fast and preferred exile because they knew that by so doing they showed their loyalty and adherence to the Nicene creed. The reason for their exile was not simply their refusal to subscribe against Athanasius; it was not merely a personal matter. Behind Athanasius lay the Nicene creed, and the attack on Athanasius was but the prelude to an attack on the Nicene creed. In this sentence, Hilary too, shows his awareness of this fact.

§ 5 L.19sq. In spite of imperial pressure, the sentence had not been taken calmly[18].

L.20 quia enim a deo regnum est - cf. Romans XIII, 1.

L.20-22 non tamen.. quae dei sunt - this is a protest against imperial intervention in ecclesiastical affairs[19], and against Constantius'/

Notes.

17. cf. their policy at Arles and Milan. A VII, § 5. Or. Syn. Sard. ad Const. Imp. II Text. Narr. § 3 p.186-7 Feder.
18. cf. Ath. Apol. ad Imp. Const. 27 for an account of the suffering, persecution and violence used to induce the bishops not to communicate with Athanasius. Also Ath. Hist. Ar. 33,34,76. Sulp. Sev. H.S. II, 39 gives an account of the turmoil at the synod of Milan,
19. cf. also Ath. Hist. Ar. 33,34.

Constantius' declaration at the synod of Milan "Whatever I will, be that esteemed a canon"[20]. Here is another aspect of the problem posed by having a Christian Emperor[21]. When Constantine became a Christian, both East and West at first welcomed the Emperor's participation in ecclesiastical affairs.cf.at Nicaea 325. The East continued to assert that everything should be kept under the Emperor, with the Church assisting him, but the West[22] soon took the view that Church and State should be kept separate. Hilary[23] takes the Gospel as his authority for this view. This assertion of a dualism is interesting in contrast to Roman or Byzantine totalitarianism.

L.22,23 taceo.. indicium - at Arles and Milan, the Emperor had obtained the judgment he desired from the majority of the bishops purely by the use of force and threats of violence.

sublata causae cognitione - at both councils the Arians had refused to discuss matters of faith and doctrine but had simply and solely insisted on the condemnation of Athanasius, without any reason given.[24]

L.23, 24 non queror... sententiam - cf.Liberius' protest that it was not possible to condemn a man unheard and untried[25]. In answer to/

Notes.
20. Ath. Hist. Ar.33.
21. cf.A V p.81 L. 2,3.
22. cf.B I; Or. Syn.Sard. ad Const. Imp. I § 6; Ossius in Ath. Hist. Ar.44.
23. B I § 5.
24. A VII § 5. Or. Syn.Sard.II N.T.§ 3 Sulp. Sev. II, 39..
25. Theod. II, 13; Amm. Marc. XV, 7.

to Constantius' statement "I am now the accuser of Athanasius; on my account you must believe what these assert", Paulinus, Lucifer, Eusebius and Dionysius had asked "But how can you be an accuser, when the accused person is not present? for if you are his accuser, yet he is not present and therefore can not be tried.. The trial ought to be conducted on equal terms both to the accuser and the accused..."

L.24,25 ubi fides est, ibi et libertas est - this is an interesting use of the text in II Cor. 3,17[26] bringing near the implication that the Church has spiritual liberty. In De Trin II, 32, Hilary quotes the text as Paul wrote it.

L.27sq. quamquam enim etc - the Arians would naturally put forward their account of these events[27] and because they had imperial support, it would be considered official and generally accepted by those who had no other direct source of information.

L.28 ex his quibusque in terris - Duchesne and Wilmart[28] read "ex aliquibus quae Biterris". This reading seems tenable in view of the agreement between what follows and c. Const. 2.

p.102/

Notes.
26. "and where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty".
27. cf.their earlier conduct towards Athanasius at Tyre, their action at Sardica and later at Ariminum, Seleucia and Constantinople.
28. Rev. Ben. XXV, 1908 p.228.

p.102 L.2 hoc volumine - like most prologues, this one seems to have been written last and at the time of its composition there seems to have been one complete volume. It is obvious that the author at this time contemplates only one book[29].

L.2sq. raptim enim tunc etc - according to Coustant[30], these words could refer either to the situation at Biterrae or at Constantinople 360. The context, and particularly § 6, seems to indicate the time following the synods of Arles, Milan and Beziers, (Biterrae). From c.Const. 2 it is known that Hilary had gone to Beziers prepared to state his case but had not been given the opportunity[31]. Moreover by the time of the council of Constantinople, the Arians had discarded the Athanasius question and revealed their real aims directly and without fear. [32] For these reasons, Constantinople seems to be excluded.

L.3 corruptio evangeliorum - e.g. perverted use of biblical texts to suit the purposes of the Arians.

depravatio fidei - e.g. the attempt to substitute a heretical creed for the creed of Nicaea.

Notes.

29. and not the three of which Jerome speaks..
30. P.L. X col. 630 (e)
31. cf. L.4sq.
32. Marx (p.392sq.) has also shown that this fragment was already known to Phoebadius of Agen when writing c.357. e.g. c.Arr. 1 "Igitur ante haeresim zabolica fraude caecatam proferre in conscientiam publicam possim" and B I, 4 "Proferre igitur in conscientiam publicam opus temto..diabolica fraude perplexum".

L.3, 4 simulata..confessio - this probably refers to the creed of Sirmium 351, which, though not formally Arian, was yet definitely anti-Nicene[33]. In his encyclical to the bishops of Egypt, written in 356, Athanasius warns them against acceptance of a creed which the Arians were trying to force upon them on pain of exile and which they intended as a substitute for the Nicene creed. It is thought[34] that the creed referred to in this passage is also that of Sirmium 351.[35].

The Arians would naturally be attempting to encourage acceptance of the creed of Sirmium 351 as it represented their most recent effort to produce a substitute for the creed of Nicaea.

A similar passage is found in Or. Syn. Sard. ad Const. Imp. I § 3[36]
"non cessant ore impio et sacrilego animo evangeliorum sinceritatem corrumpere et rectam apostolorum regulam depravare...simplices et innocentes sub praetextu nominis Christiani raptos.. reos faciant".

L.4 in eo sermone - in all probability the one Hilary prepared for delivery at the synod of Beziers. The happenings there seem to have taken him somewhat by surprise. When summoned to attend, he naturally expected time and opportunity to defend himself, but his opponents had different ideas and used their utmost endeavour to prevent this.[37]

Notes.
33. cf. Hil. De Syn. 39-63. Ath. De Syn. 27,32.
34. cf. Robertson. Introd. to ad Episc. Aeg. p.222 Post-Nicene Library vol. 4.
35. This similarity might be taken as an indication of the date of the Preface.
36. Feder p.183.
37. cf. L.5-7, and c. Const. 2.

His reference to this "sermo" indicates that, in spite of this opposition, he had been able to make some sort of defence. cf. De Syn. 2 "since the good profession at the council of Beziers where I denounced the ringleaders of this heresy".

L.5-7 quanto nos.. contrairent - cf. c. Const. 2 describing his treatment at Beziers in being refused a hearing "sed hi timentes publicae conscientiae audire ingesta a me noluerunt".

§ 6. After Constantius' victory over Magnentius in August 353, the Arians once more began their intrigues against Athanasius[38]. Gibbon[39] writes: "As soon as the Emperor was relieved from the terrors of the civil war, he devoted the leisure of his winter quarters at Arles, Milan, Sirmium, and Constantinople to the amusement or toils of controversy: the sword of the magistrate, and even of the tyrant, was unsheathed, to enforce the reasons of the theologian; and as he opposed the orthodox faith of Nice, it is readily confessed that his incapacity and ignorance were equal to his presumption.. p.371. The first winter after his victory, which he spent at Arles, was employed against an enemy more odious to him than the vanquished tyrant of Gaul".

When conflicting reports concerning Athanasius were sent to Liberius of Rome, he in turn wrote a letter to Constantius requesting a council/

Notes.
38. Ath. Apol. ad Const. 6,20.
39. L. c. II, ch.XXI p.360.

council at Aquileia[40]. This request was granted but the meeting-place of the council was Arles where Constantius had his winter-quarters.

L.8, 9 ex eo tempore - the synod of Arles was held in the winter of 353.

L.10 Paulinus..episcopus - Paulinus of Trèves (or Trier) played a prominent part in the struggle against Arianism in Gaul. He is thought to have been made bishop c.349 and is identified with the Paulinus who delivered to Athanasius the letter sent by Valens and Ursacius to Julius of Rome, in which they renounce Arianism[41]. At the synod of Sirmium 351, though willing to condemn Photinus and Marcellus, he refused to condemn Athanasius[42], and persisting in this attitude at Arles 353, he was sentenced to exile in Phrygia, the only bishop at the council to suffer this fate. In this Preface he is referred to as "frater et comminister meus" whereas in c.Const.11, written in 360, he is called "beatae passionis vir"; he must therefore have died sometime between 356 and 360. He is believed to have written some treatises against the Arians, which have now been lost[43].

L.10/

Notes.
40. cf.B VII, 6.
41. B II, 6. Ath. Apol. c.Ar. 58 Hist. Ar. 26.
42. Sulp. Sev. II, 37.
43. Hist. Litt. de la France I, pt.II, p.124, 112 cf. Ath. Encycl. Epist. ad Episc. Aeg. § 8.

L.10,11 Paulinus.. non miscuit - Paulinus seems to have been the only bishop at Arles who remained steadfast to Nicaea. If there had been any others, they would almost certainly have been mentioned here.

L.12,13 indignus.. iudicatus - his deposition is an ecclesiastical affair, his exile an imperial one. Constantine may be said to have begun this practice when he banished the Donatists after Caecilian had been declared innocent at Milan, November 316[44]; and it seems to have become the normal procedure for deposed bishops to be exiled by the State e.g. Athanasius was exiled to Trèves by Constantine after sentence had been passed against him by the bishops at Tyre.

L.13-16 atque hoc..coepit iniuria - by tracing the plan and purpose, rather than following the actual order, of events, the author hopes to prove that what was at stake was not merely favour towards a man but primarily a confession of faith i.e. no matter how it may have seemed on the surface, it was not so much Athanasius as the Nicene Creed, which the Arians were attacking-and for which Paulinus was prepared to suffer exile. cf, note p.101 L.16-18.

L.15 eum - Coustant[45] suggests that this "eum" indicates Athanasius, but it seems more in accord with the context to refer it to Paulinus.

Notes.
44. Aug. "Contra litt. Petiliani" in P.L. XLIII, 326, and Ep. LXXXVIII § 3 in P.L. XXXIII, 303.
45. P.L. X col.631 (b).

L.16 his - i.e. the Arian proposals.

L.17sq. Atque hoc etiam etc - cf. Hilary De Syn. 6 where he requests the same care and patience, and the perusal of the whole book and argument.

L.18sq. omnia enim sunt etc - the author prescribes four guiding lines for the reader. Attention must be paid to (1) the time at which the events took place (2) the judgments (3) the persons concerned and (4) the meaning of the words (e.g. in the creeds).

L.22, 23 agitur autem ... haereat - i.e. what is really involved is the true knowledge of God and the hope of eternity.

L.23sq.et cum tam gravis etc - i.e. the affair is too important for anyone to allow himself to be swayed by externals or influenced by his brother bishops or imperial pressure. The author himself shows his own independence of spirit in daring to publish his book, fully aware of the opposition it would arouse and the threats to his own well-being. cf.§ 3.

CONCLUSION. This Preface is evidently an introduction to a historical polemic work written in defence of Athanasius and the Nicene Creed, and it gives the purpose and a short description of the contents of the book. It is written by a Western bishop[46] who had been present at/

Notes.

46. p.101 L.5,6 "locorum..peregrinum", p.102 L.9,10 "frater et comminister Paulinus".

at Beziers[47] where his attempts to secure an audience had been baulked by his opponents[48]. Already he had broken off relations with the heretics[49], and, though he is not yet in exile[50], he knows that this fate awaits him with the publication of his book[51]. This coincides completely with the situation of Hilary of Poitiers in 356. He had been present at Beziers and refused audience; he had broken off relations with Saturninus and other Arians; and now, after the council of Beziers, he awaited exile. Moreover the Preface shows stylistic kinship with other works of Hilary: for example, the vivacity of style produced by unconnected heaps of short sentences, the point put sharply into prominence through apparently intended omission, and other characteristic expressions and phrases[52].

According to Schiktanz[53], Hilary wrote this Preface while still in exile at Constantinople. He thinks that p.101 L.9sq. "nocque, quo etiam"etc is a description of the scene in the palace at Constantinople and the request for an audience[54] is that made by Hilary at Constantinople. But he admits himself that this interpretation has its difficulties. One must go further and say that the contents of the Preface sufficiently confute this opinion. It is evident from §§ 3 and 4 that the author is not yet in exile, Though/

Notes.
47. p.101 L.28 note on Biterris.
48. p.102 L.5sq.
49. p.100 L.9.
50. p.101 L.5,6 "locorum..peregrinum" L.13-15 "enimvero..exulare".
51. § 3.
52. cf.notes in Commentary.
53. p.60sq.
54. p.102 L.5sq.

though that threat hangs over him. Some bishops indeed have already suffered exile, but he is still living in his own country. It is significant, too, that in all his works written in exile, Hilary always refers to that fact[55] whereas in the Preface no mention is made of it. Then the events at Arles are referred to as having taken place recently and it is obvious that they still kindle indignation in the minds of the orthodox. But, when the council of Constantinople met, the events of Arles had become overshadowed and well-nigh forgotten because of what had happened in the intervening years. Nor does the spirit of the introductory paragraph of the Preface correspond well with the wrathful mood which actuated the c. Const.; the refusal of audience must refer to the previous one at Beziers described in c. Const. 2. Then, too, the description of the turmoil in the palace is similar to that given by Athanasius, in his Hist. Ar. 31, describing the confusion at the synods of Arles and Milan. It also corresponds with the picture drawn in the narrative text (§3) to the Or. Syn. Sard. ad Const. Imp.

The evidence, therefore, seems in favour of the composition of the Preface soon after the council of Beziers in 356, when Hilary was still in Gaul; in all probability the basis of the book, for which it formed the introduction, was the speech hurriedly delivered at that synod and now "polished up" for purposes of publication. At any rate, this is one of the reasons he gives for the composition of/

Notes.
55. cf. De Trin. X, 4, De Syn. 2, c. Const. 2.

of the book[56]. The other reason given is the necessity of counteracting the Arian propaganda and making clear to all the secret motives behind the dispute. How far he succeeded in his task, it is now impossible to judge because of the loss of several documents and the confusion existing among those which remain. It is obvious that the Preface was not intended to cover all the documents in the collection as now preserved; probably all that remains of the original volume is A IV, B I, B II, and the Oratio Synodi Sardicensis ad Constantium Imperatorem et Textus Narrativus[57]. On the practical side, it would at least help to clear the issues in the controversy; it may also have served to strengthen the Gallic bishops and keep them faithful to the Nicene Creed.cf. Hil. De Syn. 1 sq.

Notes.
56. § 5.
57. Feder p.181sq.

## Series B II, 1 Synodal Letter of the Western bishops at Sardica 342

SUMMARY. (1) The Western bishops at Sardica accuse the Arians of having caused all the trouble in the Church with their heretical doctrine, and state that this synod had been assembled by the Emperors expressly to put an end to all this dissension. With imperial encouragement, bishops had come from the East to discuss the troublesome questions concerning Athanasius of Alexandria and Marcellus of Ancyra, of which in all probability the recipients of the letter have already heard. (2) Some time ago, after Eusebius, Maris, Theodorus, Diognitus, Ursacius and Valens had written to Julius of Rome against Athanasius and Marcellus, other bishops wrote testifying the innocence of the bishop of Alexandria. Whereupon the former bishops, when summoned by Julius, refused to come, thus showing the weakness of their case. This was revealed even more at the synod of Sardica. For when they saw Athanasius, Marcellus, Asclepas and others present, they refused to enter the synod despite frequent invitations from all the bishops and especially the old confessor Ossius. (3) Not only did they flee on account of the presence of Athanasius and the others but also because men had come from diverse places accusing them of many crimes and even of attempted murder of bishops. (4) Although their flight had revealed their wickedness, (5) the synod decided to make inquiry into their actions and accusations, so that there should be no occasion/

occasion for further mischief, and they were found to be calumniators and authors of a plot against the orthodox bishops. Arsenius, whom, they said, Athanasius had murdered, was still alive, and from this it could be inferred that their other reports were also fabrications. Moreover, those who came from Alexandria testified that what the Easterns had reported about a cup said to have been broken by Macarius, a presbyter of Athanasius, was untrue. This was also confirmed by the Egyptian bishops who wrote to Julius. The other charges brought against Athanasius were also dealt with by the synod and found to be without foundation. (6) Then it considered the case of Marcellus. His book was read and the deceit of Eusebius and his supporters discovered. For what Marcellus had advanced as a hypothesis, they falsely represented as his professed opinion; but when read in its context, his faith was found to be correct. He had not asserted either that the Word of God had his beginning from the virgin Mary or that his Kingdom had an end; on the contrary, he had written that his Kingdom was both without beginning and without end.

Asclepas of Gaza also produced acts drawn up at Antioch in the presence of his accusers and Eusebius of Caesarea, and proved that he was innocent by the declaration of the bishops who judged his cause.

(7) The Easterns, therefore, had good reason for not entering the synod, and their flight confirmed their calumnies.

The Westerns then give a list of the leading members of the Eusebian party and assert that these men would not allow their followers/

followers to approach the council or even the Church, but on their way to Sardica had held several synods and agreed not to appear at the trial or the assembling of the council, but simply to come and make their appearance known in the city and then immediately take to flight. This plan had been ascertained from (Mac-) Arius of Palestina and Stefanus of Arabia, who, after coming with them, had separated from their perfidy. These two bishops also spoke of the violence used by the Eusebians and asserted that many who had come with them adhered to orthodoxy but were prevented from joining with the Westerns.

(8) So the synod pronounced Athanasius, Marcellus, Asclepas and their clergy innocent and wrote to their dioceses informing them of this decision; it also excommunicated the intruders, Gregory in Alexandria, Basil in Ancyra and Quincianus in Gaza, and deposed the other leading Eusebians. Finally the Westerns charge the recipients of the letter and their people to have no communion with such men and to give their assent, in writing, to these decisions.

COMMENTARY. This letter has also been preserved in Greek in Ath. Apol. c.Ar. 44-49 and Theod. H.E. II, 6, and in Latin in the Verona Codex[1]. The Greek text, from which the Verona Codex copy is translated, differs from that of Ath. and Theod. but substantially resembles that of the latter. The Verona text differs from Hilary's in/

Notes.

1. cf.W. Telfer The Codex Verona LX (58) in Harvard Theol. Review XXXVI p.169-246.

in giving a larger introduction[2] and there are slight changes in words and construction. There are variations also between Hilary's text and the Greek of Ath. and of Theod. but none seriously affecting the substance[3].

In addition to the Faber-Coustant edition, this letter has also been edited by Labbe-Cossart II, 679-684, Harduin I, 661-667, Coleti II, 711-716, Mansi III, 69-74.

p.103 L.3sq. In both B II 1 and Ath. Apol. c. Ar. 44-49 the names of the provinces from which the bishops have assembled are omitted but they are found in Theod. and the Verona Codex. B II, 1 gives the shortest superscription of all. Unlike A IV, 1, this letter is not addressed to any particular recipient.

According to the Westerns, the aim of the Emperors in summoning this synod was to abolish all dissensions by removing false doctrine and establishing true faith in Christ[4] and finally to settle the questions raised concerning Athanasius and Marcellus.

Notes.

2. cf. Theod.
3. e.g. p.104 L.5,6 cf. L.18,19. p.105 L.4 and 22 Hil. and Ath. omit "et Asclepa Gazae" which Theod has. p.106 L.1 "propter eas" resembles Theod. more than Ath. Theod. has the names "Menophantus et Stephanus" which Ath. omits. p.110 L.7 Hil. and Ath. have the plural "episcopos", Theod. the singular. p.111 L.26 Asclepas is mentioned in the Greek but not in the Latin. p.114 L.27 Μαρεώτου is omitted in Latin. p.115 L.9 mysterium L.25 μυστηρίων. p.118 L.25 "Beloved brethren" in Greek, omitted in Latin. p.119 note by the collector in Latin L.8 "licet timuens non adfuerit de Oriente" based on p.123 L.6 and 21 and Theod. p.121 L.1,2 Latin has "Ario..ex Palestina (ac) Stefano de Arabia", and the Greek "Μακαρίου ἀπὸ Παλαιστίνης καὶ Ἀστερίου ἀπὸ Ἀραβίας." p.122 The sees of the bishops are given in the Latin text (L.5,6) but not in the Greek (L.24,25)
4. cf. A IV, 1 §1.

p.104 L.3, 4 imperatorum - i.e. Constans and Constantius.

L.9sq. venerunt enim ab Oriente etc. - cf. A IV, 1.

p.105 L.3,4 Athanasio.. Marcello - the Verona Codex and Theod. add Asclepas of Gaza. cf. also p.106 L.5, p.111 L.7, p.133, L.2.

L.5 calumnias - cf. A IV, 1.

p.106, L.1 propter eas ecclesias - Coustant prefers the Ath. reading καὶ δι' ἑαυτοῦ. Theod. has δι' αὐτας. The Verona Codex reads "propterea", which the Ballerini in their edition change to "propter eas"[5]

§ 2 cf. previous notes on A IV, 1 for this.

p.106 L.2 Eusebio - this is the Eusebius who eventually became bishop of Constantinople. First of all, he had occupied the see of Berytus in Syria. Then he had himself transferred by unlawful means to Nicomedia[6]. Deposed soon after Nicaea, he was later restored along with the other exiles, and, according to Socrates[7], immediately started plotting against Athanasius and the Nicenes. On the deposition of Paul in the autumn of 338, he was elected bishop of Constantinople/

Notes.
5. s. Leonis Opera III, 598sq.
6. Ath. Apol. c. Ar. 6. Depositio Arii 1.
7. I, 23.

Constantinople and, as such, enjoyed great favour with Constantius. According to Socrates[8], he died shortly after the synod held in Rome under Julius.

Mari - Maris of Chalcedon in Bithynia is said to have been a disciple of Lucian of Antioch[9] and was a supporter of Arius before the council of Nicaea[10]. At that council he was one of five who were unwilling to subscribe the creed but he at length gave his approval[11]. At Tyre 335 he was appointed one of the commission of inquiry to Mareotis[12] and he was also present at Constantinople[13]. He is mentioned in Julius' letter[14], was at Antioch 341, and was one of the party who elected Macedonius to the see of Constantinople[15]. His name does not appear in the list of bishops of the Eastern synod of Sardica[16], but from the letter of the Easterns[17] it appears that he was present. According to Socrates[18] and Sozoman[19], he was present at Ariminum 359 and Constantinople 360.

Theodoro - see note A IV, 3 (10).

Notes.
8. II, 11,12.
9. Philost. II, 14.
10. Ath. De Syn. 17.
11. Socr. I, 8. Soz. I, 21.
12. Ath. Apol. c. Ar.13,72. Theod. I, 28. A IV, 1.
13. Socr. I, 35.
14. Ath. Apol. c. Ar. 20.
15. winter 341/2. Socr. II, 12.
16. A IV, 3.
17. A IV, 1 p.60 L.1sq.
18. II, 41.
19. IV, 24.

L.2; 3 Diognito - Diognitus (or Theognitus) of Nicaea in Bithynia, in conjunction with Eusebius of Nicomedia, Maris of Chalcedon, Theonas of Marmarica and Secundus of Ptolemais, persisted in support of Arius at the council of Nicaea, and was threatened with exile, but later gave way and subscribed. He took part in several synods against Athanasius and was also a member of the commission to Mareotis. He died before the synod of Sardica.

L.3 Ursatio et Valente - see notes A I p.45 L.15. Iulio - cf. A IV, 1.

L.5 Athanasium et Marcellum - cf. A IV, 1. Theod. and Verona Codex add Asclepas. cf. p.105 L.3,4.

p.107 L.1sq. nam etsi etc. - just as now at Sardica the opponents of Athanasius were afraid to enter the council because of the weakness of their case, so previously they had refused to come to Rome for the same reason.

p.108 L.3 Ossium - see note A II, p.46 L.14.

L.3 -6 qui et propter...habeatur - the construction of this sentence is confused. The best sense can be obtained either by omitting "qui" L.4 or changing this "qui" into "qua" and inserting a verb like "meretur" before "ut" L.5.

L.7/

L.7,8 de consacerdotibus nostris - probably "absentibus" has to be added. cf. Ath. Theod. and Verona Codex.

p.109 L.9,10 ferrumenim..viri - e.g. Lucius of Adrianople[20].

p.110 L.4 "alter" probably also refers to Lucius.

p.110 L.7 episcopos - Ath. and the Verona Codex have the plural, but Theod. has the singular. That several bishops had this experience can be gathered from Theod. II, 12 "messengers were sent in quest of Theodulus and Olympius, bishops of Thrace, as well as of me (i.e. Athanasius) and of the presbyters of my diocese; and had they found us, we should no doubt have been put to death. But at the very time they were planning our destruction we effected our escape[21]"

L.9 Theodulus - he was bishop of Trajanopolis in Thrace. It would appear from this letter and the corresponding passages in Athanasius, that Theodulus had died while the synod of Sardica was in session.

p.111 L.5 iudicum - i.e. civil judges, not bishops. cf. also p.181 L.14 Or. Syn. Sard. ad Const. Imp.

L.6 Theognito - see note p.106 L.2 Diognitus. This letter is no longer preserved.

Notes.
20. Ath. Apol. de fuga 3.
21. see also Ath. Hist. Ar. 19. Apol. c.Ar.45. Apol.de fuga 3. Socr. II, 26.

L.7 Athanasium et Marcellum - as before[22], Ath. Theod. and the Verona Codex add Asclepas. cf. p.133 L.2. They have also the plural instead of the singular "imperator" L.8. cf. p.104 L.5.

L.11 - p.112 L.1 Arriomanitarum - this form is also found in A I, p.44 L.2 and A II, p.47 L.3.

L.8 eos etiam quos vehementissime - Feder departs from the text of A here and relying on the Greek adopts Coustant's reading[23].

p.113 L.5,6. The Greek text of Ath. and Theod. and the Latin of Verona Codex would require the addition of "ipsorum" after "adversus ecclesias" (L.5) and "conscientiae" after "timore" (L.6).

L.7 et per eandem..nudarent - cf. p.109 L.7sq. etc.

§5 The Nicenes thwart any future Eusebian trickery by making inquiry of their own accord into the affairs in question and find the accusations without foundation in fact. By so doing, they counteract the Eusebian assertion that they were unwilling to have such an inquiry. They consider all the accusations made formerly against Athanasius, for example, at Tyre[24].

Notes.
22. p.105 L.3,4, p.106 L.5 notes.
23. P.L. X col. 635 (b).
24. see previous notes in A IV, 1. For similar testimony to Athanasius' innocence cf. Julius' letter in Ath. Apol. c.Ar. 20sq.

p.114 L.5,6 Arsenium - one of the earliest accusations brought against Athanasius by the Meletians was that he had murdered bishop Arsenius of Hypsele(who adhered to the Meletian party) and had cut off his right hand for magical purposes. The originator of this deception was John Archarh, the leading Meletian bishop, and Arsenius was bribed to hide himself in order to make the story seem true. When this accusation was brought to the Emperor, he commissioned his nephew, the censor Dalmatius of Antioch, to investigate the affair and Athanasius had to defend himself. He did so by making inquiries partly by letter and partly by a deacon. The latter discovered that Arsenius was hidden in the Egyptian monastery of Ptemencyrcis, but before he reached there, Arsenius had escaped in a ship with Helias, a monk. This Helias and a presbyter Pinnes were, however, arrested and brought before the governor at Alexandria where both eventually confessed that Arsenius had not been murdered but was still alive[25].

The next episode in the affair took place at the council of Tyre 335. Again the Arsenius charge was raised, but, by this time, so far as the Eusebians knew, Arsenius had completely disappeared. They themselves did not know what had happened to him, least of all did they suspect that Athanasius had managed to get hold of him. What had actually taken place was that, without the knowledge of the Eusebians, the bishop of Hypsele had come secretly to the synod at Tyre where he had been recognised, and been arrested by the consul Archelaus/

Notes.
25. Ath. Apol. c. Ar.65-67. Socr. I, 27. Soz.II, 28.

Archelaus. Arsenius naturally tried to deny his identity but was shown up by bishop Paul of Tyre, who had at one time known him, and Athanasius was informed of this further development by Archelaus[26]. Arsenius also wrote to Athanasius renouncing the Meletian party[27]. When, therefore, in answer to Meletian charges, Athanasius produced Arsenius in the council, confusion reigned and on this point at least his enemies were silenced.

p.114 L.6,7 unde ex..falsitatis - the Westerns judge the authenticity of the other accusations in the light of this Arsenius affair.

L.8 Machario - while on a visit to Mareotis during an early part of his episcopate, Athanasius discovered that a layman, named Ischyras, was exercising priestly functions. His presbyter, Macarius, was sent to summon Ischyras, but, on arrival, found that he was ill and so could only request his father to restrain him from the offence. Ischyras, however, sought the protection of the Meletians and accused Macarius of having, on Athanasius' orders, burst into his chapel, overthrown his altar, broken his chalice and burnt the sacred books[28]. According to Athanasius[29], this accusation had first been raised when he was with the Emperor in Psammathia[30], but nothing had come of it, perhaps because of the production of a letter from Ischyras in which he admitted the deception and asked to

be/

Notes.

26. Socr. I, 29.
27. Ath. Apol.c.Ar.69.
28. Ath. Apol. c. Ar.63. Socr. I, 27. Soz. VI, 23. B II, 5 §3.
29. Apol. c. Ar. 60.
30. c.331.

be received into the Church again[31]. At the same time, Macarius, with another priest Alypius, disproved the accusation brought against Athanasius by three Meletian clergy, Ision, Eudaemon, and Callinicus, with reference to the linen vestments[32]. Again accused of the breaking of the chalice, Macarius was brought in chains to Tyre 335. It would seem that, despite his apologetic letter, Ischyras had still not been admitted into communion with Athanasius, and partly because of this and partly because of the promise of a see from the Eusebians, he had changed sides once more[33]. When the commission was chosen by the synod to investigate affairs in Mareotis, it clearly revealed its bias by taking Ischyras with it and leaving Macarius in chains at Tyre[34]. At Constantinople 335 the Eusebians made no mention of Macarius and the chalice[35] and at the synod of Rome 341 the charges against him were found to be false[36]. The Easterns at Sardica brought up the charge of breaking the chalice but Macarius was not mentioned and indeed the accusation was directed against Athanasius[37].

Following /

Notes.

31. Apol. c. Ar. 64.
32. Apol. c. Ar. 60.
33. Apol. c. Ar. 85.
34. Apol. c. Ar. 72.
35. Apol. c. Ar. 87.
36. Apol. c. Ar. 27sq.
37. A IV, 1 § 6 sq. In a letter to Athanasius, Constantine openly exposed the inconsistency with which the Meletians had charged at one time Athanasius and at another Macarius with the breaking of the chalice. cf. Apol. c. Ar. 60. It may not be out of place to remark that, while on the whole our sympathy lies with Athanasius in his conflict with the Arians, there were occasions when his conduct was rather high-handed and did nothing to promote understanding between the Nicenes and the Arians. cf. his attitude towards Constantius prior to his return to Alexandria in 346

Following the example of the Roman council, the Westerns at Sardica refute the accusations about Macarius.

p.115 L.1 episcopi scribentes...ad Iulium - cf. Ath. Apol. c. Ar. 3-19 for their letter.

L.3 acta - i.e. the sentence against Athanasius delivered at Tyre 335 on receipt of information from the commission of inquiry sent to Mareotis.

L.3, 4 quae habent...confecta - cf. Ath. Apol. c. Ar. 82 and also the letter of Julius in Apol. c. Ar. 20sq.

L.4sq. simul tamen in ipsis actis etc - Athanasius[38] writes in the same vein. The falsity of the catechumens' evidence was revealed (1) by their contradictory testimony with regard to Ischyras and (2) by the fact that the Eucharist could not have been celebrated while catechumens were present.

Notes.
38. Apol. c. Ar. 72, 83.

L.5,6 and L.10 the original Latin text has not been preserved and has now to be supplied from the Greek.

L.8 cella - MS. A reads "ecclesia" but Feder, relying on the Greek ἐν κελλίῳ, prefers "cella". cf. also Ath. Apol. c. Ar.37.

L.9 mysterium - i.e. the Eucharist.

p.166 L.1-3 nam et ipse..dicebat - in Ath. Apol. c. Ar 83 this charge is directed against Macarius.

L.3-5 ad hoc..appareret - ie. their witness was false because, if Ischyras was sick, he could not have been standing offering the sacrament, as the catechumens had tried to make out.

L.5-7 denique falsitatis..quidem fuit - Ischyras had been made "bishop" of his own village in Marcotis (which had previously belonged to the see of Alexandria) and because there had been no church there hitherto[39], permission had been obtained from the Emperor to build one[40].

L.7sq. venientes enim etc - this is related also in letters from the clergy of Alexandria and Mareotis[41]. The meaning is that as Melitius/

Notes.
39. cf. p.140 L.13.
40. cf. Ath. Apol. c. Ar.85.
41. Ath. Apol. c. Ar.73-75.

Melitius had neither church nor ministry in Mareotis, he could not have appointed Ischyras as presbyter; and moreover, as Ischyras had never been appointed to any post by the bishop of Alexandria, he had no claim to be a presbyter, far less a bishop.

L.8 Melitio - Melitius was bishop of Lycopolis in the Thebais. His see stood next in rank to that of Alexandria and he had been ordained to it not long before the beginning of the Arian controversy. He used Peter of Alexandrias flight from persecution as an opportunity to extend his own sphere of influence[42] and later was deposed for this by a synod of Egyptian bishops under Peter. Meletius' answer was to separate himself and his followers.

The council of Nicaea recognised him as having authority within his own city but gave him no powers of ordination and required those whom he had appointed to be confirmed by a more legitimate ordination. Melitius accepted these decisions and retired to Lycopolis. Later, however, he emerged again to join in the opposition against the ordination of Athanasius to the see of Alexandria. Contrary, also, to the Nicene regulation, before his death he nominated his friend John as his successor[43] and this was recognised by the council of Tyre[44]. In course of time, the Meletians were said to have merged themselves with the Arians in Egypt[45].

Alexandro - see note on him in A VII p.91 L.25.

Notes.
42. Soz. I, 24.
43. Soz. II, 21.
44. Soz. II, 25.
45. Soz. II, 21.

p.117 L.5 sq. liber quem conscripsit etc - this book of Marcellus is no longer extant except in the quotations of Eusebius of Caesarea. It may have been true that the synod at Constantinople 335 had taken conjectures of Marcellus as definite assertions and thus gone too far; but the Western Sardican synod was equally at fault in not going far enough. It was quite correct, so far as it went, to say that Marcellus did not impute a beginning to God the Word from the virgin Mary, but, as previously noted[46], Marcellus did not equate the Word with the Son, and the question as to whether he denied the eternal Sonship was thus left unanswered[47].

p.118 L.3,4 Asclepius - apud Anthiociam - see note A IV, 1 p.55, L.20.

L.5 Eusebio ex Caesarea - Eusebius of Caesarea was forerunner of what came to be known as the Semiarian or Homoiousian party i.e. though detesting the extreme Arian position, he had still grave suspicions about the Nicene creed. It has been strongly asserted by such scholars as Hort[48], Burn[49], and, for a long time Harnack[50] that his Caesarean creed formed the basis for the Nicene Creed, but this theory has now been largely discredited through the work of Schwartz/

Notes.
46. cf. notes on Marcellus in A IV, 1.
47. cf. Eusb. Caes. De Eccles. Theol. I, 18. P.G.24 col. 862-3.
48. cf. his "Two Dissertations" p. 54 sq.
49. cf. "Introduction to the Creeds" p. 76sq. and "The council of Nicaea" p. 1b sq.
50. cf. Hauck's Realencyklopaedie, 3rd. ed. XI, 1bsq.

Schwartz[51], Seeberg[52], and Lietzmann[53]. It is now fairly generally agreed that at the council of Antioch, held shortly before Nicaea[54] and most probably in preparation for that council, three bishops, Eusebius of Caesarea, Narcissus of Neronias and Theodotus of Laodicea, had refused to sign the synodal letter and creed and as a result been provisionally excommunicated. Thus, when the council of Nicaea met, Eusebius had been compelled to put forward a creed which was designed, not to serve as the basis for the creed of the council, but to clear himself from any suspicion of heresy. Furthermore, the reason for his hesitation in signing the Nicene creed was not because his own creed had been rejected or changed, but because he thought the council had exceeded the directions of the Emperor in the creed which was eventually produced. Instead of only giving a clearer definition of the traditional teaching, of which his creed was a good example, and which the Emperor had recommended, the council had, as it were, by the inclusion of the word 'homoousios' forced upon the Church an altogether new and unexpected line of teaching[55]. He took part in the various synods which were held after Nicaea, was present at the deposition of Eustathius at Antioch, and also at Caesarea, Tyre, Jerusalem and Constantinople, where he was commissioned to refute Marcellus of Ancyra. He died c.339.

Notes.

51. Zur Geschichte des Athanasius VI, in Nachricht. Gött.1905, p.271sq. and 1908,VII, p.305sq.
52. "Die Synode von Antiochien" (Berlin 1913).
53. Z.N.T.W. XXIV, 1925, p.203. cf. also in this respect Kelly "Early Christian Creeds" p.205sq.(London 1950).
54. in the early weeks of 325. cf. H.G. Opitz Z.N.T.W.XXXIII,1934 p.151.
55. cf. his letter in P.G. 20 col.1535sq.

p.119 L.3,4 diacones..episcopatum - cf. the case of Ischyras.

L.6 Eusebios duos - i.e. Eusebius of Caesarea and Eusebius of Nicomedia. Ath., Theod., and Codex Verona mention only one Eusebius, but Feder's reading might find support in the Or. Syn. Sard. ad Const. I §5 p.184 L.5,6 which names all the bishops mentioned here except George.

L.6 Theodorus. - see note A IV, 3 (10). L.7 Narcissus A IV, 3 (56). Stephanus A IV, 3 (1).

L.8 Georgius ex Laudocia - though not actually in the first rank, George took an active part in the theological disputes of the fourth century. He began as a strong supporter of Arius, then became a Semiarian, and finally an Anomoean. A native of Alexandria, he had been ordained presbyter by Alexander of Alexandria[56] but when he went from Alexandria to Antioch and tried to act as mediator between the orthodox and the Arians, he was deposed by Alexander both for false doctrine and for irregularities of life[57]. Because of this, he had to withdraw to Arethusa where he acted as presbyter; on the expulsion of Eustathius, however, he returned to Antioch and gained the support of the Arians. According to Athanasius[58] he had himself/

Notes.
56. Eus. Vita C. III, 62. Philost. VIII, 17.
57. Ath. De Syn. 17, Apol. c. Ar. 8, Apol. de fuga 26. Theod. II, 9.
58. Apol. de fuga 26.

self appointed bishop of Laodicea on the death of the Arian Theodotus, and as such attended the various synods held against Athanasius.

L.8 licet timens..Oriente - this phrase is not found in Ath. Theod. or the Verona Codex and seems to be a comment inserted by the collector. cf. p.123 L.6.

L.9 Acacius - A IV, 3 (9). Menofantus - A IV, 3 (4). L.10 Ursacius and Valens - A I p.45 L.15.

p.120 L.3sq. venientes etenim Serdicam etc - it has sometimes been deduced from this statement that the Easterns had held their main synod, from which their letter[59] would be issued, before they actually arrived in Sardica, but this conjecture seems disproved from their letter[60]. It seems probable from this account, however, that the Easterns had already composed their letter while on the way to Sardica and had it ready for publication immediately they entered the city.

p.121 L.1 Ario scilicet ex Palestina - Ath., Theod. and Verona Codex read "Macarius", but, in the list of subscriptions, Athanasius has "Arius" and in his Hist. Ar. 18 says "As to Arius and Asterius, the/

Notes.
59. A IV, 1.
60. cf.note on A IV, 1 p.48 L.9 "apud Serdiciam".

the one bishop of Petrae in Palestine, the other bishop in Arabia"[61].

p.121 L.2 Stefano de Arabia - Ath., Theod. and the Codex Verona read "Asterius from Arabia". Ath. Hist. Ar.18 also has Asterius. In the list of subscriptions given in B II, 4, there is no Stefanus mentioned, but after "Arius a Palestina" comes "Asterius ab Arabia"[62]. So it would seem that "Asterius" is preferable to "Stefanus" here.

According to Athanasius[63], both these bishops were banished to Upper Libya by the Eusebians but returned to their sees under Julian.

L.5sq. adserentes etiam hoc etc - it is very probable that there were bishops among the Easterns who did not share the views of the leaders, were not in sympathy with the refusal to participate in the synod with the Westerns and were prepared to hear both sides before giving their verdict[64].

L.10sq Quia ergo etc - similar charges were made by the Easterns in their letter e.g. A IV, 1§§8, 9 etc.

p.122 L.3 translationes - in canon XV of the council of Nicaea all translations had been forbidden, but the practice continued because "ambition, being the enemy of the Church, is not subject to its laws"[65].

The/

Notes.

61. Petrae is here placed wrongly in Palestine. In Tom. ad Ant. 8 Athanasius assigns to Asterius the see of Petra, Arabia.
62. p.137 L.5,6.
63. Hist. Ar. 18.
64. cf. Julius' letter Ath. Apol. c. Ar.33.
65. Till . VI, 673.

the Westerns here make it a ground of accusation only when the translation is from a smaller to a larger church.

p.123 L.1 Gregorium - A IV, 1 p.48 L.12. L.1, 2 Basilium - A IV, 3 (23). L.2 Quincianum - A IV, 3(11).

L.6sq. etsi timens etc. - this statement is also found in the Greek text[66] and is the basis for the collector's remark "licet timens non adfuerit de Oriente"[67]. The reason for this fear is not now known, but it is possible that George shrank from meeting clergy whom he had known in his early days at Alexandria and who knew all about his deposition by Alexander. He might also have been frightened for trouble within his own see.

p.123 L.7 - p.124 L.1 quia a beatae..deiectus est - it is not known exactly when this took place but from Athanasius' statement in his 'De Synodis' 17, it may well have been before the council of Nicaea.

CONCLUSION. In his prologue B I, the author asserted that he was going to begin his work with an account of the events which took place recently at Arles, but the document, which now follows it in the MSS. shows no apparent connection with the preceding. It is the letter of the Westerns at Sardica, the counterpart of the Eastern/

Notes.
66. except the words "ut dictum est" which probably come from Hilary.
67. p.119 L.8.

Eastern Sardican one A IV, 1. Whereas the latter declares Athanasius and his associates guilty, the former asserts that the accusations brought against those bishops are false, pronounces them innocent and condemns the Easterns for their flight. cf. now B II, 5 Conclusion and B II Conclusion.

There has been much controversy as to whether this letter represents an official Latin original issued by the synod of Sardica itself, or a Latin translation from the Greek. Zahn, Schiktanz, and Feder and Gelzer (Z.N.T.W., 1941, p.1 -24) favour the latter view and some support for their opinion might be gained from the fact that certain phrases in the Latin text[68] seem to savour of Greek rather than of Latin constructions.

But, if it were a translation, it would be difficult to explain the considerable divergences which exist between the text as found in MS. A and a Greek one like that of Athanasius[69], divergences which are smoothed out in the Latin text of the Verona Codex, which does represent a translation from the Greek of Theodoret. The difference in character between the Latin text of B II, 1 and that of the Verona Codex weighs against this opinion. Moreover the Ballerini, in their edition of the works of Leo the Great III p.XXXI, have shown that the synod of Sardica drew up two sets of canons, one in Greek for Greek-speaking bishops, another in Latin for/

Notes.

68. for example B II, 8 p.125 L.3 "hos omnes longe facite": B II, 3 p.112 L.1,2 "necessitatem patiebantur ista tolerare".

69. for instance p.104 L.8(ut) pietas sola, quae est in Christo hominibus custodiretur cf. L.20,21. p.114 L.9,10 testificati sunt, qui praesentes fuerunt ex Alexandria de eodem loco, eo quod nihil tale esset factum.cf. L.26-28.

for Latin-speaking ones. There seems no reason why they should not have adopted the same policy with their letter. cf. Schwartz in Z.N.T.W., 1931, p.5sq

To enter into the controversy concerning the date of Sardica would be out of place in a Commentary such as this where that question is not of importance. Suffice to say that E. Schwartz[70] has done distinguished work on this problem and put forward a convincing argument for the date 342, though this has not yet found universal acceptance[71].

B II, 2 Letter of Western Sardica to Julius of Rome, 342.

SUMMARY. (1) The Westerns begin their letter in a general way, accepting Julius' explanation of his absence from their council and asserting that, though absent in body, he was yet present in spirit and favourable intention. Episcopal appeals to the see of the apostle Peter are to be encouraged. (2) As their own writings and the legates of Julius at Sardica will faithfully expound all that has taken place, they have thought it almost superfluous to enter into details in this letter. But they protest at the Easterns' blatant refusal to participate in the synods at Sardica and Rome. (3)/

Notes.
70. Nach. Gott. 1911 p.469sq.
71. It is, for instance, disputed by J. Zeiller "Les origines chrétiennes dans les provinces danubiennes (Paris 1918) p.228sq.

(3). The emperors had sanctioned discussion of three subjects (a) all points of dispute on the faith and integrity of the truth had to be settled (b) a decision had to be reached on the persons against whom charges had been brought (c) inquiry had to be made into the persecutions and tribulations suffered by bishops because they had dared to oppose the Arian and Eusebian heresy. (4) Then they announce the decision reached on the impious and unskilled young men, Ursacius and Valens, who had spread the deadly seeds of adulterous doctrine everywhere and caused destruction and confusion. Valens is also accused of having caused the death of a bishop Viator. From all this Julius will clearly perceive that they have covered everything possible. (5) They ask him to make known in writing the decisions of the council in Sicily, Sardinia and Italy. Finally, they make a request for Marcellus, Athanasius and Asclepas to be kept in communion, append a list of heretics so that there may be no doubt about them and again entreat him to warn all the clergy in writing not to receive letters of communion from the heretics.

COMMENTARY. This letter has been transmitted both in the usual group of MSS of the Collection and in MSS containing acts of councils[72]. In addition to the Faber-Coustant edition, it has been edited by Baronius ad ann.347 n.XXIIIsq., Binius I, 443, Ed. regia III, 41-43, Labbe-Cossart II, 660-662, Harduin I, 653sq., Coustant/

Notes.

72. cf. Feder in C.S.E.L. LXV Praef. II, A, 3, p.42 and p.126 app. crit. and Stud. I, 23sq., II, 12sq. and III, 103sq.

Coustant Epp. Pontif. 395-398, Coleti II, 690sq. , Mansi III, 40sq. It has been preserved only in this work.

p.126 L.5 Iulium - Julius became bishop of Rome in 337 and had already distinguished himself by his famous letter issued from a synod held in Rome in the spring of 341.[73] In it, he had answered all the Eusebian arguments and formed a defence of the orthodox position, which the Westerns at Sardica used as the basis for their approach to the controversy. He did not appear in person at Sardica but was represented by two presbyters and a deacon[74].

L.10,11 (quia experimentum..Christus) - this Biblical quotation is not found in the existing MSS but is added by Baronius in his edition[75] and is also inserted by Coustant[76].

L.15sq. et honesta fuit etc - what his particular excuse was can now only be guessed. From the context it would seem that Julius was afraid of an Eusebian attempt at intrusion into his see while he was absent at the synod.

p.127 L.1 aut canes..oblatrarent - cf. the synod's letter to the Alexandrine Church[77] and the Or. Syn. Sard.5[78]

Notes.
73. cf.Ath. Apol. c. Ar. 20sq.
74. p.126 L.14sq. p.127 L.7sq. cf. Silvester of Rome who had been represented by two presbyters at the council of Nicaea.
75. perhaps from the very old codex K which he followed here. cf.Fed. Praef. II, A, 3.
76. He changes "quia"to "an". cf. the Vulgate.
77. in Ath. Apol. c. Ar.38.
78. Feder p.184 L.9.

ad caput...sedem - several bishops of Rome had already suggested that true unity could be gained only through the Churches of Christendom recognising as their centre the bishop who, it was claimed, sat in the chair of Peter and whose see comprised the capital of the civilised world[79]. To justify themselves they quoted our Lord's words to Peter in Matt. XVI, 18, but for practical purposes, the strength of their claim lay in the unique position of Rome as the capital of the world and the only apostolic see in the West. Then, c.260, came an appeal to the Roman bishop, Dionysius, from the Alexandrians in their quarrel with Dionysius of Alexandria, and its significance was not lost upon his sucoessors; for example, in his famous letter[80], Julius, while stating that, in the case of bishops of apostolic sees, the custom was that all questions relating to them should be referred to the episcopate as a whole, claimed that, in the case of the bishop of Alexandria, it was customary that such authority should be reserved to the Roman see. This claim was disputed by the Dedication council of Antioch, 341, which confirmed the decision of Tyre against Athanasius, and it may have been both in answer to Antioch 341 and to give authority to Julius' action in his council of Rome, that the Western bishops at Sardica now encouraged appeals to the see of Rome/

Notes.

79. for instance, Victor (189-198) asserted this at the time of the Easter controversy, and was denounced for making this claim by Irenaeus (Eus. H.E. V, XXIII, XXIV): Callistus (217-222) seems to have made similar claims and been attacked on that account by Tertullian in his "De Pudicitia": Stephen (254-257) in the controversy about the baptism of heretics.

80. Ath. Apol. c. Ar. 20sq.

Rome "as to the head". But they give no clear indication of their intention in this matter and do not attempt to enter into details about the appeals themselves. Probably they have in mind the type prescribed in two of the Sardican canons[81], namely, that a bishop condemned by his colleagues should have the opportunity of re-consideration under the direction of the Roman see. It is noteworthy, however, (1) that Rome has no authority to interfere of its own accord in any case. Appeal has to be made to it before it can act. (2) that, though the bishop of Rome is given this special prerogative, the way in which he is addressed both in the previous letter[82] and in this indicates that he is still regarded as an equal. From what is said elsewhere in the letter[83], the honour paid to Julius resembles to a certain extent that given to Silvester of Rome by the council of Arles 314, i.e. the bishops recognise the importance of Rome as a link between the various churches of the West, as "a centre, not of communion, but of communications"[84].

Some[85] have thought this sentence[86] an interpolation in the interests of the Roman bishop. Others, however,[87] have defended its authenticity.

Notes.
81. III & VII.
82. B II, 1.
83. e.g. p.130 L.4sq., L.14sq.
84. Kidd "The Roman Primacy to 461" p.44.
85. e.g. Blondell "De Primatu Ecclesiae(Geneva 1641) p.106: Bower "The History of the Popes" I (Dublin 1749) p.161: Fuchs "Bibliothek der Kirchenv.II p.128 n.135: Hef. Councils II, p.163 n.7 - p.164).
86. L.3 - 5 hoc enim..sacerdotes.
87. e.g. Ceillier IV (Paris 1733)p.696: Mohler "Ath." II (Mainz 1827)p.73: Hergenrother" Handbuch der allgemeinen Kirchengesch. I (Freiburg in Breisgau 1884) p.367 n2.

It must be admitted that the sentence does not seem to have very much connection with the preceding, but the explanation may lie in the desire of the writers for brevity[88], whereby they have omitted part of their thought, knowing that the recipient would understand the reference. A fuller exposition of their thought might be as follows:- they have asserted that Julius, though absent, yet speaks through the council because his decision at the synod of Rome has been taken as the basis of theirs. But, as already seen, the Dedication council of Antioch had questioned the validity of Julius' decision. In contrast to this, the Westerns at Sardica, both in their letters and in their canons, uphold this decision, for bishops shall rightly appeal to the head.

The fact, too, that the sentence agrees with the spirit of canons III and VII of the synod of Western Sardica seems an additional argument in favour of its authenticity.

p.127 L.7 chartae - e.g. their letter to all the churches in B II, 1.

L.8,9 Arcydami et Filoxeni..Leonis - according to Athanasius, Arcydamus and Filoxenus signed for Julius at Sardica. A Philoxenus was one of two presbyters sent by Julius to summon the Eusebians to Rome[90].

L.12 certi auctores - e.g. the leaders of the Easterns condemned at the synod of Western Sardica. cf. their letter B II, 1 p.123 L.4sq.

Notes.
88. cf. p.127 L.10 p.130 L.2,3.
89. Apol. c. Ar.50.
90. Ath. Apol. c. Ar.20.

L.14 octoginta episcopis - 80 was the usual number of bishops at Egyptian councils, cf. Tillemont[91] and note on A VII p.90 L.17.

The encyclical of Western Sardica refers in general terms to these bishops[92]. Athanasius[93] also mentions these 80 bishops when giving the letter of the council of Sardica to the Church of Alexandria.

p.127 L.17 - p.128 L.1 sed et conventi..venire noluerunt - cf. Ath. Apol. c. Ar.20sq. This refers to the synod of Rome which met in the spring of 341[94].

p.128 L.4sq. Tria fuerunt etc - the first two purposes for calling the synod coincide with those given in their letter B II, 1 §1, but the third extends the scope of the synod. Not only the cases of Athanasius and Marcellus, but also all other injuries done to ecclesiastics are to be investigated.

L.5 imperatores - cf. B II 1 §1 p.104 L.3,4.

L.8 de iniquo iudicio - unfair because of their "ex parte" proceedings.

Notes.
91. VIII, p.74.
92. B II, 1 p.106 L.5,6.
93. Apol. c. Ar.37.
94. see also A IV, 1 p.56 L.8note.

L.10sq. quod graves etc. - similar expressions are found in Or. Syn. Sar. § 1 p.181 L.11sq.

p.129 L.2,3 Arrianam et Eusebianam heresim - cf. B IV, 2 p.158 L.24 heresis Arrianae vel Aecianae.

L.7sq. Quid autem etc - cf. Or. Syn. Sar. § 5 p.184 L.7, Ath. Apol. c. Ar. 13,37,41[95].

L.7,8 de impiis..Valente - Athanasius[96] states that Arius had from the first instructed Valens and Ursacius as young men i.e. during his exile in Pannonia after the council of Nicaea.

L.9 adulterinae doctrinae letalia -cf. B II, 1 p.119 L.4,5. Or. Syn. Sar. § 2 p.182 L.5,6.

L.10,11 ecclesiam aliam invadere voluisset - this must refer to the city of Aquileia, the capital of the province of Venetia and one of the most important cities of Northern Italy[97]. There is no reference to this in any other contemporary writing.

L.12 Viator - nothing else is known of this person. Athanasius[98] relates/

Notes.
95. Euseb. V.C. IV, 43 "the Pannonians and Moesians the fairest of God's youthful flock among them".
96. Ep. ad Egypt. 7.
97. cf. L.13.
98. Apol. c. Ar.50.

relates that a Viator from Italy subscribed the acts of Western Sardica, but this can not be the same person because the incident concerning the Viator of B II, 2 seems to have occurred before the council of Sardica.

p.129 L.15 - p.130 L.1 ea quae..significavimus - this letter was for long considered lost but is now recognised as being preserved in the so-called Liber I ad Const.[99] cf.Rev. Ben.1907[100].

p.130 L.4sq. Tua autem excellens etc - the bishop of Rome acted as a sort of centre of communication for the whole of the West, but Sicily, Sardinia and South and Central Italy were more immediately under his jurisdiction[101]. Several times previously the bishop of Rome had been asked to act in this capacity[102].

L.12 plena relatio fratrum - cf.p.127 L.8,9

L.13-15 eorum autem.. curavimus - cf.B II, 3 p.131.

The Western bishops do not ask Julius to confirm their decrees in writing[103] because his legates will already have subscribed for him at the synod. They are concerned, however, that he should make the decisions of the synod as widely known as possible.

Notes.

99. i.e. Or.Syn. Sar. in Feder p.181sq.
100. The similarities between this letter and the Or. Syn. Sar.have been shown in the course of the commentary.
101. cf.Bright Notes on Canons p.17sq and note on p.127 L.4 B II, 2.
102. cf.Kidd "History of the Roman Primacy to 461" p.44 on the importance of Rome as "a centre, not of communion, but of communications".
103. cf. B II, 1 § 8.

CONCLUSION. Several reasons may be given for the Westerns' action in sending this special letter to Julius. First of all, there was the peculiar position of Julius. He had not been present in person at the synod but his presbyters had subscribed on his behalf. The encyclical of the Westerns[104], therefore, did not apply to him because that had been issued to secure the assent in writing of bishops who were neither present in person nor represented. Then, in order to publicise their decrees, it was imperative that they should gain the active co-operation of the bishop who occupied the most important see in the West. Furthermore, this special honour would be paid Julius[105] in recognition of his services at the synod of Rome 341, which had provided a basis for their own action.

In their letter as a whole, the Western bishops do not advance beyond the position generally accorded the Roman Church in the fourth century i.e. an important focal point for the Church of the West. But their vague, indefinite statement on episcopal appeals to Rome[106] gave ample opportunity for later claims on behalf of the Roman see.

Ursacius and Valens probably receive special mention in the letter because of their particular connection with the Western Church, the main sphere of their pernicious influence.

Notes.
104. B II, 1.
105. cf. § 1
106. p.127 L.3-5.

B II, 3 Names of the Heretics.

There follows the list of heretics promised at the end of the letter to Julius. The list is transmitted in the same MSS as the preceding letter though the order in which the names appear differs somewhat in the various codices. Though Theodore of Heraclea is mentioned in the list given in B II, 1 p.123 L.5,6 his name does not appear here. In B II, 1 p.119 L.7[107] the see of Narcissus is given as Neronias.

B II, 4 List of bishops who subscribed the decrees of Western Sardica.

For the various transmission traditions cf. Feder Praef. II, A 3; p.131 L.10 app. crit. and Stud. II, 12sq. Feder has also made use of conjectures of various editors in their conciliar collections, such as Cochlaeus K III - K IIII, Crabbe I (1551) 333-335, Binius I, 439, Ed. regia III, 40sq., Labbe-Cossart II, 662-664, Harduin I, 651 and 655sq., Coleti II, 687sq. and 691sq., Mansi III, 38sq. and 42, and also Le Quien, Oriens christianus (Paris 1740), Ballerini, S Leonis Magni Opera III (1757) XLII - XLIX. Turner also gives a critical edition of these names in his Ecclesiae Occidentalis Monumenta Iuris Antiquissima I, II, III p.545sq.

Notes.
107. and in Theod. I, 7. Socr. II, 26.

p.132 L.1 Ossius ab Spania Cordobensi - see note on A II, p.46 L.14. C. H. Turner[108] remarks that the form used by the fourth century for Hosius and Sardica is quite different from the one used at the present day. From the Greek forms Σαρδικη and Ὁσιος come the Latin "Sardica" and "Hosius", but the fourth century form was Serdica and Ossius. In Hilary's collection the following forms are found: Serdica (the most common), Sardica, Sardicia, Serdicia; Ossius (the most common), Osius (found only once).

Corduba (or Cordoba), one of the chief cities of Spain, was the seat of one of the four "conventus iuridici" of the province of Baetica and the usual residence of the praetor. Diocletian had divided the Spanish diocese into six Provinces: Baetica, Lusitania, Gallaecia, Tarraconensis, Carthagiensis and Mauretania Tingitana. Of these, five were represented at Sardica, viz: Baetica by Corduba, Lusitania by (Augusta) Emerita[109], Gallaecia by Asturica, Tarraconensis by Caesarea Augusta[110], Carthaginiensis by Castulo[111].

After Ossius, who as president of the council subscribed first, the Spanish bishops subscribe in definite order[112] according to the age of their sees, as had taken place earlier at Elvira and Arles[113]. At Elvira Annianus' predecessor had signed in sixth place, and Florentius' predecessor in tenth place. Asturica was not represented at/

Notes.
108. J.T.S. t12, 1911, p.275-7.
109. Bishop Florentius represented Emerita as a deacon at Elvira c.300 and Arles 314.
110. also represented at Elvira and Arles.
111. also represented at Elvira.
112. Turner, E.O.M.I.A. p.546sq. suggests that the true order is preserved in Hilary.
113. cf. Gams, Die Kirchengesch. von Spanien Vol.II Bk.VI, § 3 p.183.

at Elvira or Arles, but seems to have had a bishop as early as 250. Ursatius' predecessor had subscribed in eleventh place at Elvira, and at Arles signed likewise in the penultimate poisition. There is no mention of the see of Barcelona before Sardica.

p.133 L.5 Marcellus - see note on him in A IV, 1 p.49 L.22.

L.7 Asclepius - see note A IV, 1 p.55 L.20.

p.134 L.1 Vincentius - see note A VII p.90 L.24.

L.3 Protogenes - see note A IV, 1 p.51 L.18.

L.6 Lucius a Tracia de Cainopoli - according to Athanasius,[114] Lucius was the successor of Eutropius at Adrianople. See also notes A IV, 1 p.55 L.21 p.56 L.20.

p.135 L.6 Aethius - Aetius of Thessalonica is associated with canon 16 of Western Sardica.

p.136 L.3 Athanasius - see note A IV, 1 p.53 L.12.

L.4 Gaudentius - see note A IV, 1 p.66 L. 1, 9

Notes.
114. Apol. de fuga 3.

p.137 L.1 Fortunatianus - see note B VII, 8 p. 168 L.15.

L.5 Arius a Palestina - see B II, 1 p.121 L.1.

L.6 Asterius ab Arabia - cf. B II, 1 p.121 L.2,11.

p.138 L.1 Calepodius a Campania de Neapoli - Feder[115] suggests that Calepodius must have died soon after the dispatch of the synodal letter of the Westerns, because, in the address of the Easterns' letter already his successor Fortunatus is named. But it does not seem necessary to suppose this. Just as the Easterns mention Gregory as the bishop of Alexandria, while the Westerns support the claims of Athanasius, so it may be with Calepodius, the Nicene representative, and Fortunatus, his Eusebian rival.

p.139 L.5 Eutichius ab Acaia (Ticius ab Asia) de Motonis - Feder[116] thinks it improbable that two bishops with like-sounding names, coming from the same province, could follow immediately upon each other in the subscription list, especially when no clear local designation is given. Moreover, Athanasius, in his list knows only one Eutychius. This opinion is generally accepted[117].

p.139 L.7 sexaginta et unus - there are really only 60 names in the list/

Notes.
115. Stud. II, 42.
116. Stud. II, 47.
117. cf. Turner l.c. p.559.

list. Feder attributes the 61 to a mistake occurring because of the Roman numbering ILX. Turner[118] thinks some scribe has added 61 through a misunderstanding of p.139 L.5 (58) Euticius ab Acaia.

This list of participants can be augmented from other sources. Athanasius[119] states that Vincent of Capua[120] and Euphrates of Agrippina (i.e. Cologne) were sent by the synod to the Emperor in the East. The Greek text of the 7th Sardican and of the 5th Carthaginian (348) canons says that Gratus of Carthage was also at Sardica[121]. Gratus is also mentioned in Ath. Apol. c. Ar.50. Greek martyrologies mention for 25th Feb. a bishop Theginus of Scopelos, a Cycladic island, who is said to have been at Sardica[122]. The Cod. Veron. LX also gives some names not contained in B II, 4, viz. (4) Johannes (26) Restitutus. (3) Julianus (cf. also (29). Athanasius mentions only one Julianus). (4) Ammonius (Athanasius mentions Ammonius twice) (5) Arrianus (9) Zosimus (11) Appianus (12) Eulogius (13) Eugenius (In (31) is given Eugenius de Heraclea. Athanasius mentions only one Eugenius). (15) Martyrius (In (40) is Martirius de Naupactis. Athanasius has only one Martyrius). (16) Eucarpus (In (54) is Eucarpus Opuntius Achaiae. Ath. mentions only one). (19) Maximinus (Ath. mentions among the bishops of Gaul one Maximianus/

Notes.
118. l.c. p.559.
119. Hist.Ar. 20.
120. cf. p.134 L.1.
121. cf. Hef. II, 135sq.
122. Acta S.S. Feb. XXV(III) p.500.

Maximianus who is doubtless identical with Maximinus of Triers. Maximinus is mentioned along with Julius of Rome and Ossius in A IV, 1 p.58 L.1,2 and B II, 5 p.141 L.17,18, as being the persons who had persuaded the Emperor to call the synod of Sardica. He was also among those condemned by the Eastern synod (A IV, 1). But there is no evidence that Maximinus had actually been present at the synod and Feder is of the opinion that Verissimus of Lugdunum may have subscribed for him). (20) Arcidamus, Philoxenus, Leo. (28) Severus de Calcide Thessaliae (34) Hermogenes de Sicyone (44) Amantius Viminacensis per presbyterum Maximum. (47) Aprianus de Petavione Pannoniae. (48) Antigonus Pellensis Macedoniae (50) Olympius de Eno Rodopes (He is also mentioned in the 17th Sardican canon, and in Ath. Hist. Ar.19 and Apol. de fuga 3). (51) Zosimus Orreomargensis (54) Eucarpus Opuntius Achaiae (55) Vitalis Bartanensis Africae (56) Elianus de Gortyna (57) Synphorus de Hieraptynis Cretae (58) Musonius Heracleae . (59) Eucissus Chisamensis (60) Cydonius Cydonensis.

Athanasius (Apol. c.Ar.50) gives a few more names:- Domitianus (II), Petrus, Eutychus, Philologius, Spudasius, Patricius, Adolius, Sapricius. On the other hand, Alexander (III), Ammonius, Appianus, Aprianus (II), Cydonius, Eucarpus(II), Eucissus, Eugenius(II), Eutherius (II), Johannes, Julianus (II), Martyrius (II), Olympius, Severus(II) are missing in the Athanasian list. Some names, too, are given in different form in Ath. compared to the other lists, e.g. Lucius of Adrianople is Lucillus, Marcellus Marcellinus, and Ursacius Ursicius.

The imperfections of the various lists indicate that the exact number of bishops present at Sardica can not now be ascertained. According to Sozomen[123] and Socrates[124], the number of participants was approximately 300, but they have based this figure on a wrong interpretation of a passage in Athanasius[125] where he says that more than 300 bishops had agreed to the decisions of Sardica and in another passage of the same work[126] he gives the names of over 280 bishops but says plainly "This is the letter which the council of Sardica sent to those WHO WERE UNABLE TO ATTEND and they on the other hand gave their approval; and the following are the names both of those bishops who subscribed in the council and OF THE OTHERS ALSO". Later, at the end of the same passage, he says that with nearly 63 bishops who signed for him before the council, the total amount was 344. So Sozomen and Socrates have gone wrong in thinking this number represented all who were personally present at Sardica. In his Hist. Ar. 15, Athanasius says that about 170 bishops had come from East and West to Sardica, and by the Easterns the context shows that he means the Eusebians[127]. If we deduct the 80 Eusebians, we are left with c.90 orthodox bishops, which agrees quite well with the number that can be inferred from the various/

Notes.
123. H.E. III, 12.
124. H.E. II, 20.
125. Apol. c. Ar. 1.
126. § 50.
127. Fuchs "Bibliothek der Kirchenvers. II p.98-99 is of the opinion that the 170 did not include the Eusebians and so adds 80 to it and gets the 250 of Theod. II, 7.

various lists.[128]

Comparison of the various lists of provinces gives the following results:- All the provinces given in B II, 4, except Asia, are found in the other lists, Ath., Cod. Veron. LX, Cod. par. Syr. 62, and Theod., and Asia is found in Theod. and Cod. par. syr. 62. If we add the provinces garnered from the bishops named in other sources, they are Africa, Creta, Moesia, Rodope, Roma, Calabria, Noricum and Sardinia. The province of Dacia is really "Dacia mediterranea" while "Dacia ripensis" is called in some other lists "altera Dacia". In B II, 4, Cod. syr. and Theod. "Gallia" is given in the singular, while in the other lists it is called "Galliae". In B II, 4 it is "Pannoniae" in the plural; in Cod. syr. and Theod. it is "Pannonia".

In distinction to B II, 4, most of the lists follow a certain geographical order in giving the names i.e. from East to West or vice versa.

According to Athanasius[129], the following provinces agreed to the decrees of Sardica: Egypt, Libya, and Pentapolis, Palestine, Arabia, Isauria, Cyprus, Pamphylia, Lycia, Galatia, Dacia, Moesia, Thrace/

Notes.

128. In J.T.S. vol. 24 p.74 n.1, C.H. Turner notes that in the collection of Theodosius the deacon, after the canons of Sardica, a later hand has transcribed another version of the same canons. But, he adds, this alternative version is written "in rasura" and the original material apparently consisted of the signatories to the canons of Sardica. As the erasures extend over five full pages and part of a sixth, and there are normally 27 lines to a page in the MS, he calculates that there may easily have been 80 or 100 signatories.

129. Apol. c. Ar. 1.

Thrace, Dardania, Macedonia, Epirus, Thessaly, Achaia, Crete, Dalmatia, Siscia, Pannonia, Noricum, Italy, Piceum, Tuscany, Campania, Calabria, Apulia, Bruttia, Sicily, the whole of Africa, Sardinia, Spain, Gaul and Britain.

It can be seen that, though predominantly Western in character, the synod still had its supporters in the East, even in areas (e.g. Asia Minor) where the Eusebians were strongest, and on this basis alone could claim greater authority than its rival Eastern Sardica.

B II, 5 Narrative text.

SUMMARY. (1) After revealing the vanity of thecharges brought against Athanasius, (3) the author of the narrative text directly addresses the bishops who have condemned Athanasius wrongly and against their better knowledge. He recounts the reasons they might give for their conduct and answers them in convincing fashion; in all things they have preferred the authority of false bishops to that of true. Then he considers the case of Marcellus and Photinus (4) The latter had been a deacon under Marcellus, had been led astray by him and as a result had been deposed by a Milan synod. He relates, too, the request of Valens and Ursacius to Julius of Rome for admission into communion, and their profession in writing of the innocence of Athanasius, the false sentence passed against him, and the sin of the Arian heresy.

COMMENTARY. p.140 L.2 Res - i.e. the affair of Athanasius as seen in the light of the synod of Sardica.

L.4 testes ex Aegypto compositi - cf. A IV, 1 p.55 L.29, A VII, p.90 L.17, B II, 1 p.115 L.1. B III, 2 p.156 L.6.

L.5 falsorum iudicum - i.e. the Easterns who came to Sardica.

L.5-6 nocturna.. fuga - cf. Ath. Apol. c. Ar.36 "their indecent and suspicious flight".

L.7 originem causae - at the beginning (i.e. before 330), the Arians had tried to raise suspicions about the lawfulness of the election and consecration of Athanasius; Eusebius of Nicomedia was especially concerned in this. These accusations were dispelled, however, by the testimony of the Egyptian bishops who had participated in the election[130]. Then, after a plot to secure Athanasius' deposition for refusing to sanction the return of Arius to the Church had also failed, the Eusebians united with the Meletians to bring forward charges against him concerning Ischyras[131]. This was the basis on which the Easterns built their case against Athanasius at Sardica.[132]

L.8 presbyteri - i.e. Macarius. cf. p.141 L.19sq. Ath. Apol.c. Ar. 11sq[133].

Notes.
130. Ath. Apol. c.Ar. 6.
131. cf. A IV, 1 p.53 L.12sq.
132. cf. A IV, 1.
133. cf. previous notes on A IV, 1 for this.

L.10 Scyras presbyter negatur - cf. Ath. Apol. c. Ar.11sq., 46.

L.13 apud Mareotem ecclesia nulla est - Ath. Apol. c. Ar.12 says "So that this man (i.e. Ischyras) had then no church"; 46 : "Meletius never had either Church or minister in Mareotis", cf. B II 1 p.116 L.10sq.
Coustant[134] points out that there were many churches in Mareotis but takes this phrase to mean that there was no church in Ischyras' village. The explanation is probably to be found in Ath. Apol.c.Ar 11:- "Now the place where they say the cup was broken, was not a Church; there was no Presbyter in occupation of the place... Since then there was no church there; since there was no one to perform the sacred office... " i.e. though Athanasius' enemies had claimed that there was a church in that particular place in Mareotis, in actual fact there was found to be none.

p.140 L.14 soli religio - the religion of the place i.e. the church of the place.cf. p.141 L.6 loci religio.

L.14,15 aut aliquo....desedit? - cf.Numbers XVI, 31sq.

L.15sq Scyras de diacono etc - cf.B II, 1 p.116 L.5sq. Ath. Apol. c. Ar.12.

Notes.
134. P.L. X col. 643 (g)

p.141 L.8 vos sacerdotes - the following passage reveals that the author is now addressing the bishops who have recently condemned Athanasius at Arles. Schiktanz[135] thinks that the unexpected mention of the bishops of Arles indicates that a passage dealing with that synod has now dropped out. But it does not seem necessary to suppose this. The mention of those bishops, though rather startling, is not altogether incongruous with the preceding passage[136].

L.14sq. 'secuti', inquit etc - cf. the argument from tradition put forward by the Easterns at Sardica[137].

L.17 Saturninus - see note A I p.46 L.2.

Mention of Saturninus in company with Valens and Ursacius, especially when considered in the light of the statement made on p.142 L.5sq., indicates that the author is no longer concerned with the events at Sardica but is reviewing what has taken place recently at Arles 353, the first synod since Eastern Sardica to condemn Athanasius. The author can not be thinking of Milan 355 because, in that case, he would almost certainly have mentioned the synod held previously at Arles. Moreover, in the documents now available, there is no evidence to show that Saturninus played a prominent part in the proceedings at Milan; in contrast, as bishop/

Notes.
135. p.68.
136. cf. the Conclusion.
137. A IV, 1.

bishop of Arles, he had acted as president in the synod held in his see in 353.

L.17,18 ab Ossio...communionem? - cf. A IV, 1 p.58 L.1, p.65 L.31sq.

L.19sq. presbyter eius etc - see previous notes in A IV, 1, B II, 1, also cf. Ath. Apol. c. Ar. 10sq. The fact that the Eusebians again dared to raise this accusation at Arles shows that the overwhelming proof in favour of Athanasius' innocence brought forward by the Westerns at Sardica had had little or no effect on their opponents. At Arles the Easterns, with imperial consent, brought forward a draft decree condemning Athanasius on accusations asserted to have been already proved against him before Sardica[138], and, according to Gibbon[139], it was the memory of the firm and effectual support which the primate of Egypt had derived from the attachment of the Western Church, which induced Constantius to suspend the execution of the sentence of the East till he had obtained the concurrence of the Latin bishops.

L.22,23 ad huius rei..interrogatos (sc. impers.'dicitur') - Athanasius[140] charges his enemies with having paraded the sacred mysteries before catechumens and even before heathens and thus incurred the danger of the heathen, in their ignorance, deriding them, and/

Notes:
138. Sulp. Sev. H.S.II, 39.
139. c. XXI (II,371).
140. Apol. c.Ar.11.

and the catechumens, in their over-curiosity, being offended. His enemies themselves gave occasion for this charge when they brought forward catechumens and heathen to give evidence in their accusations against Macarius, for they testified about various happenings in a service at which, according to the rule of the Church, they should not have been present.

L.23,24 Mareothae ecclesiam nullam esse - cf. p.140 L.13.

p.142 L.1sq. sed ut subiectioni huic etc - cf. Ath. Apol. ad Const. 27, Hist. Ar. 31. There is more than a touch of irony here because the author feels that they as bishops, leaders of the Church, ought to have been willing to endure these persecutions for the sake of the truth.

L.5, 6 o dignos successores Petri atque Pauli! - cf. Iren. adv. Haer. III, 1; Clement of Alex. Strom I, 1; Eus. H.E. IV, 1; Epiph. Haer. XXVII, 6. This mention of Peter and Paul together is an interesting revelation of the "non-papal" attitude of a fourth century bishop. Bishops as such are the successors of the apostles as such.

L.8 satisfecimus..propositioni - there is nothing in the text to explain this "FIRST proposition". Some part of the text, therefore, must now be missing .cf. p.147 L.23 Nam TERTIUS mihi locus praestat etc.[141]

Notes.

141. B II, 2 §3 mentions the 3 purposes of the synod of Sardica, but it is the SECOND one which deals with the persons. See Conclusion.

L.10 Marcello - see note A IV, 1 p.49 L.22.

Fotino - Photinus was a Galatian by birth and was trained by Marcellus, under whom he served as deacon. Later he was elected bishop of Sirmium, the most important see in the Illyrian provinces. All parties seem to have agreed on his heretical character, but he was protected for some time because of the Nicenes' defence of his master Marcellus. He was first attacked at the "macrostich" council of Antioch, but despite several other synodal condemnations, he retained his popularity in his own see and was thus able to remain in office until his deposition by the synod of Sirmium, 351. He appears to have been recalled with the other bishops under the Emperor Julian, but he was again and finally removed under Valentinian.

p.142 L.14,15 turbare..praedicationibus - while all agreed on the heretical nature of Photinus' doctrine, opinions differed as to the particular heresy of which he was guilty. Sulpicius Severus, Epiphanius and Augustine accused him of being involved in the errors of Sabellius; at other times he is credited with the errors of Paul of Samosata.

There is no doubt that, while to a large extent adopting the teaching of his master Marcellus[142], he was not content to rely solely on that but made his own distinctive contribution. He abandoned Marcellus' theory of the supernatural birth, and his chief/

Notes.

142. e.g. in the doctrine of the impersonality of the Logos.

chief error seems to have lain in his insistence on the strictly human origin of Jesus Christ. According to the Eusebians, he asserted that the Son of God had not existed before all ages but had His beginning when He took our flesh from Mary, and the seat of His Personality was in His human spirit.[143]

L.17sq. igitur ad tollendum etc - it is not possible to state with all certainty the dates of the synods mentioned here nor the meeting-place of the second one. According to Socrates[144], it was only when Valens and Ursacius heard of Athanasius on his homeward journey from Aquileia and his welcome at the council of Jerusalem, that they went to Rome with their recantation, and also wrote to Athanasius about this. This would place their repentance about the middle of 346. Now A V, 1[145], B II, 6[146], and Ath. De Syn.10 show that this had taken place at a synod of Milan. The question to be decided is whether this synod is to be identified with the one mentioned on p.142L.18. Robertson[147] and Hefele[148] are of that opinion. The latter states that c.345, soon after the end of the Sardican synod, the orthodox bishops at a synod of Milan found it necessary to pronounce the anathema against Photinus.... and also that this synod dealt with Ursacius and Valens who, because of a change/

Notes.
143. cf.Ath. De Syn. 26sq.
144. II, 24.
145. p.80 L.9.
146. p.144 L.10.
147. Ath. Prol. XLVII.
148. II, 189.

change in view of Constantius in favour of Athanasius had thought it necessary to renounce Arianism.

The difficulty raised by this interpretation is to understand why Ursacius and Valens had not been received into communion after this recantation, and then, only after the lapse of two years, had sought to secure this through Julius. cf. B II, 7. In their letter to Julius[149], there is no complaint about having been kept waiting for two years, nor anything to suggest that they had already made their recantation and now in desperation, as it were, make this appeal to Julius. Nor would it have been politic for Julius to have granted their request, if a Western synod had refused it. Besides, it was still too early at the date suggested by Hefele[150] for Valens and Ursacius to have known what the trend of events was to be. As a result of Athanasius' rejection of his first two letters, Constantius might still have been expected to favour the Arians. Only after Constantius' third letter and Athanasius' acceptance of it, would they know definitely how affairs were moving and decide to follow the same course; and this took place sometime in 346[151]. Moreover, B II, 5 §4 makes it plain that the approach of Valens and Ursacius to the bishop of Rome took place, not at the time of the synod of Milan mentioned on p.142 L.18, but at that of the synod held two years later.

It seems better, therefore, to identify the synod, at which Valens/

Notes.
149. B II, 6.
150. i.e. c.345.
151. cf. Robertson Prol. XLVII. Ath. Apol. c. Ar. 58.

Valens and Ursacius had made their recantation, not with that mentioned on p.142 L.18, but with the one held two years later in 346/7, also at Milan[152]. After pronouncing a sentence of deposition on Photinus, this synod had then dealt with the case of Ursacius and Valens and granted them forgiveness. Thereupon, these two bishops had written to Julius, the leading bishop in the West, their purpose being, not to seek a communion which had already been refused them[153], but to secure his aid as a protective measure against any reprisals which Athanasius might initiate against them.[154] As Hilary points out in his narrative text[155], Julius would be pleased to have their letter, not only for the prestige which it gave him personally, but more especially for the advantage thus gained for the catholic cause[156].

Finally, the date 344/5 for the earlier synod of Milan corresponds reasonably well with the statement of Liberius, in his letter/

Notes.

152. Some (e.g. D.C. B.IV, 394), relying on B II, 9 p.146 L.5, prefer Sirmium as the meeting-place of this synod, but A V, 1 p.80 L.9, B II, 6 p.144 L.10, and Ath. De Syn.10 are against this.

153. cf. Hefele's theory.

154. cf. their letter to Julius B II, 6 p.144 L.4sq. It is evident from this that they intend to counter any action on the part of Athanasius with an appeal for Julius' protection and to play off these two bishops against each other.

155. B II, 5 §4.

156. It may be noted that Hilary describes the recantation in stronger terms than Ursacius and Valens. In their letter to Julius, the latter request only pardon for their error and, as was natural, minimise their change of mind as much as possible. In contrast to this, Hilary gives the full implications of their appeal to Julius i.e. not only forgiveness but reception into the Church and acceptance into communion. cf. p.142 L.24,25 and p.144 L.1sq.

letter A VII[157], that four bishops, Demofilus, Macedonius, Eudoxius and Martyrius[158], had refused to condemn Arius at a Milan council held eight years before. As this letter was written c.353, this would date the Milan synod, of which Liberius speaks, c.345, near enough for it to be identified with the one[159] at which Photinus was condemned as a heretic.

L.21sq. quodiam pridem..resecari - e.g. those deprived of communion by the synod of Sardica[160].

L.24, 25 recipi se..rogant - on the wording cf. p.142 L.17sq. note, p.144 L.1sq.

L.25 sq. Iulius ex consilio etc - cf. Ath. Apol. ad Const. §1

p.143 L.1 de iudicii falsitate - i.e. at Tyre and Eastern Sardica.

L.2 talibus litteris - i.e. B II, 6.

CONCLUSION. This narrative text, written, like B I, shortly after Arles[161], reveals the connection between the preceding documents in/

Notes.
157. § 4 p.91 L.18sq. cf. Ath. De Syn. 26.
158. i.e. the envoys dispatched by the "macrostich" council of Antioch.
159. p.142 L.18.
160. cf. B II, 1 §8; B II, 2 §5; B II, 3.
161. cf. notes on p.141 L.8, 17.

in B II and the Preface to the work. In B I the author had stated that he was going to begin his work with the events at the synod of Arles where Paulinus of Trèves had been exiled because he refused to condemn Athanasius. His first task, therefore,[162] was to review the case of the bishop of Alexandria and prove his innocence. He does so by incorporating the Sardican documents, which, he feels[163] are overwhelming proof in favour of Athanasius, and thus provide a good basis on which to upbraid his fellow-bishops for their recent action at the synod of Arles.

While doing so, his attention momentarily turns to the case of Marcellus and Photinus but, after a brief mention, he breaks off to relate the repentance of Valens and Ursacius, an incident which again fully illustrates Athanasius' innocence. In B II, 9 he resumes his account of Marcellus and Photinus.

Notes.
162. cf. p.142 L.8sq.
163. cf. § 2.

B II, 6 Letter of Valens and Ursacius to Julius. c.347.

SUMMARY. They assert that they wish to recant their former attitude towards Athanasius and now desire to have communion with him and to seek pardon for their error. But, they continue, if the Easterns or even Athanasius call them to account with evil intent, they will not go without Julius' knowledge. Finally, as in the "libellus" which they had presented at Milan, they anathematise Arius, his supporters and his heresy. The letter is written by Valens and subscribed by Ursacius.

COMMENTARY. This letter, and the one following, have been preserved also in Ath. Apol.c.Ar 58 and Hist. Ar.26. They were written originally in Latin, but Athanasius translated B II, 6 into Greek from a copy sent him by Paulinus of Treves. They are found also in Soz. H.E. III, 23,24 and Nicephor. H.E. IX, 27.

In addition to Faber-Coustant, B II, 6 has been edited by Labbe-Cossart II, 723, Harduin, I, 691, Coleti II, 768sq., Mansi III, 167sq., Coustant Epp. Pontif.403-406.

According to Socrates[164], it was during Athanasius' homeward journey from Aquileia that Valens and Ursacius had recanted. Their letter to Julius must therefore be placed late in 346 or the beginning of 347.[165]

Notes.
164. II, 24.
165. cf.also B II, 5 §4 and B II, 7.

p.143 L.4,5 Post renuntiationem Orientaliun - the "Orientales" are not the Eusebians but the Eastern bishops supporting Athanasius. cf. p.144 L.4. They would be the bishops who came from Syria and Palestine to the council of Jerusalem at the summons of Maximus of Jerusalem. That council gave Athanasius a cordial welcome on his journey home from exile and, in their synodal letter, the bishops protest his innocence. cf. Ath. Apol. c. Ar. 56sq. Hist. Ar. 24sq.

L.8 antehac - they had been engaged in the struggle against Athanasius since Tyre 335.

L.9 litteris nostris - this would include the documents containing false accusations against Athanasius, which were brought back by the deputation sent to Mareotis by the council of Tyre[166]. They had been sent to Julius by the Eusebians who tried to impose a condition of secrecy; the bishop of Rome, however, felt that the person therein attacked should be made aware of these accusations and showed the documents to Athanasius[167].

L.9,10 litteris sanctitatis tuae - i.e. the letter of Julius given in Ath. Apol. c. Ar. 20sq.

L.13/

Notes.
166. Ath. Apol. c. Ar. 72.
167. Ath. Apol. c. Ar. 83.

L.13 nostras - the Greek translation has ὑμῶν = vestras, and this is the reading adopted by Coustant. But, in view of the following words "falsa NOBIS esse insinuata", the Latin reading seems preferable. They assert, as an excuse for their previous conduct, that they have themselves been misinformed[168].

p.144 L.1, 2 atque ideo..Athanasii - mention has already been made of the difference in tone between this letter and the narrative text[169] B.II.5. According to Hilary, they had asked for acceptance into the Church and reception into communion, but in their letter they ask, not for readmission into communion, but only for pardon on account of their error: i.e. they do not feel particularly guilty about their past conduct and state quite simply, as if it were not an essential condition of their repentance, that they are most willing to embrace communion with Athanasius. As has been said, it was natural both for them to seek to create this impression, especially so in view of the insincerity of their change of mind, and for Hilary to state boldly and clearly what he, and every other orthodox bishop, knew to be the true state of the case, namely, that this repentance on the part of Valens and Ursacius involved not only reception into the Church but also readmission into communion.

L.3 pro insita sibi benivolentia - cf. the conciliatory spirit shown/

Notes.
168. It is noteworthy that the Greek text omits the "nobis".
169. cf. p.142 L.17sq., L.24, 25.

shown by Julius towards the Eusebians prior to the synod of Rome. cf. his letter in Ath. Apol. c. Ar. 20sq.

L.4 Orientales - i.e. the supporters of Athanasius. cf. p.143 L.4,5 note.

L.5,6 citra conscientiam tuam - Valens and Ursacius could expect no sympathy or mercy from Athanasius and his Eastern supporters after their previous treacherous behaviour[170]. So, relying on the pardon which they hoped to obtain and remembering the conciliatory tone of Julius' famous letter and the spirit of toleration he had shown in receiving the Eusebian deputation prior to the calling of the synod of Rome, they now sought his protection lest they should at any time be brought to judgment.

L.7sq qui dicunt: erat tempus etc - these are the well-known Arian tenets. cf. the anathemas at the end of the Nicene Creed [171]. But even the Easterns at Sardica had been able to anathematise similar statements[172]. Their condemnation of Arius and his system is therefore a general one and not of much consequence.

p.144/

Notes.
170. cf. their part in the commission sent by the council of Tyre to Mareotis.
171. cf. B II, 10.
172. cf. A IV, 2 p.72 L.4sq.

p.144 L.9 per priorem libellum nostrum - this "libellus" is no longer extant.

L.10 quem apud Mediolanum porreximus - their "libellus" would be presented at the second of the two councils mentioned in B II, 5 §§ 3, 4.[173]

CONCLUSION. It is not difficult to understand the motives which would impel Valens and Ursacius to write to Julius. Primarily because of his famous letter, he was the most important of the Western orthodox bishops engaged in the controversy at this time. So they would write to him to give greater authority to their action at Milan and as further proof of their recantation, relying on his generous spirit as shown in his actions prior to the Roman synod, and knowing that if they obtained his favour they would be secure from any attacks that might be made upon them because of their previous conduct.

Moreover, Julius was not only a stalwart supporter, but also a personal friend of Athanasius[174]; so Valens and Ursacius would be hoping that an approach through Julius might serve both to allay the doubts and to remove any bitter feelings that Athanasius might have towards them.

The bishop of Rome can not be blamed for accepting their recantation at its face value. At this particular time, with the return home of Athanasius and the continued favour of Constans, orthodox/

Notes.
173. cf.p.142 L.17sq. note.
174. cf.the latter's visit to Rome on his way home from exile.

Orthodox hopes were high and naturally the spirit of tolerance pervaded their actions.

B II, 7 Narrative text.

SUMMARY. This letter was sent two years after the heresy of Photinus was condemned by the Romans.

COMMENTARY. p. 145 L.2,3 Haec epistula etc - it is evident that this statement is closely linked with the one in B II, 5 p.142 L.18, 19, "Fotinum, qui ante biennium iam in Mediolanensi synodo erat hereticus damnatus." "Romani" is not to be taken in a strict sense but is a collective term for the Western bishops gathered at the synod of Milan, for whom the use of Latin was a common bond. That the word "Romanus" could be used for a person speaking Latin is illustrated from the following examples (1) Hil. Ps. 2 § 35 uses "in Romanam linguam" where "in Latinam linguam" would have been more usual. (2) Jerome Ep.LXXXII § 7 writes: "and as he constantly converses and daily associates with Latins, I think he can not be ignorant of the speech of the Romans". Then in Ep. LXXX § 1 Rufinus says: "Large numbers of the brethren...begged... to make Origen a Roman", and Jerome pledges himself to give to Roman ears these homilies of Origen and as many of his other works as he can.

B II, 8 Letter of Valens & Ursacius to Athanasius. c.347.

SUMMARY. They state that they have taken advantage of the visit of the presbyter Moyses to him, to send this letter from Aquileia, informing him that they have peace and ecclesiastical communion with him and requesting an answer.

COMMENTARY. The letter is edited by Labbe-Cossart II, 724, Coleti II, 769, Mansi III, 168.

p.145 L.6 Aquileia - one of the most important towns in Northern Italy. Athanasius stayed there for some time after the council of Sardica.

L.10 Moysetis - nothing else is known of him, but he seems to have been an Egyptian presbyter.

L.13,14 dederis enim...rependas - though Valens and Ursacius asked Athanasius to reply in writing, there is no evidence that he ever did so.[175]

L.14,15 sane scito..scito - i.e. they do not request communion from Athanasius but offer it, as it were, on equal terms.[176]

Notes.

175. Hist. Ar.26: "though Athanasius had sent no communication to them, even by these persons" suggests that Athanasius had always been suspicious of them and refused to have any relations with them.

176. cf.B II, 5 §4 and B II, 6 notes.

CONCLUSION. The authenticity of these two letters, H II, 6 and 8, has never been questioned except by Gibbon[177], who doubts the fact of the recantation on the ground of the dissimilar tone of the two letters. This difference in tone, however, may be accounted for by the fact that Valens and Ursacius, having gained the favour of the bishop of Rome, felt more secure, indeed had obtained the protection required to make them safe from orthodox attack, and thus wrote in grudging spirit to Athanasius, an unwelcome task but one necessary to complete their renunciation of Arianism; this may even have been demanded by Julius as a condition of his favour.

Athanasius[178] gives this letter in the same order as in the collection of Hilary i.e. following some time after the letter to Julius. But in his Hist. Ar. 26, though again giving the same order, he makes it appear as if this letter to himself and their going up to Rome had taken place at the same time. Furthermore, in a letter to Constantius[179], Ossius states: "They (i.e. Valens and Ursacius) voluntarily went up to Rome, and, in the presence of the bishops and presbyters, wrote their recantation, having PREVIOUSLY addressed to Athanasius a friendly and peaceable letter". Ossius, of course, was writing several years later, and, being by this time in extreme old age[180], may very easily have confused the actual course of events.

The/

Notes.
177. Decline and Fall c. XXI, note 108.
178. Apol. c. Ar. 58.
179. Ath. Hist. Ar. 44.
180. cf. Hist. Ar. 45.

The order given in Hilary's collection is the most likely one, because it seems more probable that Valens and Ursacius would approach Athanasius through the mediator Julius than approach him direct and afterwards write to Julius. They needed the support of the bishop of Rome BEFORE they wrote to Athanasius, not AFTER. Moreover, if they had previously written to the bishop of Alexandria, it is strange that there is no mention of it in their letter to Julius; surely this would have been further evidence of their recantation and important enough to be included.[151]

The possibility that there might have been friendly letters from Ursacius and Valens to Athanasius in addition to B II, 6 is so remote as to be practically excluded.

It is significant, too, that, both in his Apol. c. Ar. and Hist. Ar., Athanasius places the letter to himself after that to Julius.

The letter may be dated sometime in 347.

The reason for this change of mind on the part of Ursacius and Valens is to be found in the political situation at this time. Their master, Constantius, was being compelled by Constans to change his attitude towards Athanasius, and these courtier bishops found it politic also to make their peace with the bishop of Alexandria. LATER Later events were to show how shallow and false their recantation had been.

Notes.

151. The same argument applies to those who support the view that Valens and Ursacius wrote to Julius because Athanasius had not given the requested answer. If this had been so, they would certainly have mentioned it in B II, 6.

II, 9 Narrative text.

SUMMARY. (1) On receipt of the above letters, Valens and Ursacius were restored to communion. Then the author continues with the case of Photinus. Despite his condemnation, it had been found impossible to depose him at Sirmium because of his popularity with the people. Before Photinus was accused, Athanasius had broken off relations with Marcellus, who, after the reading of his book, had been restored to the episcopate by the synod of Sardica. Athanasius' reason for this was not the publication of his book, but the introduction by Marcellus of new doctrines and his responsibility for the teaching of Photinus. His action in this matter unfortunately gave an opening to those who wished to act against Photinus. (2) Now no synod had ever been held against Marcellus except the one annulled at Sardica and no mention had been made of him when the Westerns had dealt with Photinus and reported their decision to the Easterns. Despite this, scoundrels had tried to implicate Athanasius and Marcellus in the condemnation of Photinus and thus raise questions long ago dead and buried by the judgment of truth. It was evident from the letter of the Westerns at Sardica that Marcellus had been condemned by the Arians because of the book he had written on the subjection of Christ; perusal of this book, however, had shown his innocence and the falsity of the Arian judgment. As custom demanded, a letter was written to the Easterns concerning Photinus, not, as is now being done, to extort assent, but to give the customary information of what had been done. (3) Then the author of the narrative text asks/

asks why Athanasius is accused of denying communion to Marcellus, and asserts that he had done so, not on account of the doctrine contained in his book, but because of his other teachings. So both judgments of Athanasius on Marcellus were correct. He was right in holding communion with him at Sardica when his belief concerning the subjection and surrendering of the Kingdom was orthodox, and later he was right in refusing him communion, even though he did not have synodal authority for this. But an even greater wickedness was perpetrated. (4) Hilary then proceeds to show that the faith, which they produced at the beginning of their letter, was heretical. It had begun softly with a general confession of the Trinity, made to elicit the subscription and assent of all, and so to carry this assent on to what follows, namely, a censure against Photinus, an accusation against Athanasius, a condemnation of the catholic faith. The synod of Sardica will surely have shown this. Nevertheless he feels himself bound to deal briefly with the whole affair. (5) He asserts that it has always been the duty of bishops to protect the faith and expound the correct belief to be held on God the Father, the Son of God, and the Holy Spirit, for "the perversity of heretics always arises from their impious faith". (6) Then he mentions the council of Nicaea and gives the Arian doctrine of two Gods, one, God the Father, the other made by Him into a new substance from nothing by His power. (7) Finally, he relates how the 300 or more bishops gathered at Nicaea condemned the Arian heresy and laid the foundation of catholic unity on the basis of evangelic and apostolic doctrines. As proof of this, he gives the Nicene Creed.

COMMENTARY. p.146 L.3-5 maxime cum..continerent - by their recantation Valens and Ursacius had shown that the accusations brought against Athanasius by Tyre and Eastern Sardica were false and thus confirmed the decisions of Western Sardica.

L.5 verum inter haec Syrmium convenitur - those commentators, who have taken this phrase to refer to a Sirmian synod, have found difficulty in assigning a precise date to it. Because of a passage in Sulpicius Severus[182], where it is the Emperors who are still addressed, some have placed it in 349[183]. Ceillier[184] puts it after 350. Zahn[185] dates it 347, because the phrase "verum inter haec" points to a close connection of the events with the pardon given to Valens and Ursacius.

But this phrase does not necessarily mean that a synod was held at Sirmium. It seems more probable that an embassy was sent from the synod of Milan 346/7 to Sirmium to execute the decisions reached with regard to Photinus[186], but on arrival there, they found it impossible to depose him. The 'inter haec' shows that this must have taken place about the same time as the preceding, i.e. c.347.

L.6 olim reus pronuntiatus - this probably refers to the judgment delivered against him at the first of the Milan synods[187]. It could/

Notes.
182. Chron. II, 37.
183. cf. Coustant P.L. X col.649 (c).
184. IV, 714.
185. p.78.
186. cf. B II, 5 § 4.
187. cf. B II, 5 § 4.

could also refer to the attack made upon him at the "macrostich" council of Antioch.

L.8...sed idem Athanasius - Zahn[188] thinks there is a gap before "sed idem Athanasius"etc. This is also the opinion of Feder. But it does not seem necessary to assume that a description of a Sirmian creed and its refutation have dropped out. Hilary is not primarily interested in the Sirmian assembly or Photinus. They are included only because of Photinus' relationship with Marcellus. To have given a longer discussion to this subordinate and secondary matter would have detracted from the main purpose of the narrative text.

L.9sq. qui post recitationem libri etc - cf. B II, 1 § 6. Marcellus' book is not now extant.[189]

L.11 alia nova - i.e. those not discussed at Sardica.

L.12 in quam Fotinus erupit - cf. B II, 5 p.142 L.14,15 note.

p.146 L.13 a communione sua separat - Coustant[190] suggests that the Easterns at Sirmium had replied in writing to Milan[191], and Hilary had believed too readily the calumny, inserted in this letter, about Athanasius breaking off relations with Marcellus; and so, when/

Notes.
188. p.78
189. see note on Marcellus in A IV, 1 p.49 L.22.
190. P.L. X col. 650-1 note (e).
191. cf. p.147 L.10,11.

when he says that this happened before Photinus was accused, he is thinking, not of the time preceding the earlier synod of Milan, but of the time of the second one.

It is scarcely believable, however, that the Easterns, if they did indeed reply in writing, would put a false accusation in their letter for this would have jeopardised their case from the very beginning. If false, Athanasius would almost certainly have denied it in some of his works because, at this time, his enemies were using this incident between Marcellus and himself as the excuse for reopening their attack upon him and raising again the questions settled at Sardica.

Stilting, indeed, refuses to believe this account of the strained relations between Marcellus and Athanasius simply because the latter nowhere in his writings states that he has ever broken off relations with him. This is true; Hilary is our only authority for this[192]. But it is not very surprising that Athanasius does not mention this for he speaks very rarely of Marcellus, and even where he does mention him, it is always briefly and coldly[193].

L.13,14 anteriore tempore quam Fotinus arguitur - as no qualifying remark is placed on this, it must mean that Athanasius had broken off relations with Marcellus before Fotinus was accused FOR

M.F/

Notes.

192. Sulp. Sev. II, 37 also gives it, but his account is dependent on B II, 9.

193. e.g. in his letter to the Egyptian and Libyan bishops § 8, he does not mention Marcellus in the list he gives of orthodox contemporaries. cf. also Epiph. Haer. LXXII, 4.

THE FIRST TIME[194] i.e. shortly after Sardica, while Athanasius was still in the West. The Arians must have alleged that it was only after Photinus had been condemned that Athanasius broke off relations with Marcellus because of certain doctrines contained in his book, which had been accepted at Sardica. Hilary denies this and asserts that Athanasius had broken with Marcellus before the condemnation of Photinus and for a different reason. The bishop of Alexandria had broken with him because of other new doctrines which had not been discussed at Sardica but which Photinus had developed and been condemned for.

L.14sq.praeventam iudicio meditationem etc - the author of the narrative text attempts to prove that Athanasius' action in separating Marcellus from communion did not invalidate the decision of Sardica concerning him but rather gave it authority for the bishop of Alexandria had taken this action not because of his book - Marcellus was quite orthodox in this and so Sardica's decision was the correct one - but because of his later opinions. The Arians, however, had taken his action as an opportunity to show that Sardica had not said the last word on Marcellus and therefore they were justified in proceeding against his pupil, Photinus, and entitled to raise all these questions again; and thus lead up to a further attack on Athanasius himself.

It would seem that both the orthodox and the Arians were concerned/

Notes.
194. contrast Coustant's opinion in p.146 L.13 note.

concerned at this time about Photinus, but Hilary's argument is that the Arians had no right to attack him because they were doing it for wrong reasons. Coustant[195] refers "antea" (L.17) to the action of the synod of Constantinople 336 in deposing Marcellus, which decision was repealed at Sardica. If this is so, then the phrase "quia promptum...effici" (L.16) must be taken as an explanatory side-remark[196] and the meaning would be that, whereas evil-minded men[197] related Athanasius' action against Marcellus to that of Constantinople 336 towards the same man, the correct interpretation was to relate it to the question concerning Photinus. The difficulty with this theory is that in § 2 Hilary upbraids the Arians for trying to implicate Athanasius and Marcellus with Photinus.

The alternative is to refer the "antea" to the action of Sardica with regard to Marcellus and to take the phrase "quia promptum...effici" as an integral part of the text. The meaning then is that whereas Athanasius' action ought to have given authority to the Sardican decision - because he himself had agreed to the Sardican judgment concerning the innocence of Marcellus and had broken with him for quite a different reason - the Arians had wrongly related his action to the inquiry concerning Photinus and thereby attempted to raise doubts about both Marcellus and Athanasius.

Notes.
195. col. 651 (a).
196. because Hilary could not mean that Athanasius' action, when rightly interpreted, gave authority to the action of the synod of Constantinople.
197. cf. L.23, 24.

L.20 sq. praeter eam etc - i.e. the synod of Constantinople 336. cf. also B II,1 6 p.117.

L.22, 23 cum de Fotino..relatum - this will refer to the decision taken by the Westerns at Milan[198] and reported to the Easterns "as custom demanded"[199].

L.24-26 occasionem..iudicii - like Marcellus, Athanasius had been accused by the council of Constantinople but these accusations had been dispelled at Sardica where both bishops were declared innocent. With the arrival of the report from the Westerns at Milan with regard to Photinus, the Easterns had cunningly tried to revive the original judgment by implicating Marcellus in the errors of Photinus.

L.27sq.ut emortuam etc - Hilary here reveals the true aim of the Easterns. In addition to their attack on Marcellus, they wanted to raise again the accusations concerning Athanasius. Thus, through Photinus, they hoped to undo the work of Western Sardica and once more disturb the peace of the Church. Hilary's argument is that the cases of Athanasius and Marcellus and that of Photinus are not in any way related to each other[200], that Marcellus has no responsibility for Photinus, and that condemnation of the latter involves neither Marcellus nor Athanasius.

Notes.
198. cf. B II, 5 § 4.
199. cf. p.147 L.6,7.
200. cf. L.13,14 "Athanasius breaks with Marcellus before Photinus is accused".

L.29 causae novitas - i.e. of the case of Photinus.

p.147 L.2 in superioris epistulae corpore - i.e. the letter of Western Sardica B II, 1 e.g. § 6.

L.4sq de Fotino autem etc - the Westerns had written merely to inform the Easterns of their acts concerning Photinus, but Hilary complains that now the Easterns are trying to extort assent to their letter. Coustant[201] refers the "ut nunc agitur" to the time after the synod of Ariminum but it seems more natural to refer it to the reply of the Easterns[202].

p.147 L.10sq Sed cur etc - Hilary again deals with the embarrassing question of Athanasius' break with Marcellus and defends the action of the bishop of Alexandria on the ground that it was not because of his book that Athanasius had attacked Marcellus - on this point he concurred with the decision of Sardica - but because of other doctrines and practices which, as the Easterns themselves admitted, had led to the heresies of Photinus.

L.11 rescribitur - this is probably another reference to the reply of the Easterns in which they had presumably tried to connect this break with the book of Marcellus and thus reopen the question settled by the decision of Western Sardica.

Notes.
201. col. 652 (e).
202. cf. p.146 L.26.

L.12,13 testes ipsi...sumsisse - cf.p.146 L.12,13.

L.15 fidem de subiectione et traditione regni - cf.notes on A IV, 1, B II, 1.

L.17 viri - i.e. Athanasius. synodi - i.e. Western Sardica[203].

L.19sq. verum omnis ista, etc - having satisfactorily shown the Easterns' hatred of Athanasius and how behind the facade of Photinus and Marcellus was concealed their real purpose of renewing the attack upon him, the author of the narrative text now advances to a third stage and reveals their wickedness in attempting to replace the Nicene creed with a heretical one of their own making. cf. Phoebad. c.Arr.8.

L.23 Nam tertius mihi locus - cf. p.142 L.8sq. His first aim had been to show Athanasius' innocence, his second to give details concerning Marcellus and Photinus; now his third was to reveal their heretical creed, which he regards as a typical Arian creed[204] .

L.23, 24 fidem, quam epistulae primordio condiderunt - the Easterns must have put this creed at the beginning of their reply; from the description given in the narrative text, it resembles the creed issued by the Easterns at Sardica[205].

Notes.
203. cf. B II, 1.
204. cf. B II, 11.
205. A IV, 2.

L.25sq. profitemur enim ita etc - cf. the Nicene Creed. It is obvious from the context that the "we" in this case refers to the Easterns; the author puts it thus for the sake of greater emphasis[20]

p.148 L.3sq. et spero quod etc - cf. B II, 1 and n.1. to Or. Syn. Ariminum § 1 p.186 L.1sq.

L.9sq. cura et negotium etc - cf. Iren. adv. Haer. III, 3; Tert. de Praescr. 16-21; Greg. Elib. De Fide 3, 7; A IX, 1.

L.14 epistulis variis - e.g. those of Alexander, Athanasius, Julius, and the Westerns at Sardica.

p.149 L.2,3 improbabiles - this is probably the equivalent of the Greek ἀδόκιμον. cf. II Tim. 3, 8, Tit. 1, 16.

§ 6 Cum igitur etc - cf. Sulp. Sev. Chron. II, 35; Phoeb. c. Arr. 6,18; Gregor. Elib. De fide 1.

L.5,6 Arrios duos - Sulpicius Severus[207] takes this phrase to mean two men with the name 'Arius'. Roberts[208] thinks that the one of these was Arius, the author of the heresy, and the other a presbyter of/.

Notes.
206. For a similar description of the subtlety of Arian creeds cf. B II, 11 § 2.
207. Chron. II, 35.
208. in his edition of Sulp. Sev. in the Nicene Library, p.113 n.1.

of Alexandria bearing the same name[209]. But, on the basis of such passages as Hil. De Syn. 83[210], Coustant suggests that the phrase refers to Arius, the leader of the sect, and the other Arian leader, Eusebius of Nicomedia[211]. Several objections, however, may be raised against Coustant's theory: e.g. (1) it is against the earliest testimony. (2) Hilary uses the term "Arii" for Arians in general, and always gives the names in the case of particular Arians it is particularly unlikely to mean "Arius and Eusebius" here because, in order to avoid confusion and make clear his meaning, he would have given both names, especially when Arius, the leader of the sect, was involved.

So it seems preferable to follow the testimony of the early writings and conclude that by "Arios duos" two men of the name "Arius" are meant.

L.7,8 ex omnibus..concurrunt - i.e. the council of Nicaea 325.

L.11sq. tradebant autem Arrii talia etc - the Arians started from the accepted belief in the unity of God, as a being not only absolutely one but also absolutely simple and isolated from a world of finite beings, a God Whom men can not know. So, in the creation of the world, there was need of a mediator, a demiurgic power/

Notes.

209. cf. letter of the Alexandrian Arius to bishop Alexander in Epiph. Haer. 69, 8; 72,4; Alexander's letter in Theod. H.E. I, 4. Socr. I. 6.

210. "Placeat quod ab Ariis sit negatum" and "ipsa Ariorum perfidia".

211. P.L. X col. 653-4 (b).

power, whom men can know. To preserve the isolation and singularity of God, this second God, the Son, could not be of the substance of the Father, but was generated out of nothing by the Father's will, was inferior and not strictly eternal.

L.13,14 profani..generari - i.e. dishonouring the Father because they asserted that the Son was begotten from nothing, rather than from the substance of the Father.

L.14,15 blasphemi..expoliantes - i.e. dishonouring the Son by denying Him the right of infinity such as the Father possessed.

p.149 L.19 non extantis creationis substantiae - the text is corrupt here and various readings have been suggested. Coustant gives "non exstanti creationis substantiae" or "de non exstanti creationis substantia" or "non exstantis creationis substantiam". Wilmart[212] suggests "non exstantis creatione substantiae".

If Feder's reading is adopted, the translation is: "giving to a substance of a not existing (beforehand) creation, (that is) to the Son of God our Lord, etc." i.e. Hilary asserts that the Arians destroy the unity of the Godhead through giving to the Son a different substance from that of the Father and saying that the Son is made from nothing. cf. p.150 L.17,18 note.

L.20, 21 initium de tempore - a beginning from time (instead of His eternal generation). ortum de nihilo - birth from nothing (instead/

Notes.
212. Rev. Ben. XXIV (1907) 304.

(instead of, from the substance of the Father). nomen ex altero name from another (instead of "ex ipso" from Himself cf. Hil. De Trin. VI, 16).

L.22sq. Itaque conprimendi etc. - cf. Phoebad. c. Arr.6.

L.22,23 trecenti vel eo amplius episcopi - B II, 10 and Hil. De Syn. 86 give the "spiritual" number 318[213].

CONCLUSION Mention of the breach between Athanasius and Marcellu which no other contemporary writer reports, and of the two persons called Arius, are indications that the author of the narrative text is writing close in time to these and is well acquainted with events.

This breach had evidently embarrassed the Nicenes, coming as it did so soon after Sardica, and the Arians had not been slow to take advantage of it. Though unconvincing in his defence of Marcellus, Hilary nevertheless has right on his side in condemning the Arian attempt thus to reopen the question concerning Athanasiu The latter had condemned Marcellus on a different charge from that on which he was declared innocent at Sardica; so the authority of Sardica remained firm. To justify another attack on Athanasiu

the/

Notes.

213. Ath. Hist. Ar. 66 gives "about 300"; ad Afros 2,318. Euseb. V.c.III, 8 says "more than 250". Constantine, in a letter given in Socr. I, 9 and Marius Victorinus I give "more than 300 bishops".

the Arians would have had to bring forward a charge different from those already considered at Sardica. Possibly there would have been no protest from the orthodox if the Arians had remained satisfied with involving only Marcellus in the accusations brought against Photinus; but their further attempted attack on Athanasius the champion of orthodoxy, could not pass unchallenged.

In this narrative text, Hilary makes no distinctive contribution in his third task of demonstrating the heretical creed of the Arians, giving, as it were, only an introduction to his theme, cf. B II, 11.

B II, 10 The Nicene Creed.

SUMMARY. There follows the creed and anathemas signed by 318 bishops at Nicaea. "We believe in one God, the Father almighty, maker of things visible and invisible, And in one Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of God, begotten from the Father, that is, from the substance of the Father, God from God, Light from Light, true God from true God, begotten, not made, of one substance with the Father, which the Greeks call 'Omousion', through Whom all things were made, whether in heaven or on earth, Who for us men and our salvation came down, became incarnate, became man, suffered, and rose again on the third day, ascended to the heavens, about to come to judge the/

the living and the dead. And in the Holy Spirit. But as for those who say: 'there was, when He was not', and 'before He was born, He was not', and because "he was made from nothing", which the Greeks call "ex uc onton", or saying "the changeable and alterable Son of God" is of another substance, these the catholic and apostolic church anathematises.

COMMENTARY. On comparison with the same creed as found in Hil. De Syn.84, Greg. Elib.De fide[214], and Lucif Cal. De non parcendo 18[215] the B II, 10 version shows striking similarity with that of Lucifer. In contrast to the others, the two have in common (a) in the first article they have only "visibilium et invisibilium" while the others add "omnium". (b) they omit the "nostrum" in "Dominum Iesum Christum". (c) in the generation formula "unigenitum" is lacking. (d) the completion of the Incarnation formula is asyndetical (e) in the last anathema, the words "mutabilem et convertibilem" in this order and connection are peculiar to them.

B II, 10, Gregor. and Lucifer have a double "sive" in the creation formula; and with the Gallic version[216], they have "de" three times in the communication formula whereas the others have "ex" or "ex, ex, de".

In the soteriological formula, Hil. De Syn. links the phrases with "et", B II, 10 and several others use only one "et", Gregor. and/

Notes.
214. F.L. XX, 31.
215. C.S.E.L. 14, 247-8.
216. as given in Turner, Eccl. Occid. Mon. Iur. Ant. I, 2, 174.

and Lucif. have none.

Unlike the others, B II, 10, Hil. De Syn., Greg. and Lucif. understand the formula "of one substance with the Father" as being "what the Greeks call 'omousion'".

In contrast to the others, B II, 10, Hil. De Syn. and Lucif. have the eschatological formula "venturus etc" without "unde".

In the third anathema, Hil. De. Syn. alone has "quod de"; the others have "quia ex". Hil. De Syn. continues "non extantibus"; B II, 10, Lucif., the Caecilian version[217] have "nullis extantibus"; Ruf.[218] has "nullis substantibus"; Cod. Vat. reg. 1997, Isid., Call-Span., Prisca, Dionysius II versions[219] have "nullis subsistentibus"; the Attica version[220] has "nihilo".

From all this it can be seen that Hilary in B II, 10 and Lucif. must have used the same Latin Western version whereas, during his sojourn in the East, Hilary had used a Greek version of the creed[221].

p.150 L.5 Conscripta a CCCXVIII episcopis - cf. note p.149 L.22.

L.9 hoc est, de substantia patris - it is obvious that this has been added to give a more precise explanation of the phrase "begotten from the Father", and to counter the principal tenet of Arianism that the Son was not of the essence of the Father but was created/

Notes.
217. cf. Turner l.c.
218. cf. Turner l.c.
219. all given in Turner I, 2, 174-177, 252sq.
220. cf. Turner l.c.
221. cf. the differences between B II, 10 and De Syn. 84.

created out of nothing. The Arians were quite willing to confess the Son as begotten from the Father so long as they were allowed to interpret the divine generation as a definite and external act of the Father's will. In his writings[222], Arius strenuously and repeatedly asserted that Father and Son were alien in substance and that the Son was not from the Father but came into existence out of nothingness. In this he was followed by his supporters; e.g. in his letter to Paulinus of Tyre[223], Eusebius of Nicomedia expressly denies that the Son is begotten from the substance of the Father.

It was in contrast to this that the orthodox asserted that the Son shared fully in the divine essence and emphasised this by their further statement that the Son was of the same substance as the Father (L.11).[224]

p.150 L.10 deum verum de deo vero - according to Athanasius[225], Arius had asserted that the Word is not true God, and that, if He is called God, He is nevertheless not true God, but is God by favour, like all the others, and is called so in name only. In contrast to this, the Nicene creed asserts that both Father and Son are truly God.

Notes.

222. e.g. in his famous letter to Alexander and in his "Thalia", cf. Ath. De Syn.15; Or. c. Ar.I, 6, 9.
223. Theod. H.E. I, 6.
224. The phrase itself was not entirely new but had been already used towards the close of the third century by Theognostus in his "Hypotyposes", cf. Ath. De Decret. Nic. syn. 25.
225. Or. c. Ar. I, 6.

natum, non factum - to the Arians, "begotten" and "made" were, for all practical purposes, synonymous terms. They would not admit a birth of the Son in any real sense but maintained that the Word was a creature Who had been brought into existence out of nothing by the divine decree. The orthodox, on the other hand, here give the word "begotten" its full and proper meaning.

L.11 unius substantiae cum patre, quod Graeci dicunt 'omousion' - through this declaration the orthodox completely reversed the Arian position by asserting the full deity of the Son, and it was therefore to be expected that this should be the especial object of attack on the part of the Arians. They argued that the word "homoousios" was not found in Scripture and as such, it was a revolutionary procedure to introduce it into a creed.[226] Furthermore, it had a bad history for its use had been condemned by the council of Antioch 268 against Paul of Samosata.

In his works Athanasius answers both these charges. To the first he replies[227] that if the word itself is not found in Scripture, the doctrine is[228]. To the second, he argues[229] that, while Paul of Samosata used the word in one sense, Arius denied it in another. There is no doubt that the orthodox would have preferred a Scriptural term but they discovered that the Arians interpreted every Scriptural term suggested to suit their own theories/

Notes.
226. Ath. De Syn. 36 contends that the Arians themselves had set the example in this respect.
227. De Decret. Nic. syn. 21.
228. cf. A IX, 1 p.96 L.2.
229. De Syn. 43sq.

theories; they were also aware of the Sabellianising tendency of the word but realised that only through its use could they secure a direct condemnation of Arianism.

L.11,12 per quem omnia facta sunt - according to Gwatkin[230], either δι' οὗ τὰ πάντα ἐγένετο, or some equivalent clause, is found in every formula of the Nicene period, except the Sirmian manifesto of 357, the ἔκθεσις of Athanasius, and the confessions of Adamantius and Germinius.

L.13,14 incarnatus est, homo factus est - not only did Arianism deny true divinity to the Person of the Lord, it also took away His true humanity. "Now that the Logos was so far degraded, a human spirit was unnecessary, and only introduced the needless difficulty of the union of two finite spirits in one person[231]. So the Logos was simply united directly to a human body. To counteract this, the orthodox combine "homo factus" with "incarnatus" to show that Christ took something more than a mere human body.

L.16 erat, quando non erat - "there was" when the Son existed only potentially (δυνάμει) in the Father's counsel i.e. the Father alone is God, and the Son is so called only in a lower sense[232]. The Arians/

Notes.
230. Studies p.23 n.1.
231. Dorner II, 243.
232. Arius in his "Thalia". Ath. Or. c. Ar.6.

Arians were subtle enough never to say explicitly "there was a TIME when the Son was not" but constructed their arguments as though they had inserted it[233].

Somewhat the same idea is contained in the second anathema "Before He was begotten, He was not"[234].

L.17, 18 ex nullis extantibus...alia substantia - the Arians asserted that the Son was not born of the substance of the Father but made from nothing like the other creatures. They held that generation of a Son of the same substance as the Father destroyed the singularity of God[235]. Later this phrase became the watchword of the Anomoeans or "Exoukontians"[236].

L.19 mutabilem et convertibilem filium dei - in his Thalia, Arius asserted: "By nature the Word Himself, like all others, is capable of change, but He remains good by His own act of will, so long as He wills to be so. But when He wills so, He can change, exactly as we can, for He is of a mutable nature"; and again : "He is not incapable of change like the Father, but He is by nature mutable, like the creatures[237].

This idea of mutability may have been part of what Arius learned/

Notes.
233. cf. Ath. c. Ar. I, 14.
234. cf. Ath. De Syn.16. Epiph. Haer. 69, 6.
235. cf. Hil. De Syn. 64.
236. cf. Ath. De Syn. 31.
237. cf. Ath. Or. c. Ar. I, 5, 9 and also compare Alexander's encyclical letter in Socr. H.E. I, 6.

learned from Lucian of Antioch. But whereas the Antiochenes used it of the Lord' humanity, Arius applied it to his created 'logos', who can and must be changeable precisely because he is created.

CONCLUSION. In issuing this creed to be the sole test of orthodoxy for all the bishops of Christendom, the Nicene council had taken a revolutionary step and its acceptance by all, but a very few, of the bishops there present, gained at least an external victory for Constantine and the orthodox party. Arianism seemed so utterly defeated that its adherents had to conceal their real belief for many years, whereas the advantage to the orthodox cause in securing this decision in its favour was immense. Henceforth in the West the Nicene decision was regarded as the final authority in the controversy, and even in the East this was true to a certain extent.

A few years after the Council, however, it became obvious that the victory gained at Nicaea was not so complete as it had first seemed. The old misgivings, which the conservatives voiced at the Council, once more came to the fore, and it was not until, after many a weary struggle, those same conservatives realised that only in the "ἐκ της οὐσιας" and the "ὁμοουσιος" did they have a secure defence against Arian non-scriptural expressions, that Arianism was finally vanquished at the council of Constantinople 381.

The discussion as to the exact basis of the Nicene creed may be briefly mentioned. It was for long maintained that the creed of/

of Nicaea represented simply the local creed of Caesarea revised in the light of the Emperor's instructions[238]. But the numerous and radical divergences between these two creeds[239] raised grave doubts about this theory, and the more recent opinion is that its basis was some local baptismal creed of Syro-Palestinian provenance into which the Nicene keywords were somewhat awkwardly interpolated.[240]

B II, 11 Narrative Text.

SUMMARY. (1) A comparison of the creeds reveals the falsity of the heretics and commends the full and perfect faith of the Nicene creed concerning Father and Son in the Godhead. (2) The author of the narrative text demonstrates and condemns the deceits of the Arians with regard to the phrases "deus ex deo" and "primogenitus" and expounds the proper interpretation to be given to the phrase "primogenitus omnis creaturae". (4) He asserts that, whereas the heretical ideas of the Arians promote division in the Trinity, (5) the Nicene exposition preserves the Trinity in all its fullness. Then he explains some of the phrases and ansthemas in the Nicene creed . (6) Finally he describes how Athanasius, a deacon at Nicaea/

Notes.

238. cf. Hort. "Two Dissertations" p.54sq. Burn "Introduction to the Creeds" and "The Council of Nicaea".
239. cf. H. Lietzmann Z.N.T.W XXIV, (1925) p.196sq. Kelly "Early Christian Creeds p.217sq.
240. cf. Lietzmann l. c. 203sq.

Nicaea and afterwards bishop of Alexandria, had valiantly upheld the Nicene creed, vanquished the Arian pestilence in the whole of Egypt and been falsely accused for this. Faithful judges, however, had declared him innocent, and Hilary thinks it will be of much advantage if the declaration of the synod of Sardica to Constantius is known.

COMMENTARY. In this section Hilary continues his third aim[241] viz. criticism of the creed of the opponents of Athanasius.

p.151 L.2 Fides fidei conparata - i.e. comparison of an orthodox creed, such as that of Nicaea, with a heretical one like that of Eastern Sardica. Hilary declares that through this is revealed the subtlety of the Arians in concealing heretical ideas under the guise of orthodox expressions. cf. Greg. Elib. De fide 1.

L.5, 6 inviolabili..connectitur - cf. p.149 L.18,-21.

L.6 haec - i.e. the heretical creed.

L.9-11 filium substantia..de quo est - cf. the Arian "erat, quando non erat". Hil. De Syn. 64; Greg. Elib. De fide 4; Ath. De Decretis III, 6.

Notes.
241. cf. B II, 9 p.147 L.23.

L.11 non concertum - this would refer only to his human birth and not to His eternal generation.

L.12sq. At vero etc - cf. Phoeb. c. Arr. 1; Hil. De Fide 3; 2. Phoeb. c. Arr. 3 "in hac sua perfidia, non fide".

L.13,14 virus suum...obscurat - cf. such "apologetic" creeds as the 4th Antioch and Eastern Sardican[242]. While not Arian, by their omission of the ἐκ τῆς οὐσίας and the ὁμοούσιος they represented a departure from the Nicene creed and a return to the traditional theology of the Eastern Church. The Eusebians were thus able to avoid the scandal which the issue of distinctively Arian creeds would have aroused, and the extremists among them achieved their purpose through giving Arian interpretations to these ambiguous creeds.

L.14,15 dicens "deum de deo, lumen ex lumine" - cf. the Nicene creed, also B II, 9 p.147 L.25sq.

L.15-17 ut per occasionem..extiterit - cf. Hil. De Syn. 84. Though seeming to acknowledge the words of the Nicene creed, they yet in fact deny the true generation of the Son of God from the substance/

Notes.
242. A IV, 2.

substance of God the Father, asserting that He was made God and Light only by the act and will of God.

L.17,18 ac sic..filius - it is an insult to the Father in making the divine generation an act of the Father's will and not from his substance, and to the Son in making Him inferior to the Father. Denial of eternity to the Son affects the divinity of the Father. cf. p.154 L.16,17.

L.18 ortus ex nihilo - cf. p.150 L.17,18. Hil. De Syn. 83.

L.18sq. in "primogeniti" etc - the Arians used Paul's phrase to prove that, though holding the unique position of being first born, the Son was none the less a creature, and, though prior to the world, was yet, like the world, subject to time and not eternal[243]. Consequently, when Christ was born in time from Mary, He left behind what He had before, namely His divinity[244].

L.19 creandis - the text is corrupt here. A has "creantis". Coustant suggests "creatis". But "creandis", the reading proposed by Marx[245], seems the best. cf. Greg. Elib. De fide 2: "nec non et primogenitus totius creaturae, quasi in ordine factorum primogenitus habeatur, ut ex eo seriem quandam CREANDIS mundi rebus assignent".

Notes.
243. cf. Ath. De Decret. III, 7sq. Theod. I, 4,5.
244. cf. Ath. De Decret. III, 14.
245. Tubing. Theol. Quartal. LXXXVIII(1906) p.391.

p.152 L.1sq. dissolvatur etc - cf. Phoeb. c.Arr. 9.

L.3sq. Quin etiam etc - in this passage Hilary refutes the Arian interpretation of the phrase "primogenitus omnis creaturae", and demonstrates how its meaning has been corrupted through removal from its context. cf. Hil. De Trin. VIII, 49sq. Phoeb. c.Arr. 21.

L.14sq. "imago" ergo etc - the Son can not be subject to time; this is an idea unworthy of Him Who is the image of the invisible God. Likewise the Son is not a creature for the phrase "primogenitum omnis creaturae" is explained by the next clause "quia in ipso constituta sunt omnia in caelis et in terra" i.e. He is first born of every creature because He is "the focus of the cosmic system, the constitutive principle of universal life"[246].

p.153 L.2sq. ubi enim etc - cf. p.149 L.12sq. Falsely do the Arians confess their belief in the Trinity, because, by asserting that the Father, Son and Spirit are of different substances, they divide the Trinity and destroy its unity. Dishonour is done not only to the Son but also to the Spirit Who is held to be of a third substance, different from both the Father and the Son.

L.11-13 'unum' ambo..utroque - cf. BII, 9 p.148 L.20,21 "continetur/

Notes.
246. Kennedy "The Theology of the Epistles" p.153.

"continetur fides nostra in patris et filii nominibus personisque deus unus". Both are one in substance, but each is one in person. There is one God, but two Persons[247].

p.153 L.13-16 deum verum..uterque unum - cf. the Arian interpretation p.151 L.14sq; Greg. Elib. De fide 7: "nos autem Patrem et Filium ita nominamus, ut unum Deum in his personis et nominibus consignemus".

L.17 natum vero, non factum - cf. B II, 10 p.150 L.10. Since the Son is also God, this proves that He is BORN from the Father, not made from nothing, because the form and virtue of things born is that of their origin. His is a true birth from the substance of the Father, God of God, and therefore He is also eternal.

L.26sq. essentia enim etc - cf. Hil. De Syn. 12:- "Essentia est res quae est, vel ex quibus est, et quae in eo quod maneat subsistit ..Proprie autem essentia idcirco est dicta, quia semper est"; Phoeb. c. Arr. 7: "Substantia enim dicitur id quod semper ex sese est; hoc est, quod propria intra se virtute subsistit".

p.154 L.11,12 'immutabilis' et 'inconvertibilis' - the Arians declared that the Son was alterable[248]. Alexander, however, in his/

Notes.

247. The meaning becomes clear if "deus" is inserted after "unus" L.13. For purposes of elucidation Coustant (col.656/7 note (f)) gives "unum ambo, et uterque unum. Et in Patrem unum, quia unus personali nomine Patris. Et in Filium unum, quia unus est de uno (or "quia unus est personali nomine Filii), Et in Deum unum, quia unus est de utroque".

248. cf. Ath. De Syn. 15. Arius indeed, in his letter to Alexander (Ath. De Syn.16), professed the Son to be "unalterable and unchangeable" but with the all-important qualification "at His own will".

his letter to Alexander of Byzantium[249] asserted that the Son was "unchangeable and unalterable" and the Lucianic creed[250] used the same phrase in a direct attack upon Arianism[251].

As used here, it is a denial of the Arian" τρεπτος και ἀλλοιωτος " and proves that the Son, in becoming man, brought glory to corruption rather than dishonour to eternity[252].

L.13sq. anathema autem etc - cf. B II, 10 and p.151 L.17,18. By denying the eternity of the Son, the Arians violate the deity of the Father.

L.20 auctor - i.e. Athanasius played the leading role, not in the formulation, but in the propagation of the Nicene creed.

L.20, 21 et Arrianam..vicerat - the bishops of Egypt had signed to a man the decisions of Western Sardica and Athanasius had received a magnificent welcome on his return from exile in 346[253] . But strong as was his hold on Egypt on his return from exile, it increased with every passing year, and by the time of his third exile/

Notes.
249. Theod. I, 4.
250. Hil.De Syn. 29.
251. cf. also Hil. De Syn.33; Ath.c. Gentes 41,46,47; Or.I, 26; II, 33; III, 11; Greg. Elib. De fide 8; Ambr. De fide orth. 8; Leo Tome 2,3.
252. The sentence loses some of its meaning and purport if Coustants suggestion is adopted of inserting"praedicatur in Nicaeno symbolo" after "ut" L.12. It seems better to understand "est" before " filius" L.12.
253. cf. Ath. Apol. c.Ar.50; Hist. Ar.25sq.

exile (in 356) very little is heard of Arians except in Alexandria itself; the "Arians" of the rest of Egypt being the remnant of the Meletians[254]. His powerful position is well illustrated from the difficulties which Constantius encountered in trying to remove him from his see[255]. In his c. Const., Hilary praises the devotion of all the Egyptians, except the Alexandrine heretic Georgius, to the 'homoûsion'.

L.22, 23 res postea..sententiis - this is doubtless a reference to the decision passed by Western Sardica concerning Athanasius. "Postea" - i.e. after Nicaea 325.

L.24,25 ad Constantium..oratio - cf. B II, 2 p.129 L.15sq. This is a reference to the letter which has been preserved under the title "Liber I ad Constantium".[256] For long it was considered lost and we owe its rediscovery to the work of Wilmart[257].

CONCLUSION. This narrative text shows remarkable similarity with passages in other words of Hilary, for example, his "De Synodis" and "De Trinitate", and may thus be adduced as further proof of Hilary's authorship of the Collection. The thoughts to which it gives expression are in conformity with fourth century 'Nicene' theology, and/

Notes.
254. cf. Ath. Hist. Ar.78. Ep. LIII.
255. cf. Ath. Apol. de fuga 24. Fest.Ind.XXVII. Hist. Aceph.III.
256. cf. Feder p.181sq.
257. in Rev. Ben. XXIV, 1907.

and are echoed in other orthodox writers of the time. Its main purpose is to reveal the irresponsible use made by the Arians of isolated texts and phrases, to confute the conclusions thus reached by reference to the real context, and by comparison, to enhance the truth of the Nicene creed, and so make clear to all the innocence of Athanasius, the champion of orthodoxy.

As preserved in this collection, it is of course incomplete (cf. n.154 L.24,25 note).

Though not apparent at first[258], it now becomesclear that the group of documents given in B II has close connection with the Preface B I. In B I, the author had stated that his first aim was to show that what was involved was not just a personal issue of favour towards a man (viz Athanasius) but something of greater consequence, namely, a confession of faith (viz the Nicene creed). In B II, he connects both the personal issue and the creed by dealing with the case of Athanasius in three stages. First of all, by relying on the Sardican decrees, he proves that the charges brought against Athanasius at Arles can not be defended. Secondly he shows that the Marcellus-Photinus question gives no occasion for an attack on Athanasius. Thirdly he proceeds to a criticism of the creed of the opponents of Athanasius because he asserts that, in attacking the bishop of Alexandria, they automatically decried the creed which he defended; and the author of the narrative text has an easy task in demonstrating the superiority of the Nicene creed over the creeds of the heretics.

Notes.
258. cf. B II, 1. Conclusion.

Series B III, 1 Letter of Liberius to the Eastern Bishops. 357.

SUMMARY. After reception of their letter concerning Athanasius, which had been addressed to Julius, he had sent the presbyters Lucius, Paulus and Heliarus to Alexandria to ask Athanasius to come to Rome for a personal inquiry into his case. He had also sent with them a letter warning him that, if he did not come to Rome, he would be placed outside the communion of the Roman church. On their return the presbyters announced that he refused to come. Finally, on receipt of their letter sent to him, he now writes to inform them that he has peace with them and has broken off all communion with Athanasius.

COMMENTARY. This letter has been preserved only in Hilary's work. In addition to the Faber-Coustant edition, it has been edited by Bar. Ad ann. 352 n XII, Binius I, 466, Ed.regia III, 140sq., Labbe-Cossart II, 752, Coleti II, 807, Mansi III, 208.

p.159 L.4 ad Orientales episcopos - these would seem to be more widely representative of the Eastern episcopate than those mentioned in B VII, 8 who are a special group of important Eastern bishops attached to the Court. cf. L.5,6 "universis per Orientem constitutis" and p.169 L.2, "cum omnibus vobis et cum universis episcopis Orientalibus".

L.6 Liberius episcopus urbis Romae - even in exile and despite the intrusion/

intrusion of Felix, Liberius still regarded himself as the rightful bishop of Rome. cf. B VII, 10 p.172 L.2sq.

L.7, 8 litteras caritatis vestrae - this is probably the letter referred to in A VII p.90 L.11,12. If so, some details of Liberius' reply (p.90 L.15) to the Easterns at that time may be conjectured from B III, 1 e.g. his proposal to send the three presbyters to summon Athanasius to Rome for a full inquiry.

L.8 ceterorum - e.g. Ossius and other orthodox bishops who had played a prominent part in the controversy.

L.8,9 ad nomen Iulii - with the renewal of the struggle against Athanasius, his opponents would naturally be anxious to secure all possible support. Hence their reason for writing to various bishops at this time. cf. Ath. Hist. Ar. 1, 32. Apol. c. Ar. 1, 2. Nevertheless their letter to Julius causes surprise. In view of his action at Rome in 341, they could not expect much support, unless, perhaps, they were hoping that the change in the political situation had also affected Julius' outlook on the question of Athanasius.[1]

L.9 Iulii - Julius died on 12th April 352.

Notes.

1. The deceit shown in so many instances by the Arians might even support the conjecture that it had been written on the Easterns hearing of Julius' imminent death in the hope of "stealing a march" while the affairs of the Roman church were in an unsettled and uncertain condition.

L.9 secutus traditionem maiorum - cf, the relations of Dionysius of Rome and Dionysius of Alexandria; also Julius, in his letter[2], claiming a special relation of his see with that of Alexandria.

In the case of the two Dionysii, there is no positive evidence to support the assumption of jurisdiction of the bishop of Rome over the bishop of Alexandria; rather does it resemble "the request of one co-trustee to another for an explanation of the latter's action in a matter concerning their common trust".

Having this as precedent, however, Julius, in his letter, claims that, while in the case of bishops of apostolic sees, the canon requires that questions relating to them should be referred to the episcopate as a whole, in a case concerning the bishop of Alexandria such authority should be reserved to the Roman see. If the canons ascribed to the Dedication council of Antioch 341 belong to that council, No.15 may be regarded as an answer to this.[3]

On the other hand, the council of Western Sardica offered to a bishop condemned by his colleagues opportunity of reconsideration under the direction of the Roman see[4].

As for Athanasius' view on the subject: in his writings he speaks of the bishops of Rome as his beloved brothers, and fellow-ministers, and welcomes their sympathy and support, but there is no indication/

Notes.

2. Ath. Apol. c. Ar. 35.
3. Canon 15 declares that "if a bishop accused of certain offences has been tried by the bishops of the province and all have unanimously given sentence against him, he may not be tried again by others but the unanimous decision of the bishops of the province must hold good.
4. Canons III and VII.

indication that he ever thought of them as having any jurisdiction over him[5].

It is obvious that, in asking Athanasius to come to Rome, Liberius is relying on the authority of his predecessor Julius, but it is equally obvious that this could be only an invitation[6] and not a command. Even the Sardican canons would not justify a command.

A similar phrase is used in Liberius' letter A VII p.91 L.10.

L.10 Lucium, Paulum et Helianum - nothing more is known of these three presbyters.

e latere - this phrase is used in canon VII of Western Sardica and may suggest that Liberius has this in mind.

L.12 de ecclesiae disciplina - i.e. if he is found guilty, he will be excommunicated, but if innocent, he will be established firmly in his see.

L.13sq litteras etiam etc - this letter is not now extant. Liberius does not claim that this excommunication would be valid for the whole Church but only for the church of Rome and he is evidently using this threat as compensation for his inability to compel Athanasius/

Notes.
5. cf Epist. Syn. ad Afros 1.
6. cf. Julius inviting the Eusebians to come to Rome for a full inquiry into the case. Ath. Apol. c. Ar. 20sq.

Athanasius to come to Rome. Events proved that this threat was not fulfilled until the time when Liberius was in exile.

In this connection, it is significant that in his letter to the Emperor (A VII), Liberius neither condemns nor acquits Athanasius i.e. prior to his exile, his position was one of absolute neutrality and so strongly did he feel about this that he was willing to pay the price of exile rather than sacrifice his neutrality[7]. This agrees also with B VII, 8 where he declares that, though neither supporting nor condemning, he had yet demanded a fair trial for Athanasius and it was only when he knew that they had justly condemned him, that he too acquiesced in this condemnation.

This threat of excommunication might well be regarded as a customary phrase, often added to a summons and not meant very seriously. cf. when summoning the Easterns, Julius appointed a day "that they might either come or consider themselves as altogether suspected persons"[8].

p.155 L.15, 16 reversi igitur.. venire noluisse - apart from any other consideration, Athanasius would be frightened to leave his see at this time (352/3) lest his opponents should take advantage of his absence to intrude one of their puppets. cf. the new attacks being made upon him. Ath. Apol. ad Const.19.

Notes.

7. Though technically Liberius remained neutral, his refusal to condemn Athanasius would, of course, be generally regarded as substantial evidence of support, 'de facto'.
8. Ath. Hist. Ar. 11.

L.14 denique - it may safely be asserted that on this word hinges the authenticity of this letter[9]. If "denique" is taken in a logical, rather than a temporal, sense, then the final part of the letter must be referred to the same period of time as the events mentioned in the first part i.e. the beginning of Liberius' episcopate; which makes nonsense of it, because the reason for Liberius' exile was simply his refusal to condemn Athanasius. To interpret the letter correctly, therefore, the "denique" must be taken in a temporal sense, as indicating the passage of a period of time between what precedes and what follows; the exile letters given in B VII indicate that this excommunication of Athanasius can have taken place only in 357.

So, the first part of the letter (L.7-L.14) describes events taking place c.352, while the second (L.14-L.22) refers to events happening in the year 357, omitting completely what has taken place in the interval.[10]

L.17 litteras caritatis vestrae - this does not refer to the letter mentioned in L.7, 8, but to a later one[11], addressed not to Julius, but to Liberius (L.17, 18 ad nos).

Notes.

9. For fuller discussion, see section on the Liberius letters.
10. cf. Liberius' epitaph, where the resistance of Liberius and his departure for exile are eloquently portrayed, and then immediately and abruptly there follows his entry into heaven, with not a word of the happenings in the last twelve years or so of his episcopate. Then, after this, there follows a verbose description of the heavenly glory into which he has entered and the miraculous powers he henceforth enjoys.
11. cf. B VII, 8.

L.19sq.me cum omnibus etc - cf.B VII, 8,10,11.

L.21 sive ecclesiae Romanae - see note on L.6.

B III, 2 Narrative text.

SUMMARY. While they rejoice to condemn the bishop of Rome, Potamius and Epictetus would not listen to this, nor had Fortunatian any more success when he sent the same letter to various bishops. But a letter from all Egypt and Alexandria gave warning that, so long as the Serdican decisions remained inviolable, this excommunication of Athanasius would rather be burdensome and dangerous to Liberius. Just as Julius had been advised to restore communion to the exiled Athanasius, so now Liberius was advised to preserve this communion.

COMMENTARY. p.155 L.24,25 Quid in his.. eveniens est? - some authors[12], taking this sentence as it stands, have supposed that, in the original text, there stood here another letter, perhaps of the Sardican synod to Constantius, perhaps of Liberius himself, and that the laudatory expressions of the narrative text refer to this letter, which has then been suppressed and replaced by a forger who, however, has forgotten to efface this sentence.

This/

Notes.
12. e.g. G. Hermant, "La Vie de S. Ath." Bk.VI ch.25 note 3.

This theory seems most unlikely. It is difficult to imagine any forger, no matter how stupid or bigoted, making such a mistake. It seems necessary to consider this sentence as ironical. cf. the ironical description of the bishops who condemned Athanasius at Arles "o veros Christi discipulos! o dignos successores Petri atque Pauli!" B II, 5 p.142 L.5,6. In this case "in his litteris" (L.24) would refer to B III, 1.

L.25 Potamius - he is the first known bishop of Lisbon. According to the Lib. prec. 9, he had at first been a supporter of orthodoxy but was later induced to join the Arians by the present of an estate from Constantius. For this he was excommunicated by Ossius but had his revenge in the summons of Ossius to Sirmium. According to Hilary[13] Potamius and Ossius drew up the "second" formula of Sirmium but Gams[14] thinks this doubtful because of the silence of Phoebadius and the dissimilarity in style to the known writings of Potamius. There seems to be no doubt, however, that he was at that synod and helped to circulate the formula there drawn up[15]. After the council of Ariminum, he seems to have had some connection with the orthodox party again because there is extant a letter of his to Athanasius. In addition to this letter, two sermons of Potamius are extant, on the raising of Lazarus and on the martyrdom of the prophet Isaiah[16].

Notes.
13. De Syn.11.
14. Kirchengv.von Span.II (1) 237.
15. Phoeb. c. Ar. 5.
16. P.L. VIII.

L.25 Epictetus - see note on him in A VI p.87 L.6. He had already appeared earlier at Milan as a vehement antagonist of Liberius[17]. The mention of Potamius and Epictetus gives an indication of the date of B III, 1. It is known that Potamius was at Sirmium about the middle of 357 in preparation for the "second" synod of Sirmium[18] and it is probable that they were both together at the court at Sirmium about this time. The letter must therefore have been written sometime in the first half of 357.

Schiktanz[19] thinks it necessary, in order to explain the sudden mention of Potamius and Epictetus, to suppose that a letter regarding them has now dropped out of the text; but there is no warrant for this opinion.

L.25,26 dum damnare..gaudent - Schiktanz[20] suggests the meaning is that "while they rejoice that the bishop of Rome condemns (sc. Athanasius) etc". But it seems more natural to translate it thus: "while they rejoice to condemn the bishop of Rome" i.e. the steadfast attitude displayed by Liberius prior to exile would be a natural target of attack for these Western Arians. cf. the conduct of Epictetus at Milan[21].

Notes.
17. cf. the dialogue between Liberius and Constantius in Theod. II, 16.
18. Hil. De Syn. 11. Phoeb. c. Ar. 3.
19. p.34.
20. p.23.
21. Theod. II, 14.

L.26 sicut in Ariminensi synodo continetur - Schwartz[22] regards this as a gloss. Feder[23] takes it as an integral part of the text showing that the synod of Ariminum had discussed the fall of Liberius. The latter seems the more likely opinion.

p.155 L.26 - p.156 L.1 audire haec noluerunt - "haec" i.e. the information contained in B III, 1. Their unwillingness would spring either from the fact that the concession which Liberius had given was not now sufficient, or from their being too busily engaged in preparing for the coming synod at Sirmium to pay attention to this belated and, as it were, forced (i.e. through weariness of exile) condemnation of Athanasius. At this time (sometime in first half of 357) the main attention of the Arians was withdrawn from Athanasius, and they were now busy preparing their creed for the Sirmian synod of August 357.

p.156 L.1 Fortunatianus - see B VII, 8 p.168 L.15 for note on this old confidential friend of Liberius.

L.2 diversis episcopis - these would not be exiled confessors nor, on the other hand, would they be ordinary bishops who supported the condemnation of Athanasius. The letter would be sent to the bishops who had influence with Constantius, important persons like Ursacius and Valens, who could be expected to give it a warm welcome.

Notes.
22. p.35 note 1.
23. Stud. I p.167.

L.2 nihil profecit - here is found the reason for Liberius having to write the other exile letters. His first one (BIII, 1) had gained no success.

L.2-5 ut autem..decerneret - the Arians had been unable to impair the authority of the Western synod of Sardica, and therefore its decisions with regard to the innocence of Athanasius and guilt of the Arians still stood; to these decisions Julius of Rome had given his assent, and so, while paying lip-service to the tradition of his predecessors[24], Liberius had actually broken this tradition in condemning Athanasius and thus provided a source of future embarrassment and trouble for himself.

L.3,4 sibi.. sibi - i.e. Liberius.

L.6 litterae..missae - Coustant[25] and Feder[26] identify this letter with the decision of the 80 Egyptian bishops mentioned in A VII p.90 L.16sq. If so, the 'nunc' of L.8 would refer to c.352/3. This seems improbable. The author of the narrative text has been describing events taking place c.357, and it seems more natural to refer the "nunc" to this year and conclude that this letter of the Egyptians had been sent to Liberius in exile when they heard that he was on the point of weakening and surrendering to the Arians.

Notes.
24. cf. B III, 1.
25. P.L. X col. 681 (c).
26. Stud. I p.166sq.

L.7 quales ad Iulium priden - i.e. probably the letters referred to in A VII p.90 L.14sq., B II, 1 § 5 p.114 L.10sq., B II, 2 p.127 L.16,17; in that case, the "priden" would refer as far back as 340.

exulenti Athanasio - after a brief return following upon his first exile, Athanasius fled from Alexandria in April, 339[27] and was destined to remain in exile until October 346.

L.8, 9 ut de subiectis intellegetur - Coustant[28] and Feder[29] refer this to what is contained in A VII § 2 but this opinion must be rejected[30]. The "subiectis" could refer either to a letter of the Egyptians to Liberius or to a letter of Liberius to the Egyptians. This part of the text is now lost.

CONCLUSION. Though difficult to interpret and obscure in parts, B III, 1 and 2 correspond reasonably well to the generally known historical facts and so must be accepted as authentic. While the letter must have been written in the first half of 357, the narrative text belongs to a later period (cf. the mention of the synod of Ariminum). [31].

Notes.
27. Ath. Hist. Encyc. § 5. Fest. Ind. XI.
28. P.L. X col. 682 (d).
29. Stud. I, 168.
30. cf. p.156 L.6 note.
31. For fuller discussion see section on the Liberius letters. While a further short interpretation of this letter and narrative text is there given, the main purpose of this additional section has been to discuss the question of the authenticity of the letters and review the various theories propounded thereon.

Series B IV, 1. Letter of Liberius to the catholic bishops of Italy. 362/3

SUMMARY. (1) In this letter on the treatment to be meted out to lapsed, but repentant bishops, Liberius asserts that it is in accordance with apostolic precepts that severity should be repudiated. Following the example of the Egyptians and the Greeks, he thinks moderation should be extended to them but the authors of the deceit at Ariminum should be utterly condemned. (2) Those who renounce Arianism should be welcomed, but if anyone should wish to persevere in that heresy, he is to be strenuously resisted.

COMMENTARY. This letter has been preserved only in Hilary's work; its authenticity is not questioned. In addition to Faber-Coustant, it has been edited by Bar ad ann.362 n.CLXXVIII, Binius I, 466sq., Ed.regia III, 144sq., Labbe-Cossart II, 754sq., Coustant Epp. Pontif. 448-450, Coleti II, 809sq., and Mansi III, 210sq.

p.156 L.13 ad catolicos episcopos Italiae - these bishops can not now be individually identified. Liberius was evidently trying to organise opinion in Italy with regard to the question of the lapsed bishops, as had been already done in Egypt and Greece[1].

Notes.
1. cf. p.157 L.4sq.

L.16 imperitiae...resipiscens - i.e. repentance removes the guilt of an offence done unwittingly.

L.17 pietatem - "pietas" originally meant dutiful conduct towards the gods. When adopted into Christian usage, it was used to emphasise the human, rather than the divine, element; a man's "pietas" was shown through his character and action.

Probably the meaning is that it is what those who fell at Ariminum are doing now that matters, i.e. their repentance, not what they have, through force of circumstances, done in the past. Their repentance is a sign of piety and therefore they ought to be treated with the charity becoming Christians.

L.18 et ipsa - i.e. corporalis exercitatio.

L.19 quam - i.e. pietas.

L20 sq. non enim, si aliquis etc - a very literal translation would be: "for if anyone by chance (sc. of those) who act zealously with foreseeing purpose to destroy (sc. the decisions of the Egyptians and Greeks) shamelessly with more severe judgment, has also thought to change this, which is already protected concerning piety by apostolic authority, when it is said (i.e. by the 'aliquis' of L.20) that those are not to be spared who acted in ignorance at Ariminum, to whom not to know how to attack the comprehension of error/

error was not allowed (sc. as a defence), therefore severity will not be repudiated " i.e. those who advocate stern treatment of the lapsed must be prepared to go against apostolic authority. Liberius then continues to outline his position..

L.21 saeviori censura - i.e. with a more severe censure than that of the council of Alexandria 362. This council had decided (1) that those who had actively supported the Arian heresy should, if repentant, be allowed to return to communion, though excluded from all offices in the Church. (2) those who, through force or on grounds of expediency, had joined the Arians, should be pardoned and allowed to remain in office.

But even at the council itself there was an over-strict section who said that any who sought to re-enter the communion of the orthodox, after having been contaminated by any sort of communion with the heretics, should be for ever excluded from the clerical office.

Prominent among those who refused to accept the decisions and moderate policy of this council was Lucifer of Cagliari who declared that anyone who had in any way been contaminated with Arianism should be barred from ecclesiastical office[2]. It is to such as Lucifer that the 'aliquis' of L.20 refers.

'Destruere' (L.21) implies the attempted destruction of the Alexandrine decrees by the Luciferians through their "saevior censura".

Notes.
2. cf. Ruf. H.E. I, 28sq. Ath. Ep.55 to Rufinianus.

L.22 quod ia...munitum - Coustant[3] takes this as no slight indication that Liberius had already in another letter approved the decrees of the Alexandrine synod. But it seems more correct to connect the "apostolica auctoritas" with the reference to I Tim. 4,8 in L.17,18.

p.157 L.1, 2 qui apud...eperunt - for example, the many Western bishops misled by the deceits of Valens[4] and induced to sign the creed of Nikê in all good faith.

L.2,3 quibus nescire..incidere - i.e. the advocates of severity refused to make allowance for the fact that many had fallen at Ariminum through ignorance and inability to counter the deceits of the Arians.

The argument is that if those, who disagree with the policy of the Alexandrine council, contend that the apostolic injunctions also are to be overthrown, then they can advocate severity. But those, who know the reverence due to the apostolic authority, will follow the apostolic advice and show leniency towards the fallen bishops.

L.4sq. maxime cum et Aegyptii etc - cf. Ath. Ep. ad Rufinianum "a/

Notes.
3. P.L. X col. 714 (h).
4. cf. B VIII, 2 p.176 L.5 note; A V, VI, VIII, IX.

"a synod has been held (in Alexandria), bishops from foreign parts being present; while others have been held by our fellow-ministers resident in Greece, as well as by those in Spain and Gaul; and the same decision was come to here and everywhere". As they deal with the same question, it is reasonable to suppose that these synods would be held about the same time.

L.5 "parcendum" (esse) and (L.6,7) "auctores esse damnandos" are acc. and infin. constructions exrlaining "hac usi sententia".

L.6, de quibus supra tractavimus - i.e. those in L.1, 2 "qui apud Ariminum ignorantes egerunt".

L.6,7 auctores vero esse damnandos - the Alexandrine synod had declared that even those who had been leaders were, on repentance, to be pardoned, though not given the position of clergy. Liberius is probably thinking here of the unrerentant Valens and Ursacius. cf. p.158 L.24, 25.

p.157 L.7sq. qui obliqua etc - cf. Ath. Ep. ad Episc. Aeg.10; De Syn. 14; Or. c. Ar. I ch. 3,4.

L.11 in se restiferum - i.e. through making the Son of God a creature, it strikes at the very heart of the Christian faith; to that are added all the other deceits of the Arian dogma.

L.14,15 totumque se...mancipet - cf. the words of Liberius as reported in Socr. IV, 12 "But we recognise this to be the catholic and apostolic faith which remained whole and unshaken up to the Nicene council."

L.16 quibusdam - i.e. to those like Lucifer.

L.17, "rectitatis" is to be attached to 'quod', not to "astutiam".

L.17sq. verum si aliquis etc - a passage similar to this is found in Liberius' letter to the Macedonians[5].

L.20 sq. et ratione etc - reason is to be met with reason, argument with argument.

L.21 auctori perfidiae - probably Satan is meant here.

L.21,22 ecclesiae...plectetur - i.e. excommunication[6].

CONCLUSION. The subject matter of this letter indicates that it must stand close in time to the synod of Alexandria, which was held in the summer of 362. It must have been written before the middle of 363 because Athanasius in a letter to Jovian, written about that time/

Notes.
5. Socr. IV, 12.
6. Spiritual vigour as opposed to the physical violence and threats employed by the Arians.

time (i.e. middle of 363), states that the decrees of the Alexandrine synod are accepted in Gaul, Spain, Greece and all Italy, whereas in his letter Liberius is still trying to secure their acceptance. So the probable date of composition is the winter of 362/3. While the letter reveals opposition to the Alexandrine decrees, there is still no evidence of the rise of the Luciferians as a party.

According to G. Hermant[7] this is the letter meant by Siricius of Rome when he says in a letter to Himerius that, after Ariminum, Liberius sent general decrees to the provinces[8].

Baronius[9], Stilting[10] and Reinerding[11] claim that Liberius was the originator of the policy of reconsiliation. But there is no foundation for this opinion. First of all, Liberius himself admits[12] that synods had already been held in Egypt and Greece to deal with this question of the lapsed bishops, and indeed he uses their example to strengthen his argument and justify his own position. Secondly, if a Roman synod had been held or any decision taken by Rome on this matter before the synod of Alexandria, Athanasius would undoubtedly have mentioned it in his letter to Rufinianus. For him to have mentioned Spain, Gaul and Greece and omitted Rome would be unthinkable if Rome had indeed taken the leading/

Notes.
7. in his Life of Athanasius X, 6.
8. P.L. XIII, 1133.
9. ad ann. 362 tV (1866ed) p.92.
10. Acta SS. tVI (1867) p.617sq.
11. Beitrage zur Honorius und Liberiusfrage (1865) p.52sq.
12. p.157 L.3sq.

leading part in the reconciliation of the fallen bishops. It was the council of Alexandria, not of Rome, Athanasius, and not Liberius, who played the primary role in advocacy of the policy of moderation.[13].

This letter (B IV, 1) is interesting in that it shows that Liberius had recovered from the misfortunes of his exile and was regaining for the see of Rome its place of importance among the churches of the West.

B IV, 2. Letter of the Italian bishops to their brethren in Illyricum. 363.

SUMMARY. The bishops state that, after recognising the deceit of Ariminum, Italy has returned to the Nicene faith. They rejoice that Illyricum has begun to do the same. They confirm their own decision by subscription, and assert that they preserve the Nicene decrees against Arius and Sabellius, by sharing in whose inheritance Photinus is condemned, and rescind the decrees of Ariminum. In order to dispel any suspicion of doubt, copies of all this are enclosed, and whoever wishes to have fellowship and peace with them must give unequivocal evidence of their complete approval. In conclusion, they declare that the authors of the Arian or Aecian, heresy/

Notes.

13. In a letter to Dnictetus (Ep. LIX) Athanasius does mention a council at great Rome in addition to those in Spain and Gaul, but the date of this letter is very uncertain and it might have been written as late as 372.

heresy, Valens and Ursacius, and their associates have been condemned, not just at the present time, as in Illyricum, but long ago.

[illegible]. This letter has been preserved only in this work. In addition to Faber-Coustant, it has been edited by Baronius ad ann. 365 n, XXVIsq., Binius I, 487, Ed.regia III, 230sq., Labbe-Cossart II, 835sq., Harduin I, 745sq., Coleti II, 981, Mansi III, 391sq.

p.198 L.3 Inlyricum - Illyricum was one of the four large prefectures into which the Empire was divided at this time, the others being Oriens, Italia and Gallia. It was to Illyricum that Arius and his supporters had been banished by Constantine, and Valens and Ursacius were probably his disciples there. Arianism, thus introduced, took a strong hold.cf. Martin, while visiting his parents there some time before the exile of Hilary, had stood forth for the Nicene faith but was scourged and forced to depart[14]. But it would seem that the Western half was not so much affected as the Eastern and possessed some representatives of the orthodox faith.cf. Damasus Ep. I; the council of bishops of Western Illyricum 375[15]; council ofAquileia 381[16]. It is very probable that it was to bishops in Western Illyricum that this letter ( B IV, 2) was addressed.

Notes.
14. Sulp. Sev. Vita 5sq.
15. Hef. II, 289.
16. Hef. II, 374sq.

fidem paternam - i.e. the Nicene creed. cf. L.7,8.

L.7 olim - here used to denote a period of less than a year[17]

apud Nicheam - i.e. Nicaea 325.

L.8 fraudem - i.e. the deceit concerning the creed of Nike.

L.9sq. Inlyricum etiam deum etc - the fact that the Italian bishops know about the beginning of the work of restoration in Illyricum presupposes some earlier communication between the two countries. It may be that the bishops in Illyricum, knowing that the task of restoration had been successfully completed in Italy, had written there in order to gain support for their undertaking.

p.158 L.10 infidelitatis - i.e. the Arian heresy.

L.12 subscriptione - all the bishops would subscribe the letter to show that it was unanimous and done with the approval of the whole of Italy.

L.12,13 sententiam - i.e. their decision concerning Ariminum and the fallen bishops. cf. L.13sq.

Notes.
17. cf. Conclusion.

L.13 Sabelliumque - cf. note p.44 L.6 on Sabellius. According to Socrates[18], Arius had begun the controversy by contradicting Alexander's exposition of the doctrine of God and accusing the Bishop of Sabellianism. While there was no direct condemnation of Sabellius at Nicaea, a few traces are evident of a certain uneasiness with regard to him and of a need for protection against the charge of Sabellianism, and there is no doubt that, however unwarranted, one of the chief reasons for the unpopularity of the word "homoousios" was that it seemed to many to bring near the danger of Sabellianism.

In the fourth century, most of the leaders of the Nicene party were accused of Sabellian tendencies, but the two who made themselves especially liable to this charge were Marcellus of Ancyra and his pupil Photinus. In the case of the former, it may be doubted whether the accusation was just[19], but Photinus is said to have worked out Marcellus' system to its logical conclusion and to have boldly proclaimed Sabellian doctrines[20].

L.15 tergiversatione - another reference to the deceit of Valens and his associates. cf. L.8.

L.14 omnium provinciarum - i.e. all those in Italy.

Notes.
18. H.E. I, 5.
19. cf. A IV, 1 p.49 L.22,23.
20. cf. B II, 5 p.142 L.12 note.

L.14 quorum etiam exemplaria - i.e. copies of their decisions concerning the Nicene faith and the synod of Ariminum.cf. L.17s.. ut nec in fide etc.

L.20,21 quae sunt nostrae sententiae - sc. concerning Nicaea and Ariminum.

L.21 fidei - i.e. the Nicene creed.cf. L.7.

L.23 pluribus harum provinciarum - i.e. the provinces of Italia represented at the writing of this letter.cf. L.14. While the authors of the letter would have to admit the superiority in numbers of the provinces represented at Ariminum, they yet lay claim to a large measure of support for their present course of action.

L.24 heresis Arrianae vel Aecianae - Aetius had suffered a temporary eclipse at Constantinople 360[21] but Julian, on his accession 361, soon restored him and lavished many favours upon him[22] The ecclesiastical censure upon him was also removed by Euzoius, the Arian bishop of Antioch[23], who, with other bishops, composed a "libellus" in defence of Aetius and his doctrine[24]. On the death of Jovian and the accession of Valens, however, Aetius' affairs took/

Notes.
21. cf. 3 VIII, 1.
22. Ep. Juliani 15 (Loeb. p.35). Soz. V, 5. Philost. IX, 4.
23. Philost. VII, 5.
24. Philost. VIII, 2.

took a turn for the worse and he never regained the influential position he had held under Julian.

In their letter[25], the Semiarian legates at Constantinople recognised that while Aetius was condemned, his system was retained in all its essential points. This opinion is confirmed in this letter of the bishops of Italy who here assert that the Aecian (or Aetian) was the form which the Arian heresy took at this particular time.

It is interesting to note that, in the first canon of the council of Constantinople 381, the Arians are identified with the Eudoxians, called thus after their leader Eudoxius who belonged to the same group as Aetius. This had probably arisen because they were distinct from the Anomoeans on one side and the Semiarians on the other and perhaps claimed to represent most closely the old and original Arianism.cf. B II,2 p.129 L.2,3.

L.25sq. non nunc etc - again a contrast is made between the situation in Italy and that in Illyricum.cf. p.158 L.6-11 "et quantum ad Italiam..olim...Inlyricum..probare COMPISSE gratulamur".

The "olim" p.159 L.1 is probably to be connected with the statement in Liberius' letter[26] to the catholic bishops of Italy, that the authors of the heresy are to be condemned, and therefore refers to a quite recent condemnation.

Notes.
25. B VIII, 1.
26. B IV, 1.

CONCLUSION. This letter is closely linked with the preceding[27]; both represent attempts to overcome the defeat which the orthodox cause had suffered at Ariminum. It must have been written after Liberius' letter to the Bishops of Italy, because it asserts that all Italy has now been restored once more to the Nicene faith, but before that of Athanasius to Jovian, where Illyricum is mentioned as confessing the Nicene faith. As Athanasius wrote this letter about the middle of 363, a suitable date for the composition of B VI, 2 would seem to be sometime in the first half of 363[28].

The letter itself is an interesting example of the way in which the supporters of the Nicene creed sought to recover their former prestige through mutual support.

Notes.
27. B IV, 1.
28. Faber's assertion (Praef.8) that this letter was written after an Illyrican synod in 365 is refuted by the evidence of Athanasius' letter to Jovian and also by Liberius' letter to the Eastern deputies (in Socr. IV, 12.)

Series B V. Letter of Valens, Ursacius and their associates to Germinius, 366.

SUMMARY.(1)Despite the warning of Valens and Paul, Germinius had hitherto failed to give a satisfactory answer concerning the rumour of his change of mind, though he had sent a friendly letter. So now from Singidunum they write asking him to make his position clear and show that he has not departed from the catholic faith expounded and confirmed at Ariminum and accepted by all the Eastern bishops, viz. that the Son is like the Father according to the Scriptures, not "according to substance" or"in everything", but absolutely. To alter this is to revive the perfidy of Basil,(2) He is asked to give in his letter a clear denial of the statement that "the Son is like the Father in everything except innativity", in order to disprove the suggestion made by the deacon Jovianus and subdeacon Martirius that he confesses that "the Son is like the Father in everything". In return, they promise that if he shows himself in agreement with them, then the complaint brought against him by certain of his clerics, Palladius and Gaius, will not affect his good name. They send their letter by the hand of the presbyter Secundianus, the reader Pullentius and the exorcist Candidianus on the 18th December 366 in the consulship of Gratian and Dagalaifus, and retain a copy.

COMMENTARY. This letter has been preserved only in this work. It has been edited by Faber-Coustant, Bar.adann. 366 n XXVI, Binius I 488sq/

488sq., Ed.regia III, 235sq., Labbe-Cossart II, 840 sq., Harduin I, 747 sq., Coleti II, 988 sq. and Mansi III, 399 sq.

For Valens, Ursacius and Gaius cf. p.45 L.15 note. For Germinius cf. p. 47 L.16 note.

p.159 L.7 Paulus - he is mentioned only in connection with the Germinius letters. Nothing else is known about him but the presumption is that, like Valens and Ursacius, he was a bishop in Illyricum.

L.8sq. magis laudandi.. aliquam sustinere - it may be that Germinius had already made it clear that he resented the interference of Valens and the others in his personal affairs or perhaps the latter were anticipating such a protest. Or again the "reprehensio" may be connected with the "querella pro iniuria" (p.160 L.11) and refer to some dispute between Germinius and his clerics. cf. p.160 L.6.

L.10 in fide catholica - i.e. as interpreted by Valens and the others, and meaning the creed of Nikē accepted at Ariminum. cf. L.18.

L.11sq. quamvis conventione.. respondere - the main reason for Germinius not replying directly to their questions on the rumours being spread about him would be that he had not yet definitely decided what position he was going to adopt. If, as Constant supposes/

supposes (see conclusion), he had already composed his creed, there would be no reason either for his hesitation or for their questionings.

L.11 conventione - this probably does not refer to an assembly but to a private warning sent by letter from Valens and Paul (cf.p.160 L.12) and answered in a friendly tone by Germinius (p.159 L.13,14).

L.12 admonitus nolueris - cf. p.160 L.12,13.

L.12,13 quod rumor iactitat de te - from the context it is obvious that the substance of the rumour was that Germinius was transferring his allegiance from the Arian to the Semiarian party.

L.13, 14 litteristuis - this letter has not been preserved. In his state of indecision it is quite probable that Germinius would send to his former associates a letter written in friendly vein but expressed in general terms and leaving the question still open. It may have been, also, that he was still uncertain about the attitude of Valens and the others and wanted to know whether they were going to uphold the phrase "ineverything" or not; though this seems very unlikely in view of the events at Nikē and Ariminum. On receipt of this letter, his former associates must have thought there was still some hope of retaining his support; hence this assembly at Singidunum (L.16). This time they ask him to write again, stating his position clearly and without any ambiguity.

L.16 Singidunum (the modern Belgrade) was in the province of Moesia (or Mysia).

iterum - cf. L.11 note, L.13,14 note. No reply of Germinius to this request is extant but it could have been the letter, now lost, which stood in front of his Creed. cf. A III.

L.18 sq. a fide catholica - i.e. the creed of Nikē cf. notes on A V, VI, VIII, IX, B VIII.

L.19,20 cui etiam.. consenserunt - i.e. at Seleucia 359 and Constantinople 360.

L.19 universi - i.e. in so far as the Arians had been able to secure the signatures of the deputies representing the Eastern synod of Seleucia at Constantinople[1]. When the Arians, led by Acacius, had presented a revised edition of the Dated Creed at Seleucia, the Semiarians had refused to accept it, but their deputies eventually gave way and subscribed it at Constantinople.

L.20 sicuti iam professus es - this could refer either to the letter of Germinius (L.13,14) or even to his acceptance of the Dated Creed at Sirmium, 22 May 359, and at Ariminum.

L.21 sq. est autem hoc etc - in his letter (L.13,14) Germinius must/

Notes.
1. cf. Soz H.E. IV, 23.

must have asked Valens and his supporters to make clear their own theological position for they now give their interpretation of the Dated Creed i.e. the revised version accepted first at Nikē, then at Constantinople, and omitting the important "in everything".

L.21 in ea - i.e. the "fides catholica"(L.10,18), the revised Dated Creed.

L.22 similem..scripturas - this is the phrasing as used in the creed of Nikē. By means of this phraseology, Valens and his followers could still assert that the Son was like in part and unlike in part, and forbid any extension of the likeness beyond what Scripture allows, thus leaving a loop-hole for Arian teaching. cf. B VI, p.163 L.25,26.

L.22, 23 secundum substantiam - in their minute issued after their signature of the Dated Creed at Sirmium[2] , Basil of Ancyra and George of Laodicea put forward a defence of the word οὐσία [3] and asserted that it is included in the ὅμοιον κατὰ πάντα if the latter phrase is honestly accepted. Later, at the council of Lampsacus on the Hellespont in autumn 364, the Semiarians reaffirmed the ὅμοιον κατ' οὐσίαν on the ground that, while likeness was needed to exclude the Sabellian identity involved, in their opinion, in the formula/

Notes.
2. cf. Epiph. Haer. 72 c 12-22.
3. "It is not found in Scripture but is everywhere implied".

formula of Nicaea, its express extension to essence was required as a safeguard against the Arians.

Semiarian acceptance of the "secundum substantiam" was an important contribution to the furtherance of an alliance between the Nicene and Semiarian parties. That would be an additional reason for its condemnation by Valens and his group.

p.159 L.23 per omnia - in their minute, Basil and George attach great importance to this phrase, because the omission of οὐσία in the Dated Creed is compensated by the "likeness in everything", which guarantees a genuine Sonship. Valens' reluctance to accept this phrase was shown even at the signing of the Dated Creed, and in his later revisions at Nikē and Constantinople he omitted it altogether[4].

L.23 sed absolute - i.e. without qualification. By this means Valens sought to exclude any likeness not found in Scripture, such as the likeness in substance[5].

L.24 Basilii perfida adsertio - the council of Ancyra (April 358) under the presidency of Basil defended the ὅμοιον κατ' οὐσίαν [6]. The confession of faith issued by this council was a perfidy in the opinion/

notes.

4. see later, discussion on this phrase. It was on the words "per omnia" that the whole controversy between Valens and Germinius centred.
5. on the ground that οὐσία is not found in Scripture.
6. cf. Hil. De Syn.12.Soz IV, 13. Epiph. Haer 73 § 2 sq.

opinion of Valens and his party because the idea of creaturehood was completely removed by the assertion that the Father is the cause of a substance like Himself (πατερα ὁμοιας αὐτου οὐσιας). Also included in Basil's "perfidious assertion" was the minute issued by him after the signing of the Dated Creed, defending the word οὐσια and giving a fuller explanation of the meaning of the phrase κατα παντα.

p.159 L.24 - p.160 L.1 propter quam.. damnata est - after the Homoean victory at Constantinople 360, various charges were brought against the leading Semiarians, among them Basil, and they were deposed and exiled[7].

p.160 L.3 litteris tuis - cf. p.159 L.18 rescribere.

L.4, 5 similem esse.. innativitate - from the time of the council of Sirmium 359 this had been the accepted Semiarian doctrine.

L.5 excepta innativitate - cf. p.161 L.6 note.

L.5,6 litterarum - this would be the same letter as is mentioned on p.159 L.13,14. It would seem that Jovianus and Martirius (of whom nothing else is known except that they were under Germinius' jurisdiction) had given a different account of Germinius' position than he had done in his letter.cf. p.159 L.13-15, p.160 L.8sq. It is/

notes.
7. Socr. H.E. II, 42, 43; Soz.H.E.IV, 24, 25.

is quite probable that Germinius had gone further in personal statements than in writing.

L.6 verbo deprecationis - to understand the order of events, this phrase must be taken in conjunction with the "querella pro iniuria" (p.160 L.11). Some of Germinius' clergy had apparently disagreed with the new standpoint adopted by him, rumours had been spread[8], and Germinius had taken vigorous steps to check this discontent[9]. The rebellious clergy had then appealed to Palladius and Gaius, members of the party of Valens, and a warning had been sent to Germinius from Valens and Paul[10]. Matters were complicated when Germinius replied with a friendly letter[11], but the bearers of this letter, Jovianus and Martirius, justified the rumours and complaint by asserting that Germinius had indeed transferred his allegiance and professed that "the Son is like the Father in everything". So Germinius is now requested to write another letter and remove all ambiguity.

L.7,8. meos.. nostros - this distinction means that the writer of the letter must stand in a more intimate relationship to Valens and Paul than some other members of the group. Because he is not mentioned by name in the letter itself and also because of his very close/

notes.
8. cf. p.159 L.12, 13. p.160 L.12,13.
9. cf. p.159 L.9 reprehensionem p.160 L.11 querella pro iniuria.
10. p.159 L.11. p.160 L.12,13.
11. p.159 L.13 sq. p.160 L.5 sq.

close association with Valens, Ursacius seems the most likely person to have done the actual writing of the letter. This impression is strengthened by the fact that the council, from which the letter (B V) was issued, was held at Singidunum, the see of Ursacius[12].

L.9 "per omnia.. patri - i.e. the Semiarian watchword, cf. p.159, L.23, 24. p.160 L.4,5.

L.10 sq. si enim sic te etc - the Arians promise that if Germinius shows himself to be of the same faith as themselves, then they in their turn will overlook the complaint of his clerics. Schiktanz[13] thinks this remark is proof of the authenticity of the letter.

querella pro iniuria.. facta, licet nolueris.. inquirere-cf. p.159 L.12. Germinius was justified in thus refusing an inquiry into the complaint, because his clerics had exceeded their power in disregarding him and appealing to other bishops with whom they knew they would find a ready and sympathetic hearing.cf. L.6 note.

L.11 Palladius - see B VI p.160 L.22 sq. note.

L.12 licet nolueris..inquirere - cf. p.159 L.12,13.

L.12,13 prima conventione - cf. p.159 L.11.

L.14 illis.. rationem - when called to account for accusing Germinius/

Notes.
12. p.159 L.16.
13. p.90.

.ius, the reason they would give would be their concern to safeguard the "catholic faith".

L.14 temeritate - i.e. in disregarding Germinius and appealing to Palladius and Gaius, bishops who had no authority to hear their complaint.

p.160 L.15 Secundianum - an Arian bishop, Secundianus, from "Moesia superior" was condemned at the synod of Aquileia, 381. Farlati[14] and Feder[15] suggest that he is to be identified with the Secundianus mentioned in this letter B V. The conjecture seems feasible because it is reasonable to suppose that the presbyter Secundianus, like the reader Pullentius and the exorcist Candidianus (of both of whom nothing else is known), would be at this time a cleric under the jurisdiction of Ursacius.

L.16 XV Kalendas Januarias - i.e. 18th December.

L.17 Gratiano - i.e. Gratian, the future Emperor, who was at this time not yet seven years old.

According to Clinton[16], Gratian and Dagalaifus were consuls in 366.

notes.

14. Illyricum Sacrum VII, 607 (1817 ed).
15. Stud. II, 123.
16. Fasti Romani p.464 (1845 ed).

CONCLUSION. It is evident from this letter that Valens and his associates had not yet seen or heard of the profession of faith published by Germinius[17]; it would not be possible for them still to be in doubt if, as Coustant[18] would have it, Jovianus and Martirius had brought news of this creed with them to an earlier conference, for Germinius definitely and unequivocally shows there that he believes in the "similis per omnia". Nor could Germinius have remained silent[19] if their conference had been held as a result of the publication of his creed; indeed if the creed had actually been published, there would have been no need for any conference because all doubts and questionings would have been thus automatically settled. It is more probable, therefore, that A III, in its letter (now lost) and creed, contains the answer of Germinius to this letter B V.

From such a letter as this, it can be seen that the alliance with the Homoeans at Sirmium 359 had been a tactical error on the part of the Semiarians. They had gained no advantage whatever from it. On the contrary, the fears of Basil and George[20] had been realised; Valens and his associates had later revised the creed in their own interest, used it for their own purposes, and thus put the Semiarians, who had subscribed it, in a false position. By this alliance the Semiarians had ruined their own position and thrown away any chance they had of victory at the councils of Seleucia and Constantinople.

Notes.
17. A III.
18. P.L. X col.718 (e).
19. cf. p.159 L.12,13. p.160 L.12,13.
20. cf. their minute in Epiph. Haer. 73 c.12sq.

Series B VI Letter of Germinius to Rufianus, Palladius and others.366.

SUMMARY. (1) Because of information received from Vitalis, a civil officer in his district, Germinius now writes to several bishops informing them of the differences in faith which exist between himself and Valens, Ursacius, Gaius and Paulus. He asserts that he teaches what has been handed down from the Fathers and Divine Scriptures, namely, that Christ is similar to the Father in everything except innativity, and he supports his statement with various passages from Scripture (3) It is surprising, he continues, that Valens has forgotten or craftily dissembles what has been done in the past. For after long discussion on the faith, under the aegis of Constantius and in the presence of Gregory of Alexandria, Pancratius, Basil, Valens, Ursacius and Germinius himself, Mark, with the consent of all, drew up a creed in which was written "the Son is like the Father in everything as the Holy Scriptures say and teach", and to which all subscribed. He confesses that he does not know what has led Valens and the others to adopt their new position, but he challenges them that, as he himself has shown from the Scriptures, that the Son is like the Father in everything except innativity, so now they should expound from the Scriptures how He is like in part and unlike in part. (4) It is without fear, therefore, and with all speed that he now sends an official, Cyriacus, to them with this profession, that all might know it. He asks them in turn to write back to him and give their opinion. He excuses/

excuses himself for being unable to sign the letter because of sore hands, but orders his presbyters Innocentius, Octavius, and Catulus to do so.

COMMENTARY. This letter has been preserved only in this work. It has been edited by Faber-Constant, Baronius, ad ann.357 n. XXVIIsq., ad ann.366n XXVII, Binius I, 489, Ed.regia III, 236-8, Labbe-Cossart II, 841 sq., Harduin I, 747-750, Coleti II,989-992, and Mansi III 400-402.

p.160 L.20 Rescriptum - the fact that Rufianus and the others had made this request to Vitalis is perhaps an indication that they were held in favour by him, and this is probably another instance of the civil power being used by a group of bishops to exert pressure on another bishop, over whom they themselves have no jurisdiction or authority. If this reasoning is correct, the "relatio" of Vitalis to Germinius would be more in the form of a command than of a request. Of course, Vitalis would be interested on his own account because of the trouble that might arise in his district through the dispute.

L.22sq. Dominis fratribus etc. - nothing certain is known of the bishops to whom this letter is addressed. From their appeal to Vitalis, it may be assumed that, like Valens, Ursacius and Germinius they are Balkan bishops. Moreover, because of their interest in Germinius, they must either belong to the Semiarian party or be a moderate/

moderate section in the Arian party. If Palladius (p.160 L.20,22) is identified with the bishop mentioned in B V p.160 L.11, then the latter seems the more probable assumption.

Burn[1] has attempted to identify the individual bishops, but admits that a good deal of his work is conjectural. He thinks that Rufianus might be the Rufinianus to whom Athanasius wrote, informing him about the synod held in Alexandria 362[2]. But this conjecture seems improbable because Athanasius' letter suggests an orthodox rather than an Arian bishop, and the introductory words seem to point to an Egyptian bishop standing in close relation to Athanasius and not to an Illyrian bishop living far away from Alexandria.

With regard to Palladius:- Burn attributes to him the see of Ratiaria on the Donau and thinks he is the bishop condemned at the synod of Aquileia 381. At this synod two Arian bishops, Palladius and Secundianus, were deposed[3]. In a letter addressed by the bishops of the synod to the Emperor comes an account of Arian unrest in the Illyrian province: "per occidentales partes duobus in angulis tantum, hoc est in latere Daciae ripensis ac Moesiae fidei obstrepi videbatur"[4]. Now, because Palladius is always mentioned in old documents before Secundianus, Feder[5] is of the opinion that the see of Palladius was therefore placed "in latere Daciae ripensis", and that of Secundianus in Moesia. As the city of Ratiaria lay on the border of "Dacia ripensis" this gives weight to Burn's assertion that this is the see of Palladius.

Notes.

1. "Niceta of Remesiana"(1905) Introd. p.XXXVIIsq. p.138sq.
2. Ep. LV. cf. Post Nicene Vol IV p.566 n 1.
3. P.L. LXII, 433 sq.
4. P.L. XVI, 948 A.
5. Studien II, 108.

Burn suggests that Severinus might be the Illyrian bishop addressed among others from the same province, in a letter of Ambrose of Milan[6], and, with Kattenbusch[7], identifies Nichas with Niceta of Remesiana. For the former bishop, Feder[8] prefers the Surinus who was present at the council of Sirmium 351, and objects to both bishops suggested by Burn on the ground that their theological outlook is incompatible with that of the bishops addressed by Germinius. In reply to this objection, it may be admitted that in Ambrose's time neither Severinus nor Niceta had any connection with the Arian party but that does not exclude the possibility of an earlier variation; in a time of flux such as this was, Feder's objection carries no great weight.

According to Burn, Heliodorus is probably the bishop translated from Moesia to Nicopolis in Thrace[9]. But it seems unlikely that this can be the same bishop who was present at Sardica over 20 years earlier. For the same reason, it is unlikely that Stercorius is he of Canusium who was also at Sardica. About Romulus, nothing is known.

Burn wonders if Mucianus is a mistake for Marcianus, bishop of Naissus in 409. But in that case Bonosus could not have been bishop of Naissus in 391[10].

Few of the bishops mentioned here, then, can be identified with any certainty/

Notes.
6. Ep.15 P.L. XVI, 955 sq.
7. Theolog. Literaturzeitung XXI (1896) 303.
8. Stud. II, 108.
9. cf. B.II, 4 p.137 L.3 Eliodorus e Nicopole Socr.H.E.VII,31.
10. Burn p. LI thinks Bonosus belongs to Sardica.

certainty, but there is some evidence to support the theory that they were all local Balkan bishops.

L.25 Vitalis - Germinius was bishop of Sirmium in the diocese of Pannonia in the prefecture of Italia, and Vitalis seems to have been a civil officer in this district.

p.161 L.1,2. Valenti, Ursatio, Gaio et Paulo - though the bishops addressed have relations with Valens and the others[11], they are evidently not members of that group of extreme Arians. This impression is confirmed in p.161 L.3 "id, quod..confido", which suggests that Germinius expects a sympathetic hearing from them.

L.4,5, hoc, quod... docemus - this is an answer to such a criticism as Athanasius made in his De Synodis 3, where he asserts that by prefixing to their creed the consulate, the month and the day of the current year[12], 'those,who drew up the creed, showed all sensible men that their faith dates, not from of old, but now, from the reign of Constantius.

L.5,6 Christum..innativitate - i.e. the formula of the Dated Creed. The phrase "excepta innativitate" is not actually found in the creed itself, but is implied in the phrases denoting the Son as begotten of the Father.

Notes.

11. cf. Palladius in B V and B VI.
12. cf. Hil. ad Const. 4,5.

As has been said[13], the Dated Creed was the product of a temporary alliance between the supporters of Valens and the Semiarians, like Basil of Ancyra and Mark of Arethusa. Valens had secured this alliance and its creed in preparation for the more important council of Ariminum - Seleucia. The basis of the alliance was the word ὅμοιος. On the one hand, this word ὅμοιος was one with a good orthodox history. Athanasius, in his earlier anti-Arian writings, used it often, and it is found frequently in the writings of the conservative theologians, such as Cyril, who in his Cathecheses has both ὅμοιον κατὰ τὰς γραφὰς and ὅμοιον κατὰ πάντα. On the other hand, it suited Valens and his associates because, by keeping to the simple ὅμοιον and excluding any non-scriptural definition, they were able to use it in a relative sense. Thus it could admit of degrees of likeness - what is like is also at the same time in some way unlike. That the Semiarians to some extent foresaw this evasion is shown by their addition of the words κατὰ πάντα, a phrase which Valens was persuaded to accept at the time only with difficulty[14]; later he tried to deny its presence in the original creed[15].

p.161 L.6 per omnia..excepta innativitate-cf. p.160 L.4,5 similem.. excepta innativitate. According to Souter[16], the word "innativitas" is first used among Latin Christian writers in the letters B V and B VI/

Notes.

13. cf. B V.
14. Epiph. Haer.73, 22.
15. cf. his conduct at Nikē and also § 3 of this letter.
16. Glossary of Later Latin.

VI. The phrase "ex eorum substantia" is not contained specifically in the Dated Creed, nor is it found in any of the other creeds up to this time. Germinius omits it in his creed (A III). Its occurrence in both B V and B VI, is , therefore, significant and indicates the close relationship existing between these two letters.

L.7sq. deum de deo etc - a compilation of the various phrases found in most orthodox and Semiarian creeds of this time, and given here to show that the likeness covers everything of the Nicene creed (which has "ex" instead of "de"): the creed in the "Libellus Fidei"(which has "de")[17]; and A I §2 p.44 L.11sq.

L.10 sq. There follow the customary Scriptural quotations commonly adduced by both sides in the controversy.

L.29,30 ne aliquam...demonstraret - Valens and his supporters tried to maintain that the Son was like in part and unlike in part (cf. L.5,6 note) and thought they could do this so long as the likeness was limited to that authorised by Scripture. But Germinius here uses Scripture to prove that the likeness covers everything including the divinity.

p.162 L.1 sq. quis non intellegat...in filio? - in opposition to the Arians, Germinius asserts the truth of the two natures, divine and human/

Notes.
17. in Hahn p.258sq. and P.L.XX cols. 49-50.

human, in Christ.

L.26 sq. qui propter etc - Germinius throws the blame upon Valens and the others for the breach in their relations. He maintains that he still holds to the original profession of the Dated Creed but that Valens and the others have carriciously turned away from it.

§ 2 L.28sq. nam quod etc - In this section, Germinius answers the Arians who tried to prove, from the titles given to the Son of God in Scripture, that He is a creature. He asserts that the Son is given these titles, not because he resembles them in being created, made out of nothing, but because they show the various facets of the Son's work. The analogy lies, not in the createdness, but in their purpose and operation.

Burn[18] suggests a connection between this passage of Germinius on the Lord's scriptural titles and the treatise of Niceta of Remesiana "De diversis appellationibus"..p.XLII "The tone of the treatise[19] is devotional, not controversial, and follows the line of argument taken by Germinius. Niceta quotes some ten out of fifteen of the titles quoted by Germinius".

Similar lists are found in the Libellus Fidei (P.L. XX cols.49-50) and also in the "Gelasian decree". Burn is of the opinion that their general similarity in style need not be attributed to literary dependence of one writing upon another but to their being written in the same period and to meet the same line of Arian argument.

Notes.
18. loc. cit. p. XLI sq.
19. De div. appell.

Four Titles, 'Verbum', 'Agnus', 'Via' and 'Lapis', are found in all 4 lists. 'Manus' and 'dies' are found only in Germinius.

L.28 de scripturis divinis - like every other new theory, Arianism was subjected to the test of Scripture; the Arians, in their turn, searched the Scriptures to overcome their opponents' objections and were wont to use isolated texts to confirm conclusions reached without the help of Scripture. In the present instance, Germinius reveals how they have taken the various titles ascribed to Christ in Scripture out of their context, and perverted the use of such titles to prove their own contention that Christ is a creature.

p.163 L.11 quid in.. sit - i.e. at Sirmium, May 22nd, 359 in the Dated Creed.

L.12 sub bonae.. imperatore - Constantius died on 3rd. Novr. 361[20].

L.12 quando -Socrates[21] testifies that this assembly met at Sirmium.

Sirmium 351 is excluded for several reasons :- George was not intruded into the see of Alexandria until Lent 356[22]. Moreover the aim of Sirmium 351 was to attack Photinus, but Mark's creed is not directed against the teaching of Photinus. Sirmium 357 is also excluded/

Notes.
20. Socr. H.E.II, 47.Soz.H.E. V, 1.Amm.Marc.XXI, 15 § 2,3.
21. H.E. II,30.
22. Ath. De Fuga 6.

excluded because it was composed entirely of Westerns. The issue lies, therefore, between the synod of Sirmium held in the Spring or early Summer of 358, and that of May 359. Both these synods were similar in character: both were held in the presence of the Emperor Constantius, at both Semiarians and Arians joined forces, both adopted a middle position between the two extremes, and at both the number of bishops present was relatively small. What little evidence there is seems to favour Sirmium May 359: (a) Epiphanius[23] states that Valens wished to have a copy of the creed published at Sirmium in order that he might take it with him to the council of Ariminum. This signifies that the synod of Ariminum followed very closely upon that of Sirmium, and was indeed imminent when the bishops assembled at Sirmium. (b) the creed put forward by Valens at Ariminum was very similar to the Dated Creed of May 359.

p.163 L.12,13. inter quosdam - i.e. those bishops, both Arian and Semiarian, who were preparing for the general council of the whole Church to be held at Ariminum and Seleucia; particularly anxious were Valens and his followers who feared that the council, at which the Arians would be in a minority, might issue a creed injurious to themselves.

Notes.

23. Haer. 73, 22.

L.14 Georgio..ecclesiae - George of Alexandria, who is also associated with Cappadocia[24], was of lowly birth[25] but, through his interest in philosophy, rhetoric, and history, had gained the favour of the future emperor, Julian[26]. According to Socrates,[27] he was not at Sirmium 351, but, in Lent 356 he was intruded into the see of Alexandria[28]. Philostorgius[29] asserts that he was a supporter of the Acacian party, and as such, he was "deposed" by the Semiarians at Seleucia. The Semiarians unfortunately did not possess the power to make these depositions effective, and George probably returned to Alexandria soon after the council of Seleucia. Though he had the support of Constantius [30] and later of Julian, George was never popular in Alexandria. After a riot on 29th August 358, George was forced to leave the city on October 2nd.[31], and finally, shortly after the accession of Julian, he was seized by the mob and lynched on Christmas Eve 361[32].

Notes.
24. Ath. Ep. ad Episc. 7.
25. Ath. Hist. Ar. 51, 76. Greg. Naz. Orat XXI, 16.
26. Julian, Ep. 23 in Loeb series, 1923, p.75.
27. H.E. II, 29.
28. Ath. de fuga 6.
29. III, 2.
30. Ath. Apol. ad Const. 30, 31.
31. Hist. Aceph. 6.
32. Hist. Aceph. 8. Epiph. Haer. 76, 1. Julian Ep. 10.

L.15 (Pancratio episcopo) Pelusinorum - on the basis of Socrates[33], Coustant suggests "Pancratio" should be added[34]. According to Epiphanius[35], Pancratius was present at the synod of Seleucia. Nothing more is known about him.

L.17 usque in noctem - cf. also Epiph. Haer. 73,22.

L.17, 18 ad certam regulam perductam - the assembly must have given Mark specific instructions on how to draw up the creed. Some idea of these instructions can be gained from the Creed itself. It is conservative in character, able to satisfy even the most cautious of the Semiarians without at the same time doing harm to the Arian cause; it omits all mention of the "homoousios" but follows in the tradition of Ancyra and Sirmium 358.

L.18 Marcum - cf. A IV, 3 p.74 L.18 note. Socrates[36] knows that Mark of Arethusa was concerned in the formulation of a Sirmian creed, but gets somewhat confused in the details.
The choice of Mark would be acceptable to Valens and his group because his sympathies lay more with the Arians than with the Nicenes[37].

Notes.
33. II, 29.
34. P.L. X, 721 (a).
35. Haer. 73, 26.
36. h.E. II, 30, 37.
37. cf. his presence at Eastern Sardica.

In addition to the bishops mentioned here, Sozomen[38] gives Auxentius, Gaius, and Demophilus, and Epiphanius[39] gives Hypatianus, as having been present at this assembly.

L.19,20 "filium similem .. scripturae" - were the words "per omnia" part of the original creed? They are not found in the creed which Valens put forward at Nikē and Constantinople, and are omitted in B V. On the other hand, Germinius gives them in his Creed[40] and reiterates the phrase "per omnia similis" in this letter. The manner in which Germinius quite simply puts forward this phrase as the one originally composed by Mark at Sirmium, without stressing unduly a deliberate omission by Valens, but rather emphasising only their wrong interpretation, inclines one to accept the authenticity of his evidence. This opinion is strengthened by the account given in Epiphanius[41]. According to this, when Valens was giving his signature to the Dated Creed, he tried to omit the important words "per omnia", and added them only when commanded by the Emperor. This action led Basil of Ancyra to make an addition to his signature affirming that the Son is like in all things, not only in will, but also in His being, and condemning those who said that He is like only in part.

It is significant, too, that in B V, while mention is made of the acceptance of the creed at Ariminum and Constantinople, no mention is made of its original formulation and acceptance at Sirmium 359.

The/

Notes.

38. H.E. IV,17.
39. Haer. 73, 22.
40. A III.
41. Haer, 73, 22.

The evidence, therefore, seems to favour the view that the words "per omnia" did form part of the original Dated creed.

L.21 omnes consensimus - cf. also Epiph. Haer. 73, 22.

L.22,23 si autem.. non possumus - as Valens and the others in B V[42] profess themselves vague about Germinius and ask him to make his position clear, so now Germinius acts in like manner towards them.

p.163 L.23-26 nam ut nos..parte dissimilis - now that he has stated his position and established it by proofs from Scripture, he challenges Valens and his followers to do the same and defend from Scripture the position they have adopted in B V whereby they are willing to acknowledge a likeness according to Scripture, but not one "secundum substantiam" or "per omnia"[43] i.e. making the Son like in part and unlike in part.

p.164 L.1,2 intrepidanter et sine mora - B V had contained a veiled threat and also accusations of vacillation and delay[44]. The intervention of Vitalis in the dispute is perhaps an indication that Germinius had been using delaying tactics. In B VI, however, Germinius has definitely taken up his position and is anxious to remove those suspicions.

Notes.
42. cf. p.159 L.12sq. L.16sq. p.160 L.3sq.
43. cf. p.159 L.22,23.
44. cf. p.160 L.10sq., p.159 L.12,17.

L.2 Cyriacum officialem - Cyriacus is presumably an official on the staff of Vitalis. He might be the person who brought the message from Vitalis[45]; this would give point to the "sine mora" (L.1,2).

L.3,4 Carinium...misi - nothing else is known about Carinius. If the assumption was correct that the bishops addressed in this letter have some connection with the writers of B V, then Carinius could have been sent to them with the letter mentioned in B V p.159 L.13,14. It must have been something of that kind, friendly but vague and unsatisfying, otherwise the intervention of Vitalis would not have been necessary.

L.4 professionem - in his letter B VI, Germinius has thus given a clear and definite answer to B V. No longer could Valens and the others pretend that they did not know Germinius' standpoint. It would seem, however, that he has not yet published his creed because it is still unknown to Rufianus and the other bishops, and no mention is made of it in this letter B VI.

L.5 fraternitati - this word was commonly used from the second century onwards to denote the relationship between Christians and towards the end of the fourth century began to be used in forms of address.

Notes.

45. cf. p.160 L.25, 26.

L.7 rescribere mihi - Germinius has evidently some hopes of receiving a favourable hearing from the bishops to whom he addresses his letter B VI. If Rufianus and the others did reply, their letter has not been preserved.

L.8,9 propterea quod..potuisse - Schiktanz[46] suggests that these words are a good argument in favour of the authenticity of the letter; a forger would rather have allowed Germinius to subscribe himself and with his full name.

L.10 fratribus.. Catulo - nothing more is known of these three clerics.

CONCLUSION. This letter bears no date, but as it depicts a similar situation to that in B V and reveals the same uncertainty as to Germinius' profession, it must have been written about the same time. B VI, however, does take a step forward because in it Germinius states his position quite clearly and gives a more satisfactory answer than that apparently given to the authors of B V.
So it could not have been written before B V, otherwise Valens and his associates could have had no excuse for their uncertainty as to his standpoint. As there is still no mention of the creed A III, the order of composition of the three documents, now extant, must/

Notes.

46. p.92.

must be:- first of all, B V, then B VI, and lastly A III.

Germinius must have made a definite decision after 18th Dec. 366[47], although, as B V indicates[48], the break from his former standpoint had not been a sudden one, but had been rumoured for some time. The last occasion recorded, on which Germinius definitely appears as a member of the Valens group, is on 13th Jan. 366[49]. So the change must have begun in the course of that year. It is quite probable that he did not adopt a definite position until forced to do so by the arrival of the request from Vitalis, and that, having committed himself in his letter B VI, he then issued his creed and answering letter to B V[50].

It is difficult to discover the exact reason for Germinius' change of mind. One thing is certain - though brought to a head by imperial pressure, it did not take place for any political motive. At this time, the Emperor Valens was in control of the East, had begun, in the spring of 365, the "second Arian persecution"[51], and by his support kept Arianism alive until his death at the battle of Adrianople 378. Meanwhile, in the West, Valentinian I pursued a policy of toleration and neutrality[52].

Notes.

47. the date of composition of B V.
48. cf. p.159 L.12,13. p.160 L.5sq.
49. cf. the "Altercatio Heracliani laici cum Germinio episcopo Sirmiensi de fide synodi Nicaenae et Ariminensis Arianorum; quod gestum est in civitate Sirmiana coram omni populo Idus Ian. VI feria, Gratiano et Dagalaifo consulibus" in C.P. Caspari "Kirchenhistorische Anekdota I, Christiania, 1883, 133sq.
50. cf. A III.
51. Hist. Aceph 15.
52. cf. his reply to the Semiarians, when asking permission to hold a synod "My place is among the laity. I have no right to interfere in such matters. Let the bishops assemble where they please" Soz.H.E.VI, 7. Also his attitude in the dispute between Hilary and Auxentius.

Burn[53] suggests that it was the revelation of the duplicity of Valens with regard to the κατὰ πάντα at an Arian conference held at Singidunum, which roused Germinius to revolt. But in his letter, Germinius expressly says that he is writing not in protest to a Singidunum council, but at the request of Vitalis, and it is evident from the rumours in B V that Germinius had been in revolt before this conference at Singidunum[54]. If Germinius' change of mind had been caused only by this duplicity, it is difficult to understand why the revolt had not come earlier, for example, at Nikē when Valens first perpetrated the deceit[55]. There must, therefore, have been some other contributory factor. Now, in May 366, after the death of the usurper Procopius, Valens resumed his persecution of the Semiarians. They, in turn, after holding several synods[56], decided to send deputies to Valentinian and to Liberius of Rome with instructions to accept the Nicene faith and seek their assistance[57]. It seems probable that Germinius had come in contact with these deputies and been influenced by them in a Semiarian direction. Whether Germinius eventually went so far as to accept the Nicene creed is not known.

Notes.
53. L.c. p.XL.
54. p.159 L.16sq.
55. cf. A V § 2.
56. Socr. H.E. IV, 12.
57. Socr. L.c. Soz. H.E. VI, 10.

Valens' interest in Germinius' change of mind is understandable. He would be particularly anxious lest Germinius' example should influence some of his more moderate supporters, and this anxiety would not be allayed by the interest shown by Rufianus and the other bishops mentioned in B VI.

One question remains to be answered, namely, why Hilary should have collected these documents. One reason would be Hilary's interest in the Semiarians[58], an interest which would be quickened by their overtures to the Westerns during the second Arian persecution. Then again, from B VI it appears that Germinius was hopeful of gaining support in his protest against the deceit of Valens, cf. p.161 L.3 p.164 L.6,7. It is not known if he had any success; but these documents foreshadow the change that was to come in Arian fortunes after the death of Valens and show that in spite of imperial favour, a split was already occurring within the ranks of the Arians. Another reason would be that Valens and Ursacius were Hilary's particular "bêtes noires" and he might have included these documents to illustrate the unscrupulous methods which they were prepared at all times to adopt.

Notes.

58. cf. his De Synodis.

Series B VII, 1 Narrative Text.

SUMMARY. Before he went into exile, Liberius wrote to Eusebius, Dionisius and Lucifer, who were in exile for the faith.

COMMENTARY. p.164 L.14 antequam ad exilium iret - it is not known exactly when Liberius was sent into exile, but the following letter[1] proves that it was sometime after the synod of Milan 355. It must have taken place very soon after that council because, while special mention is made here of Eusebius, Dionysius and Lucifer, the three bishops who remained steadfast at Milan and thus suffered exile, there is no mention of Ossius, who was also exiled later in 355[2], nor of Hilary, who suffered the same fate after the synod of Beziers 356.

L.14,15 hanc uniformem epistulam - it would not have been politic for the Emperor to have banished the three bishops, condemned at Milan, to the same place of exile. So Eusebius was banished to Scythonolis in Palestine, Dionysius to Cappadocia in Syria, and Lucifer to Germanicia in Syria. Because of that, Liberius wrote this circular letter.

L.15,16 Eusebio, Dionisio et Lucifero - for Eusebius see A II p.46 L.11 note. For Lucifer, A VII, p.89 L.3.

Notes.
1. B VII, 2 p.165 L.7,8.
2. Ath. Hist. Ar. 42, 45.

Dionysius became bishop of Milan in 346 and was president of the council in 355. According to the narrative text §3 to the Orat. Syn. Sard. ad Const.[3], when Eusebius of Vercelli produced the Nicene creed at the council, Dionysius stepped forward first, as president, to sign it, but was prevented from doing so by Valens. It was as a result of this incident that the Arians had the council transferred to the Emperor's palace. Dionysius was destined to spend the rest of his life in exile and died in Cappadocia in 374.

Athanasius[4] relates that, in addition to these three bishops, two legates of Liberius, a presbyter, Eutropius, and a deacon, Hilary, were also exiled at Milan, the latter having first been scourged. Rufinus[5] places bishop Rhodanius of Toulouse among the exiles, but his banishment seems to belong to another time.

B VII, 2 Letter of Liberius to Eusebius, Dionysius and Lucifer, 355.

SUMMARY. (1) Liberius comforts the exiles in their present troubles with the hope of future reward. He grieves that hard necessity deprives him of their fellowship and wishes that he had been the first to suffer that he might have given them an example to follow. (2) Because they have been brought nearer to God through their sufferings, he asks them to remember him in their prayers, that he might/

Notes.
3. p.187 L.12sq. Feder.
4. Hist. Ar. 41.
5. H.E. I, 20.

might be enabled to endure the blows which fall heavier every day, and so be made equal to them through having preserved the faith and the catholic church. He also requests them to write and give him exact details of what took place at the council.

COMMENTARY. The authenticity of this letter is unquestioned. It has been preserved only in this work. In addition to Faber-Coustant, this and the following letters have been edited by Baronius ad ann.355 n.XXXV, ad ann.353 n.XIX, ad ann.357 n.XLIII -XLV

p.164 L.18 sub imagine pacis - the professed desire of both Nicenes and Arians in appealing for another council had been to secure the peace of the Church. In order to attain this aim, the orthodox bishops had wished a full discussion of all the disputed points both in doctrine and in the question concerning Athanasius, but the Arians had demanded simply and solely the condemnation of Athanasius, and it was obvious that, under the guise of peace, they had aimed to overthrow utterly and completely the decisions of the council of Nicaea.

L.18 humani generis inimicus - i.e. Satan (working through the Arians).

p.165 L.1 singularis - in contrast to the fluctuations of Valens and his companions.

L.1/

L.1, 2 et hic probabiles..designavit - because of the whims of a tyrant, those bishops, who resisted his will, knew that death on behalf of their faith awaited them at any time.cf.Tert. ad Martyras[6] "sufferings..are but trifles compared to obtaining a celestial glory and divine reward", also Tert de Anima 55[7a], de Fuga XIV §§ 1,9 [7b].

(antexNicxxLibxxXIxnx3577sqx)

L.3 merita virtutis vestrae - in addition to any reward in a future life, the courage they had shown in remaining steadfast to their faith, would exalt the Nicene faith in the eyes of other bishops and strengthen the weaker brethren.

L.6,7 si credatis..detrusum - so close is he in spirit to them that he feels himself thrust into exile with them.cf.L.13sq.

L.7,8 denique..pendentem - after the orthodox failure at Milan, Liberius must have known that it was only a matter of time before the Emperor would confront him with the same demands as he had made to the exiled bishops and that he, too, would have to make his choice between accentance or exile. This seems to have taken place very soon after Milan.cf.Ath. Hist. Ar. 35sq. Theod. H.E. II, 16.

L.8 durior necessitas - i.e. he has the desire to be with them but necessity is more powerful than this desire; which could mean either/

Notes.
6. ante-Nicene Library XI Tert. vol. I, 4 p.6.
7a. ante-Nicene XV p.531-2
7b. ante Nic. Lib. XI p.357sq.

either that he has perforce to stay at home because the Emperor has not yet ordered him into exile, or that he feels it more necessary to stay and support the Nicene cause in Rome than to go into exile with the other bishops.

L.11-13 sed fuerit..veniretis - cf. p.165 L.1sq.

p.165 L.16sq. quantam denique gloriam etc - the privileged position and special honour accorded to martyrs is evident even in the New Testament[8]. Another trace is found in the letter of the Smyrnaeans XVII sq. giving the account of the martyrdom of Polycarp in the middle of the 2nd. century. Perhaps the strongest evidence is found in the letters of Cyprian; for example, Ep. XIX, 2[9]: "that they who had received letters from the martyrs, and may, by their aid, be holpen with the Lord amid their sins, if they begin to be sore pressed by any sickness or peril may be remitted unto the Lord with the peace promised them by the martyrs. But for the rest who, not having obtained letters from the martyrs, complain invidiously... let them await, from the protection of the Lord, the public peace of the Church itself".

Liberius encourages the exiled bishops by comparing the glory they have gained with that of those who have died in persecution. The enemies/

Notes.
8. cf. Rev. VI, 9,11; XVII, 6; XX, 4.
9. C.S.E.L.III; ii 525sq.

enemies of the faith are more insidious in their choice of weapons, and the moral courage required to resist them is greater than the physical courage involved in facing the sword of a persecutor.

It is interesting to note the use of "denique" in L.7 and L.16 and in each case not in a temporal sense. cf. B III p.155 L.16.

L.20 sq. quorum, quantumque etc - the grammatical construction of this sentence is rather complicated. "Quorum" qualifies "violentia" and "inveniuntur" is a sense construction from "perfidis", the antecedent of "quorum".

p.166 L.3sq. Et quia proximiores etc - as early as Origen and Hippolytus traces are found of a belief in the power of the holy dead to intercede for those on earth[10] and by the latter half of the fourth century invocation of the holy dead was common among Christians[11]. Liberius' thought (L.3sq.) is an adaptation of this idea combined with that of the special graces attributed to confessors and martyrs[12]. Because of their good confession, the exiled bishops will be especially favoured of God and He will be all the more willing to hear their prayers.

Notes.

10. cf. Origen "De Oratione" XIV, 6. Hippolytus "Comm. in Danielem" II, 30.
11. cf. Hil. De Trin. XI, 3; Basil "Hom. in martyres" 18; Greg. Naz. Orat. XXIV, 11; Ambrose "De Viduis" IX, 55; Jer. Ep. CVIII ad Eustochium 13; Aug. Sermo CCLXXXV, 5. Delehaye "Les Origines du culte des martyrs" (Brussels 1912).
12. cf. n.165 L.16sq. note.

L.5 sq. ut supervenientes etc - this is probably an indication that the Arians have already begun their attack on Liberius himself.

L.7 parem vobis..me - i.e. made equal, not necessarily through suffering the same fate of exile, but in having safely preserved the faith and the catholic church.

L.8,9 in ipsa congressione - i.e. in the synod at Milan where Eusebius, Dionysius and Lucifer were exiled. The fact that Liberius the bishop who had requested the council, had sent representatives to it and was directly concerned in it, has yet no certain information as to what actually happened at the synod, indicates how easily the mass of bishops could be deceived by unscrupulous men.

L.10 litteris intimare dignemini - no reply is extant and there is no evidence as to whether it was ever written. In so far as he makes this request, Liberius can hardly have expected his own exile to be imminent.

L.11 diversis rumoribus - the Arians had probably been publishing various reports of what had happened at the synod.

L.12 alia manu - probably that of his secretary, when dispatching the three copies of the circular letter.

CONCLUSION. The contents of the letter show that it must have been written very soon after Milan[13], between the end of the synod (Spring 355) and the exile of Liberius[14]. The constant reiteration of encouragement through the hope of future glory, the exaggerated tone of grief at separation from them, and the defence of preserving the faith at home give rise to the suspicion that Liberius feels himself embarrassed about bishops, who were his representatives at Milan, being in exile, while he himself still occupies his own see. It is a letter written indeed as much for his own benefit[15] as for the consolation of the exiled bishops.

B VII, 3 Narrative text.

SUMMARY. Before he went into exile, Liberius likewise wrote to Caecilianus of Spoletium in Umbria concerning Vincent of Capua.

COMMENTARY. p.166 L.15 antequam iret in exilium - cf.p.164 L.14 note.

de Vincentio Capuensi - cf.A VII p.90 L.24 note.

Notes.
13. cf.p.165 L.7sq. p.166 L.8sq.
14. c.summer 355 cf.Feder Stud. I p.105sq.
15. cf.§2.

L.16 Caecilianum - nothing more is known about this bishop.

B VII, 4 Excerpt from Liberius' letter to Caecilianus.353/4.

SUMMARY. Liberius urges him not to be dismayed by the action of Vincent.

COMMENTARY p.166 L.18 factum Vincentii - Vincent of Capua had gone at the head of the embassy from Liberius to Constantius, requesting a council at Aquileia[16]. This request was granted though the council was held, not at Aquileia, but at Arles in 353. It ended with the defeat of the orthodox, including the representatives of Liberius. The "factum Vincentii" will refer to the fall of Vincent at Arles, cf. B VII, 5 p.167 L.2 "Vincenti ruina", L.14 "post cuius factum". Athanasius[17] excuses Vincent by asserting that it was only after severe treatment that he renounced communion with himself.

ab intentu boni operis - it is not known to what this refers, but it may be presumed that it would be some proposed action in defence of the Nicene faith. Mention of the former legate Vincent inclines one to the opinion that Caecilianus was thinking of supporting Liberius in his plea to Constantius for another council. cf. B VII, 6, A VII.

Notes.
16. cf. B VII, 6 p.167 L.6sq.
17. Apol. ad Const. 27.

from the mention of Vincent's fall and absence of any reference to Milan 355, it would seem that this letter must have been composed sometime after the council of Arles 353, but before that of Milan 355.

B VII, 5 Narrative text.

SUMMARY. He also wrote to Ossius concerning the fall of Vincent as follows:

COMMENTARY. p.167 L.2 Ossium - see A II p.46 L.14 note.
de Vincenti ruina - cf. p.166 L.18 note. His fall is mentioned also in Liberius' letter to Eusebius[18], as is also the subservience of the other Italian bishops, and then Lucifer's offer to try again.

B VII, 6 Excerpt from Liberius' letter to Ossius 353/4.

SUMMARY. Liberius states that, in his request to Constantius for a council at Aquileia, he had the support of many Italian bishops. Vincent of Capua and Marcellus, another bishop of Campania, had undertaken to go as his legates, and he had expected much of Vincent because of his past experience. His fall had, therefore, been a source of grievous sorrow to him.

COMMENTARY. p.167 L.4 Inter haec - Liberius seems to have been giving/

Notes.
18. Bar ad ann. 353 n.20.

giving Ossius an account of recent happenings in the struggle with the Arians. In this passage, which can be only an extract from the letter, he relates some of the preliminaries to the council of Arles 353 and seeks to excuse his choice of Vincent as legate.. This letter must have been written not long after the council of Arles and before that of Milan. Like the other letters in this document, it has been preserved only in this work. Its authenticity has never been doubted.

L.4,5 multi ex Italia coepiscopi - such as, perhaps, the Caecilianus of B VII, 3 and 4.

L.6,7 sicut ipsi placuerat dudum - this is doubtless a reference to the council of Sirmium held in 351 under the auspices of Constantius.

After the completion of the civil war, both sides, orthodox and Arian, were anxious for a council to settle the affairs of the Church, the orthodox particularly so, in view of the fresh charges already being brought against Athanasius[19]. In making his request, Liberius is careful to go, not in his own strength, but with the support of many Italian bishops.

L.7 ad Aquileiam - Liberius' aim in choosing this place would be to/

Notes.
19. cf. Ath. Apol. ad Const. 2, 6, 14, 19 sq.

to try and secure a great measure of control over the council. Constantius, however, wished to have the council under his own power, and so assembled it at Arles, where his headquarters were at that time.

L.8 Marcello - nothing else is known of this bishop.

L.8, 9 legationem nostram - i.e. the embassy to the Emperor at Arles. cf. A VII p.90 L.24,25.

L.9 quo - i.e. Vincent.

L.10 causam - i.e. of the orthodox faith which was inextricably bound up with the Nicene creed and Athanasius.

L.10,11 iudex..resedisset - Vincent is believed to be the presbyter of that name who represented Silvester of Rome at Nicaea 325. He had also been present at Western Sardica[20] and was one of the legates who had brought to Constantius at Antioch a letter from the council and another, to support it, from Constans. So far as could be judged from his past record and association with Ossius, Liberius did seem justified in selecting him as leader of the embassy to Constantius.

Notes.
20. B II, 4 p.134 L.1.

L.12 integrum ius..servari - i.e. the law of the Gospels is preserved in its integrity by the orthodox bishops and therefore by this legation. In this sense the law of the Gospels can be identified with that of the legation.

L.13 simulationem - the orthodox at Arles condemned Athanasius on the promise of Valens and his followers that Arianism would later be condemned, a promise never fulfilled. Liberius here censures his legate for allowing himself to be thus deceived. No matter how sincere their proposal may have seemed, from his past experience Vincent ought to have known to beware of deceit. Because of this, his is the responsibility for the failure of the orthodox cause at Arles.

L.14 cuius factum - cf. p.166 L.18 factum Vincentii.

duplici merore - double grief because (1) of Vincent having betrayed his trust (2) of the outcome of the council.

L.15,16 ne viderer..consensum - i.e. he is afraid lest he too is thought to be implicated in the action of his embassy at Arles in condemning Athanasius. By such letters as this, however, he shows that he dissociates himself from their decision.

B VII, 2, 4, and 6 are generally accepted as genuine letters of Liberius. In the Appendix, where full discussion is made on the question of the disputed letters, the conclusion is reached that all the/

the letters of Liberius contained in Hilary's work are authentic and this assumption underlies the Commentary on the following B VII 7 -11.

B VII, 7 Narrative text.

SUMMARY. When sent into exile, Liberius brought all these fine sentiments to nothing by writing to the Arian heretics who unjustly condemned the orthodox bishop Athanasius.

COMMENTARY. p.168 L.1 missus in exilium - soon after the end of the council of Milan, the Emperor sent the zealous Arian, Eusebius, to try and secure Liberius' acceptance of the Milan decisions. When he failed, Liberius was summoned to appear at Milan before the Emperor. This would occur on the return of Constantius to Milan at the end of June or beginning of July, after his Alamanni campaign[21]. But not even Constantius with all his threats and remonstrances could cause Liberius to waver in his allegiance to Athanasius and the Nicene faith. So he was sent into exile to Beroea in Thrace in the summer of 355[22].

L. 1, 2 scribens...haereticis - cf. the following letters.

Notes.
21. Amm. Marc. 15, 4.
22. cf. Sulp. Sev. Chron II, 39. Theod. II, 15sq. Pref. to Lib. prec. 3 C.S.E.L. 35, 2.

According to Chapman[23], these are the words with which the forger introduces his work[24]. Vichhauser[25] is also of the opinion that this narrative text can not have originated from Hilary because, he asserts, the use of the words "sanctus" and "orthodoxus" in this connection is foreign to him. But he is at least mistaken with the word "sanctus"[26], and indeed there is no real reason why these words should not have come from the pen of Hilary. The sentiments expressed in this narrative text are those which one would naturally expect from an orthodox bishop who himself had suffered exile for the faith and who was disgusted at the way in which Liberius had fallen after all his previous actions and protestations. cf. B VII, 2 and 6.

B VII, 8 Letter of Liberius to Eastern bishops. 357.

SUMMARY. (1) Liberius begins his letter by saying that their holy faith is known to God and to men. He excuses his former attitude towards Athanasius, declares that he now agrees with their just condemnation of him, and has sent a letter concerning this to Constantius by the hand of Fortunatian, and announces that he has peace with them and all the Eastern bishops. (2) As further proof of his attitude, he asserts that, after Demofilus' exposition, he has /

Notes.
23. Rev. Ben. 1910 p.190.
24. cf. the section on these Liberius letters.
25. p.46.
26. cf. Hil. De Syn. 77,90.

has accepted the Sirmian creed. Consequently, he asks them to procure his return from exile to his own see.

COMMENTARY. p.168 L.5 Dilectissimis...Orientalibus - P.Sinthern[27] declares that the placing of "presbiteris" before "coepiscopis" indicates the suspicious character of the letter. But this seems an unlikely opinion because a forger would be most careful to avoid such an elementary mistake. Feder[28] suggests that it is a defect in form not surprising in the letter of an old man humbled by exile, a letter probably written down by a strange hand[29]. Moreover, as the title is not given in the concilian collections, he thinks it might be a later addition.

But there seems no reason why "presbiter" should not be used here in the sense of "old", "aged", "elder"[30]. "Brethren, elders[31] and fellow-bishops."

Orientalibus - probably like those mentioned in B VII, 9, a group of bishops of diverse views, including extremists, such as Acacius and Eudoxius, and conservatives, such as Basil.

L.9 ego Athanasium non defendi - Liberius could say this in the sense that he had always demanded a fair trial at which the rights of/

Notes.
27. De causa papae Liberii p.144.
28. Stud. I p.169.
29. cf. Stud. I p.110.
30. cf. Tert. de Cor. Mil.11.
31. i.e. the aged men of the Church, including bishops just as "brethren" includes them.

of both sides could be fully discussed and a just judgment given; in this sense he could be said to have taken neither side and therefore had not defended Athanasius. Moreover, if it was objected that the cause of his exile had been his refusal to condemn Athanasius, he could reply that this refusal had not been based on any defence of that person, but had simply arisen from a desire to see justice done; i.e. he could not condemn Athanasius until the latter had had a fair trial, not a farcical affair like Arles 353 or Milan 355. cf. L.12 "when I knew that you had JUSTLY condemned him".

L.10 11 sed quia..iudicarer - this is evidence again of the power of tradition[32]. The action of every bishop is to a certain extent limited by the acts of his predecessor, and the bishop of Rome was early recognised as being in a special position as far as this was concerned[33]. The reference is to the active part played by Julius in the defence of Athanasius. cf. his letter[34] and his synod at Rome in 341.

L.12 iuste vos illum condemnasse - this can not have taken place at the Sirmian synod mentioned on p.169 L.7, if Sirmium 351 is meant, because that synod was concerned only with Marcellus and Photinus. Nor can it refer to Sirmium 357 because that was a purely Western synod[35]. Perhaps it refers to a statement in a communication sent by/

Notes.
32. cf. A IV, 1. B II, 1. Tert. ad Praescr. 16-21.
33. cf. Iren. adv. Haer. III, 3.
34. Ath. Apol. c. Ar. 20sq.
35. Soz. IV, 12.

by these Easterns to Liberius, or it may even refer right back to the decision of Tyre and mean that Liberius has now been persuaded to accept that as a binding decision of the Eastern Church.

L.13 mox..vestris - he is eager to show his readiness in giving consent to their decisions.

litteras - this could be "Studens" (B III, 1). cf. p.171 L.8sq, p.156 L.1sq. // also p.168 L.15 note.

L.14 id est de condemnatione ipsius - Faber is of the opinion that these words were not part of the original text, but there seems to be no reason why they should not be taken as such.

L.15 Fortunatianum - Fortunatian of Aquileia seems to have been in close connection with Liberius during his exile. Jerome[36] declares that "Fortunatian is to be blamed because he first solicited Liberius going into exile, broke him and compelled him to sign a heresy". Hilary[37] says that Fortunatian circulated the letter "Studens" to try and gain some advantage for Liberius, but without success. The letter referred to in this letter[38] is probably to be identified with "Studens" for, although the latter is addressed to/

Notes.
36. Cat. Script. 97
37. in B III, 2.
38. p.168 L.13.

to Eastern bishops, and not to Constantius, mention is made in B VII, 10 p.171 L.8sq. of a letter, written indeed to Eastern bishops, but taken by Fortunatian to Constantius[39].

p.168 L.16 sq. amoto Athanasio etc - this had been the sole demand of the Arians at Arles and Milan. At that stage, they had not dared to attack the Nicene creed openly, and so their plan of campaign had been to take an indirect step towards their ultimate objective by overthrowing its most valiant upholder, Athanasius. But now, by the time this letter was written, as Liberius himself must have realised, emboldened by their successes at Arles, Milan and Beziers, the Arians had cast aside this fear and were issuing creeds which were openly heretical and designed to replace the Nicene creed.

p.169 L.1 epistulia - i.e. circular letters issued by Athanasius to defend himself against the lies of the Arians and to secure support[40].

L.5 Demofilus - i.e. the bishop of Beroea (where Liberius spent his exile). cf. A IV, 3 p.78 L.2 note.

Notes.

39. The other possibility, of course, can not be ruled out viz. that in addition to the Easterns' letter, Fortunatian had also taken one addressed by Liberius to the Emperor himself.
40. cf. Ep. LI to Lucifer.

L.7 Syrmio - it is difficult to determine which synod of Sirmium is referred to here. Four opinions are possible (1) it is the "Long" Sirmian 351 (2) the Sirmian synod of August 357, which produced the "Blasphemy"[41] (3) one of which no trace survives[42] (4) the Sirmian synod of 358.

Hefele[43] accepts on the whole the account of Soz. H.E. IV, 15 that Liberius signed the so-called third Sirmian formula of 358. But to do so, he discounts, on unconvincing grounds, the testimony of B VII, rejecting as spurious the Liberian letters and comments of the Fragmentist. If, however, the letters and comments in B VII are taken as authentic[44], it becomes very improbable that Sirmium 358 is meant because (a) B VII, 8 represents Liberius as consenting to the Sirmian decrees while still in exile in Beroea i.e. before the synod of Sirmium 358 was held. (b) according to Liberius' own testimony in his interview with Constantius[45], Theodore of Heraclea[46] was already dead even before the time of the synod of Sirmium held in August 357. (c) so far from participating in the synod of Sirmium 358, Eudoxius was actually the centre of attack by that synod.

Blondell, Petavius[47] and others have favoured the synod of Sirmium held in August 357, and Hilary[48] does indeed describe its creed as a "perfidia". But again the objection arises that Theodore of/

Notes.
41. Hil. De Syn. 11.
42. cf. R. Hussey in his notes to Soz. H.E. III, 12.
43. II, 231sq.
44. cf. additional section on Liberian Letters.
45. Theod. II, 16.
46. B VII, 9 p. 170 L.5.
47. in his notes on Epiph.
48. De Syn. 11.

of Heraclea was already dead before it was held. Secondly, according to Sozomen[49], only Westerns were present at this synod. Thirdly, so far from aiding in its composition[50], Basil of Ancyra was violently opposed to this creed. So this possibility must also be excluded. There remain (1) and (3). As an alternative to (3) is it possible that the Sirmian synod of B VII, 8 could be the one held in 351? Schiktanz[51] and Coustant[52] think so. In favour of this view is the fact that a large number of the bishops, mentioned in B VII, 9 as having participated in the composition of the creed signed by Liberius, had been present at Sirmium 351; for example, Narcissus of Neronias, Theodore of Heraclea, Basil, Eudoxius, Macedonius of Mopsuestia, Mark of Arethusa, Valens and Ursacius[53]. It has been objected that, in his De Synodis 38sq., Hilary treats the creed of Sirmium 351 so favourably that it is difficult to believe that in another part of his works he would call it a "perfidia" and anathematise Liberius for signing it. But in considering this difference in judgment, one has also to remember the different aims and circumstances of the two works. In the De Synodis, Hilary was trying to effect an union, or at least promote friendly feelings, between the Nicenes and Semiarians, between Westerns and Easterns, and so readily welcomed from the Eastern side anything/

Notes.
49. IV, 12.
50. cf. B VII, 9.
51. p.102.
52. P.L. X col. 689 (i)sq.
53. cf. Socr. II, 29. Soz. IV, 6.

anything which approximated, or was not injurious, to the Nicene creed. In so far as the "Long" Sirmian creed excluded ultra-Arianism, it was useful for his purpose and so could be interpreted in a favourable light. On the other hand, in the present work his purpose[54] was to reveal that the chief and ultimate aim behind the deceit and cunning of the Arians was the complete overthrow of the Nicene creed. From this point of view, any creed composed after Nicaea 325 constituted a threat to the authority of the Nicene creed. In subscribing the Sirmian creed, Liberius was, therefore, departing from the true faith and helping the Arians to achieve their aim. He had subscribed something which was "praeter fidem unam", which was therefore a "perfidia, non fides"[55]. Reprehensible in any bishop, it was a grievous sin and worthy of the strongest condemnation (i.e. of being anathematised) in the case of the bishop of Rome whom all had regarded as a pillar of Western orthodoxy and to whom the whole West had looked for example and guidance. When Liberius succumbed, it must have seemed as if the Arian heresy would sweep unhindered across the whole of the West. In face of that danger, the strong language used here by Hilary is understandable[56].

It may be wondered why Liberius was asked to subscribe a creed composed as early as 351. The only reasonable explanation is that it/

Notes.
54. cf. B I.
55. cf. c. Const. 24.
56. As events turned out, in the hour of crisis the great mass of Western bishops remained staunch to the Nicene creed. cf. Hil. De Syn. 1sq.

it was the only creed which the Arians had at that time in their possession capable of rivalling the Nicene; until they produced a more up to date one, the creed of Sirmium 351 would lose none of its power or efficacy in this respect.

So it would seem that the synod of Sirmium 351 offers the best solution to the problem, and the creed in question will be the "Long" creed issued there[57].

p.169 L.7 a pluribus..nostris - cf. B VII, 9 for their names. The synod of Sirmium 351 was composed principally of Eastern Eusebians; it is quite probable that Valens and Ursacius were the only Western representatives.

L.8,9 haec est.. sequentia - Baronius[58] omits this note but admits in the appendix that he had found it in the collection of Cresconius. Feder[59] grants the antiquity of the three anathemas given here together with the one given at the end of B VII, 10, and declares that they must have come from the original collector of the fragments or from one of the first copyists. Nevertheless, he is unwilling to accept Hilary as their author because (1) not all the anathemas have been included in the conciliar collections which have transmitted/

Notes.
57. for the text of this creed, cf. Hil. De Syn. 38. Ath. De Syn. 27.
58. ad ann. 357 n.34.
59. Stud. I p.124sq.

transmitted these letters (2) the creed of Sirmium 351 is treated differently in Hilary's De Synodis, and (3) Liberius would already be in possession of his see again after his return from exile at the time when Hilary was composing his work, and so it would be unthinkable that Hilary should hurl such anathemas at him at that time.

To the last two objections of Feder, answer has already been given in p.169 L.7 note. It may here be added that even though Liberius was once again in possession of his see when these words were written, the price he had paid for this return would not soon be forgotten by the orthodox. Peace had by no means returned to the Church as a whole, indeed the orthodox cause was shortly to suffer another enormous set-back at Ariminum. In such circumstances, Liberius' lapse merited even then the strongest condemnation.

As to the first objection, it is quite possible that these marginal notes could have been overlooked or purposely omitted by the copyist of the conciliar collections.

In view of what has been said on p.169 L.7 note, there seems no reason why these anathemas should not be regarded as having come originally from Hilary. The 'ego' therefore refers to him.

The phrase "sanctus Hilarius illi anathema dicit" (L.10,11) is obviously not from Hilary but must have been inserted by a copyist with an explanatory aim in order to obviate the danger of these marginal notes being regarded as having come not from Hilary but only/

only from a copyist. If this is so, it would be additional evidence for the Hilarian authorship.

p.169 L.11, 12 et sociis tuis - i.e. the Easterns with whom Liberius has now associated himself.

L.12,13 in nullo..tenetur - he again shows his eagerness to agree with their decisions. cf. p.168 L.13.

L.13,14 praevaricator - cf. p.168 L.11.

L.14sq. sane petendum etc - he now reveals his real reason for writing to the Easterns, namely, that they might secure his return from exile.

CONCLUSION. Because the bishops addressed in this letter still rely on the creed of Sirmium 351, there is good reason to suppose that the letter itself must have been written before the synod of Sirmium met in August 357 and issued the second Sirmian creed.

It is not difficult to guess Liberius' reason for writing to those Easterns. They were the bishops with most influence over Constantius at this particular time, and so the most hopeful way of securing a return from exile was to obtain it through their intercession. Unfortunately for Liberius, those Eastern bishops were too preoccupied with their own affairs at this time to pay much attention to his plea. Until 356 the Arians had been united in a common bond of resistance to the Nicenes, but they were by no means

a homogeneous mass, and, with their victory in that year, they soon began to divide into splinter-groups, of which the three most important were (a) the Semiarians (b) the Acacians (or Homoeans) and (c) the Anomoeans, with each group engaged in a desperate struggle for supremacy. It is not surprising that, in such a situation as this, Liberius met with little success and was compelled to look elsewhere for support[60].

This letter (B VII, 8) provides an interesting link with Liberius' attitude before his exile. From A VII it is evident that Liberius, when first raised to the episcopate, proceeded very cautiously with regard to Athanasius; in this letter to the Emperor he adopts a non-committal position, neither justifying nor condemning the bishop of Alexandria; but at the same time he does show himself anxious to secure a fair judgment. He appears, not as a zealous or extreme supporter of Athanasius, but rather as an independent judge whose sole concern is to secure a fair trial for the accused. In B VII, 8 this attitude is brought to its logical conclusion because he asserts that it is only when he knows that they have JUSTLY condemned Athanasius, that he has given his consent to their decision.

Notes.
60. cf. his letter to Vincent B VII, 11.

B VII, 9 Narrative text.

[illegible] It gives a list of the bishops who participated in the formulation of the perfidious Sirmian creed mentioned in B VII, 8.

CONTAIN. p.170, L.3 apud Sirmium - i.e. the synod of Sirmium 351 cf. p.169 L.7 note.

L.5sq. For Narcissus, Theodorus, Basilius, Eudoxius, Demofilus, Marcus and Acacius cf. A IV, 3 notes. For Ursacius and Valens cf. A I p.45 L.15. For Macedonius A IV, 1 p.66 L.24,25.

L.6 Cecropius - Cecropius was translated from the see of Laodicea in Phrygia to that of Nicomedia in Bithynia by Constantius in 351[61]. Athanasius strongly condemns him and asserts that, like Auxentius of Milan and Epictetus of Centumcellae, he has secured his election through calumnies against the orthodox[62]. He was one of those invited by George of Laodicea to attend the consecration of the church erected by Basil at Ancyra 358[63]. He perished in the earthquake at Nicomedia in August 358[64].

Silvanus - he was present as bishop of Tarsus at Ancyra 358, and later took a prominent part in the discussions at Seleucia[65].

With/

Notes.
61. Ath. Hist. Ar.74.
62. Ep. ad Episc. Aeg. 7.
63. Soz. IV, 13.
64. Soz. IV, 16.
65. Socr. II, 39.

With the other legates, he went to Constantinople[66], and was deposed at the council there[67].

Evagrius - this is probably the bishop of Mitylene in Lesbos who subscribed the Acacian formula at Seleucia[68] and was subsequently deposed by that synod[69].

Hireneus - this must be the Ειρηναιος bishop of Tripolis in Phoenicia, who is said to have subscribed the Acacian formula at Seleucia[70].

L.7 Bassus - this is probably the bishop of Carpathus who was present at Eastern Sardica[71].

Gaudentius - it is not known who this is. It can not be Gaudentius of Naissus who was present at Western Sardica, or Guadentius of Ariminum, because both these bishops were recognised supporters of the Nicene creed.

L.8 Julius - it is scarcely probable that this is the bishop who was present at Western Sardica[72].

Notes.
66. B VIII, 1.
67. Theod. II, 27.
68. Epiph. Haer. 73, 26.
69. Socr. H.E. II, 40.
70. Epiph Haer. 73, 26.
71. A IV, 3 p.77, L.8,9.
72. B II, 4 p.135 L.1.

Nothing is known of Exuperantius, Terentianus, Surinus, Simplicius or Junior.

L.8,9 requirendum omnes haeretici - this phrase is a later interpolation. A copyist evidently thought that "omnes haeretici" needed to be added to complete the thought, and put a note to this effect in the margin. Then, later, someone with less understanding incorporated the whole note into the text, including the now meaningless "requirendum".

B VII, 10 Letter of Liberius to Ursacius, Valens and Germinius. 357.

SUMMARY. (1) Liberius asserts that he writes to them, who are sons of peace, not under any compulsion, but for the sake of peace and concord, which is preferable to martyrdom. He informs them that he had condemned Athanasius before he wrote to the Emperor, and that his only reason for delay in writing to the Easterns concerning the former had been to try and secure the recall of his legates or the bishops who had suffered exile. (2) He then mentions the letter, sent by the hand of Fortunatian, and informing the Emperor and the Easterns about his break from Athanasius, a copy of which he also sent to the Emperor's eunuch, Hilarius. Consequently he now requests them, for the sake of peace and concord, to intercede for him /

him with the Emperor and thus secure his return to Rome. Again he affirms his agreement with them all and also with Epictetus and Auxentius, and separates from communion anyone who dissents.

COMMENTARY. In addition to Faber-Coustant and Baronius, this letter, with B VII, 8 and B VII, 11, has been edited also by Schiktanz[73], and Chapman[74].

p.170 L.11 For Ursacius and Valens cf. A I p.45 L.15. For Germinius cf. A III, p.47 L.16.

L.12 vos filios pacis esse - it had been the assertion of Valens and his friends at Arles and Milan that, when Athanasius was condemned, peace would once more be restored to the Church; and in this letter Liberius stresses that it is the peace of the Church which is his main objective in condemning Athanasius.
His language here is in strong contrast to that used in his letter to the Emperor A VII §4 p.91 L.17sq. "quae est pax etc".

L.13,14 non..impulsus - i.e. his desire to communicate with them is a sincere one, not induced by force, threats or weariness of exile.

L.14,15 sed pro bono..praeponitur - he feels that peace and concord are/

Notes.
73. Die Hilarius - Fragmente p.159sq. (1905).
74. Rev. Ben. 1910 p.32-36.

are to be preferred to martyrdom i.e. though his condemnation of Athanasius and communion with Ursacius and Valens might seem a sign of weakness and entail loss of glory as a martyr, yet the peace and unity thus gained for the Church amply compensate for this. It was expedient that one man should be sacrificed for the Church.[75]

L.15 his litteris convenio vos - his reason for writing to them would be similar to that which prompts him to write B VII, 8. Just as he was about to write to the Easterns as a means of securing a speedy release from exile, so here he appeals to Ursacius, Valens and Germinius, bishops who had always enjoyed the especial favour of Constantius and who had been the mainstay of the Arian cause in the West. For this last reason, indeed, Liberius would naturally expect a ready welcome from them because it was a great victory to have won over the bishop of Rome, even though he was in exile.

L.16 sq. cognoscat itaque etc - the text of A is corrupt, but the sense and to a certain extent the wording can be restored from S. Feder's conjecture p.171 L.2 "scriberem, quod"[76] is to be preferred since it causes less disruption to the text of A.

That he had already condemned Athanasius before he wrote to the Emperor is suggested also in B VII, 8. Baronius[77] interprets it as meaning/

Notes.
75. Contrast his language in B VII, 2.
76. on the basis of a suggestion by Duchesne "Mélanges d'Archéologie et d'Histoire XXVIII (1908) 48.
77. ad ann.357 n.35.

meaning that Liberius had already condemned Athanasius before going into exile according to the letter of the Easterns mentioned in B III. This view, however, is untenable because the reason for Liberius' exile was simply his refusal to condemn Athanasius.

p.171 L.1,2 secundum..episcoporum - this could refer either to a letter sent by himself to the Easterns[78] or to a letter sent by the Easterns to him and asking him to write to the Emperor[79]. The context[80] favours the latter opinion.

L.2,3 quod et..Romanae - Coustant[81] conjectures that immediately after his weakness, Liberius sent a letter to the Roman clergy similar to that given to Vincent, informing them of his condemnation of Athanasius and asking for their help in winning over the Emperor. But it does not seem necessary to suppose such a letter. Liberius gives here as one of the reasons for his condemnation of Athanasius the fact that, since his own departure into exile, the Roman Church (under Felix) has separated the bishop of Alexandria from communion, as all the Roman clergy can testify.[82]

L.3 presbiterium - Liberius calls only the presbyterate to witness because he regards himself, not Felix, as the rightful bishop of Rome.

Notes.

78. such as B VII, 8.
79. such as the one mentioned in B III, p.155 L.17.
80. cf.L.4sq.
81. P.L. X col. 694 (d).
82. It seems less probable that it is a reference to the threat in B III, 1 to excommunicate Athanasius if he did not come to Rome, of which threat the Roman clergy would be aware.

L.4sq sola haec causa etc - Liberius has evidently been questioned about his delay in writing to the Easterns concerning Athanasius. He gives as reason that he was anxious to secure the recall of his legates and the bishops who had been exiled.

The Easterns had obviously been displeased at having to wait so long for an answer to the letter which they had sent Liberius, i.e. the letter of the Easterns mentioned on p.171 L.1. But the bishop of Rome had good reason for not giving a swift reply. He had fulfilled their first request in writing to the Emperor[83] after his condemnation of Athanasius, but in this letter to Constantius he must also have taken the opportunity of asking for the recall of his legates and the other exiled bishops in view of this change in his relations with the bishop of Alexandria. He, therefore, awaited the result of this appeal before writing to the Easterns because its success or failure conditioned his letter to them. If it was successful, he would then appeal through the Easterns for his own release. Mention of the deacon Urbicus being removed from him[84] may be an indication that his first appeal to the Emperor was successful, and the resultant letter to the Easterns could then be B VII, 8.

Until those envoys and bishops, who had been exiled for obeying his instructions in refusing to condemn Athanasius, had been allowed to return home, Liberius could scarcely request his own release from exile.

Notes.
83. p.171 L. 1, 2.
84. B VII, 11 p.173 L.1sq.

L.5 legati mei - i.e. Eusebius, Dionysius, Lucifer[85].

L.6 ad comitatum - i.e. at Milan 355.

p.171 L.6 episcopi - for example, Paulinus of Trèves who was exiled at Arles 353.

L.8,9 Fortunatianum - cf. p.156 L.1sq. p.168 L.15,16.

L.9 litteras meas - this could conceivably be B III, 1 cf. p.168 L.13,15 notes.

L.10sq. perferat quas..imperatorem - some MSS omit this passage. The omission can be explained through the same phrase " ad clementissimum imperatorem" occurring in L.9 and again in L.17; the eye of the copyist has accidentally jumped from L.9 to L.17. Coustant[86] is unwilling to admit the authenticity of this passage, but he is led to this conclusion through erroneously identifying the Easterns mentioned here with those of B VII, 8. It seems more likely that they are the bishops addressed in B III, 1. cf. p.171 L.9, p.168 L.13,15 notes.

L.11 quas credo - sc. "ei"'which I entrust to him'.

L.12 ipsius - i.e. the Emperor. cf. p.172 L.1, 2 pietas eius.

Notes.
85. cf. B VII, 2.
86. P.L. X col. 694 (f).

L.11, 12 quod pietas..accipiet - i.e. as representing a significant advance in the fulfilment of his aim of securing the peace of the Church.

L.13 Hilario - Chapman[87] prefers "Philario" on the supposition that this was a natural name for a forger to invent for an imperial eunuch ("lover of Arius"). But the better MS tradition favours the reading adopted by Feder, and that there was an imperial official of this name active at that time is confirmed in the works of Athanasius[88]. It is probably the same person who is meant here.

L.14sq. quapropter etc. - now he gives his real purpose in writing to them.

p.172 L.3,4 ut temporibus..tribulationem - that the affairs of the Roman church were at a low ebb during the exile of Liberius can be gathered from Theodoret's account of Constantius' visit to Rome in the spring of 357[89].

L.6 sq magnum solatium etc - i.e. disunion and war within the Church are a sin against God. They would therefore be committing a sin, for which they would have to answer at the day of judgment, if they do/

Notes.
87. Rev. Ben. 1910 p.39.
88. e.g. Ath. Apol. ad Const. 24; Hist. Ar.48,81; Hist. Aceph.IV.
89. Theod. H.E. II, 17.

do not secure his return and thus restore peace to the Church. If, however, they do use their influence to secure his release and thus bring peace to the Roman church, this action will stand them in good stead at the Day of Judgment.

L.9 Epictetum - cf. A VI p.87 L.6 and also B III, 2 where it says that Epictetus and Potamius rejoice to condemn the bishop of Rome. In this part of the letter (B VII, 10), Liberius is evidently trying to conciliate a bitter opponent, who was at the same time a close friend of the bishops to whom he is writing. The same applies to Auxentius[90].

L.10 quos credo..suscepturos - this weakness on the part of the bishop of Rome would certainly be received with pleasure by such men, though whether it would make them anxious to help him remained to be seen.

L.13 praevaricatori..dictum - on this anathema cf. B VII, 8 p.169 L.8, 9 note.

CONCLUSION. If the conjecture, that B VII, 8 is the letter referred to on p.171 L.4sq. is correct, then B VII, 10 must have been written before B VII, 8. But both letters are closely connected and deal with the same subject, viz. the release of Liberius from exile.

One/

Notes.
90. for Auxentius cf. A I p.45 L.15.

One is struck by the constant reiteration that he is writing to them with good intentions and of his own free will. Perhaps he felt this necessary when writing to bishops who were conspicuous for the ulterior motives which lay behind so many of their actions. He knows all will say that he is writing these letters because he wants to get back to Rome, and so he wishes to assert that he really believes Athanasius to be guilty.

B VII, 11 Letter of Liberius to Vincent. 357.

SUMMARY. (1) Liberius relates that his deacon Urbicus has been taken away from him. (2) He informs Vincent that he has withdrawn from the contention concerning Athanasius and has intimated this to the Easterns. In consequence, he asks him to assemble all the bishops of Campania, inform them of this, and then write from this assembly to the Emperor in order to secure his release from suffering. He warns him that if he leaves him in exile, God will judge between them.

COMMENTARY. p.172 L.15 Vincentio - cf. A VII p.90,L24 B VII, 3 p.166 L.15sq. The feelings of both Liberius and Vincent can well be imagined. The bishop of Rome, who had so strongly condemned the fall of Vincent at Arles 353, has himself now submitted to the Easterns, and that, too, when in full possession of the facts of the case, knowing well the consequences of his action, and without the excuse of Vincent who could always plead that he had been deceived/

deceived by the Arians into condemning Athanasius at Arles.

The composition of such a letter as this reveals the desperate straits to which Liberius had been brought through the sufferings of exile, because it represents an act of desperation. Only as a last resort would he make this request to Vincent, in view of what he had previously written concerning him[91].

Several reasons would prompt him to write to Vincent (1) the latter had a long connection with the Roman see. As has been remarked, he was probably the Vincent who was one of the two legates of Silvester at Nicaea. He might therefore be thought to have an affection for the see, if not for the bishop of Rome, and be willing to help it in the troubles into which it had fallen after the exile of Liberius[92]. (2) after his temporary lapse at Arles he seems to have reestablished himself again in Italy[93]. Indeed in an epistle of Damasus quoted by Theodoret[94], Vincent is said to have been one of the few bishops who remained firm at Ariminum. He would therefore be a power to be reckoned with so far as Italy was concerned. (3) On the other hand, through that very concession made at Arles, he might have gained some favour with Constantius, who would, in that case, be disposed to listen to a petition coming from him with the support of all the Campanian bishops. Such a petition would show that not only in Rome but in other parts of Italy there was a desire for the return of the exiled Liberius.

Notes.
91. cf. B VII, 6.
92. cf. Theod. II, 17.
93. cf. p.173 L.7,8.
94. II, 17.

p.172 L.16sq. Non doceo etc - Hefele[95] declares that this letter contains the most absurdities of all the exile letters. He can see no sense in the phrase "non doceo, sed admoneo", to which, according to him, the quotation from I Cor.15,33 is added quite irrelevantly, because the letter is really no exhortation but a petition. It is true that the main purpose of the letter is to request Vincent's help, but the petition is hedged round with the admonition first, that he has been brought to this dire extremity through the snares of wicked men and secondly, that if Vincent does not aid him in his distress, God will judge between them.

The quotation from I Cor.15,33 finds its explanation in what follows in L.18,19 "insidiae hominum..perveni"; he had shown courage in suffering exile for his faith, now his good character was ruined and he feels that his present misfortunes, and especially this latest one, viz. the removal of the deacon Urbicus, have been caused through the insidious tricks of evil men. From his own experience at Arles, Vincent could readily sympathise with this.

L.19 laborem - i.e. the distress in which he now finds himself.

p.173 L.1 Urbicus diaconus - nothing else is known about him. Chapman[96] is of the opinion that the forger has invented this name, but there is nothing to support this view. Urbicus is a recognised Roman name. cf. the poet of that name in Juv.6, 71. Mart. 1,42,11.

Notes.
95. Councils II, 241.
96. Rev. Ben. 1910 p.40.

Schiktanz[97] suggests that Urbicus had acted as secretary for Liberius and that his removal could account for the change in style of the Liberius letters. This seems rather a flimsy conjecture, however, as is also his division of the letter into three parts.

There may be a connection here with Liberius' request for the release of his envoys in B VII, 10[98]. Evil men[99] may have taken advantage of this request to have his source of comfort, Urbicus, removed; this may have been an instance of their "insidiae".

L.2 Venerium - he was probably the imperial official in command at Beroea [illegible]. "Agens in rebus" is a technical term used of magistrates and officials cf. Cod. Theod. 6,27. Lucif. Ep. 4. Ath. in P.G. I, 608.

L.4,5 me de contentione...recessisse - Liberius does not say outright (as he does in the other letters) that he has condemned Athanasius; he probably feels embarrassed because of his earlier letter to Ossius[100] where he has censured Vincent for doing that very same thing.

L.5, 6 et ad fratres..eius nomine - i.e. B VII, 8.

L.8 episcopos cunctos Campaniae - i.e. all those under the influence of Vincent.

Notes.
97. p.109.
98. p.171 L.4sq. note.
99. p.172 L.18.
100. B VII, 6.

L.9 una cum epistula vestra - Hefele[101] thinks this refers to Liberius' letter to Vincent[102]. But it seems more probable that Liberius wished Vincent to write a personal letter of request to the Emperor in addition to the general one of the synod.

L.11"et manu ipsius" and L.12 "item manu ipsius pagina perscripta" show that the letter has been copied down by some other person and that Liberius has added this ending himself. cf. B VII, 2 p.166 L.12, 13. It signifies that the above letter is an official copy, and may be evidence for the authentic character of the letter itself, since it does not seem probable that a forger would have adopted this subtlety.

L.13,15 ego me.. et vos - Hefele[103] asserts that this conclusion is unreasonable. But, as at the beginning, so now a satisfactory explanation can be given. Liberius has absolved himself before God with regard to his present line of action, because he now believes that the peace and concord of the Church are to be preferred to martyrdom[104], and therefore wishes to be released from exile. If Vincent is unwilling to help him in these circumstances, God, not man, will be the judge between them. He probably feels that he can appeal to Vincent in this way because of their past relations with each other.

Notes.
101. II, 237.
102. B VII, 11.
103. II, 241.
104. cf.B VII, 10 p.170 L.14,15.

CONCLUSION. Because mention is made of B VII, 8[105], this letter must have been written shortly after that to the Easterns, and once again it shows Liberius desperately anxious to escape from exile and exploring every avenue which seems to offer a hope of release. But this letter to Vincent probably represents his last attempt to regain his freedom through the mediation of others, because, in view of what he had written earlier concerning him[106], it seems reasonable to assume that, only when every other expedient had been tried, would he request his aid.

The order of composition of the exile letters would seem to be: first of all, B III, 1 "Studens"; next B VII, 10 his letter to Valens and the others; then B VII, 8 his letter to the Easterns; and finally B VII, 11 his letter to Vincent.

All of these letters would be written in the first half of 357 before the assembly at Sirmium in the August of that year[107].

Notes.
105. on p.173 L.5,6
106. B VII, 6.
107. cf. p.169 L.7 note.

Series B VIII, 1 Letter of the Legates of the Council of Seleucia 359.

SUMMARY. According to the Easterns, the purpose of their letter is to inform the legates of Ariminum of the reason for the division in the Church. They warn them of the heresy, then prevalent, which denied that the Son is like the Father, and of which they had informed Constantius who had dutifully wished it to be anathematised But they complain that it is Aetius, the author of this heresy, who is being condemned, rather than his doctrine. They desire the Westerns, therefore, to retract this heresy, abstain from any relations with the supporters of the intrigue, and keep the catholic faith. In conclusion, they ask them to intimate all this to the Western churches.

COMMENTARY This letter has been preserved only in this collection. It has been edited by Faber-Coustant and Baronius ad ann. 359 n.XXX.

p.174 L.3 Orientalium - the names of the legates and the tone and purport of the letter show that this term "Easterns" does not include all the parties represented at Seleucia, but only the Semiarians, who indeed formed the majority at the council.

L.4 Reversis ab Arimino legatis - the legates of the synod of Ariminum would be sent off to Constantinople at the close of the synod when all the bishops had subscribed the formula of Nikê, i.e. towards the end of 359.

L.5-7 Dilectissimis..legatis - among the legates of Ariminum, Optatus and Marcialis are mentioned only here, and nothing more is known about them. Magdonius, Megasius and Valens are mentioned in A VI as having written from Ariminum to Constantius. Ursacius, Valens Germinius and Gaius appear often in these documents and are thus well-known. Justinus is probably the bishop mentioned in A V, 3, as having taken part in the synod of Nikê.

ceteris..legatis - for example, Auxentius[1] and perhaps Epictetus[2] These legates are to be distinguished from the first set who were sent to Nikê. Those in B VIII, 1 are the bishops who were sent at the close of the synod of Ariminum after Valens had secured the adoption of the formula of Nikê as the creed of the council.

L.7-10 Silvanus..Macarius - among the legates of Seleucia, nothing is known elsewhere of Erodianus, Theodorus, Valentinus and Macarius. Helpidius, Eucarpus, Eortasius, Neo, Eumatius, Passinicus, Arsenius, Didimion, Silvanus, Patritius and Leontius are all mentioned in the address of the reply which Liberius sent in 366 to the Macedonian bishops[3].

Silvanus will be the bishop of Tarsus who participated in the deposition of Photinus at Sirmium 351. On the exile of Cyril from Jerusalem in 358, Silvanus had welcomed him at Tarsus in spite of protest/

Notes.
1. Ath. De Syn. 11.
2. cf.A VI.
3. Soz. H.E. IV, 12.

protest from Acacius[4]. He was present at Ancyra 358, and, at Seleucia, had advocated acceptance of the Dedication creed of Antioch[5]. As B VIII, 1 indicates, he was one of the bishops deputed at the end of the council to report to Constantius. Deposed at the council of Constantinople 360, he returned to his see under the general amnesty granted by Julian. In 366 he was one of the deputies to Liberius, and returned with the letters of communion of Liberius and the Roman synod[6].

Sofronius is the bishop of Pompeiopolis in Paphlagonia[7]. He was likewise deposed by the Acacians at Constantinople 360.

Neo (or Neonas) is the bishop of Seleucia in Isauria, and was also deposed at Constantinople[8].

Helpidius is probably the bishop mentioned in Socr. II, 42 as Ἑλπίδιος Σατάλων τῆς Ἀρμενίας; he, too, was deposed at Constantinople.

Theophilus was a man of high character for whom Basil of Ancyra had much regard. Previously he had been elected bishop of Eleutheropolis in Palaestina Prima, when he had sworn not to accept any other bishopric[9]. The translation of Theophilus to Castabala in Cilicia by Silvanus of Tarsus was made a ground of accusation against the latter at Constantinople[10]. He joined with Silvanus, Basil and other leading Semiarians in requesting Jovian, immediately after his accession, to confirm the decrees of Seleucia, banish the Anomoeans/

Notes.
4. Theod. II, 22.
5. Socr. II, 39.
6. Basil Ep. 67.
7. Soz. IV, 24. Socr. II, 39,40.
8. Socr. II, 42. Soz. IV, 24.
9. Soz. IV, 24.
10. ibid.

Anomoeans and hold a general council[11]. Later, he was one of the envoys sent by the council of Lampsacus to Liberius of Rome[12]. He appears also in the correspondence of Basil, to whom he caused much sorrow by joining in the calumnious charges made against him by Eustathius of Sebaste. Despite all this, however, Basil said he would still cherish his friendship[13].

Ecdicius is probably the presbyter spoken of with contempt by Basil, and intruded into the see of Parnasus in Cappadocia by Demosthenes of Pontus in place of Hypsinus[14].

Passinicus will be the bishop of Zela who took part in the embassy to Jovian at Antioch in 363[15]. The see of Zela was among those represented at Eastern Sardica[16].

Leontius is the bishop of Comana who was a member of the embassy to Jovian. There are two sees of Comana, one in Cappadocia, the other in Hellenopontus; both were represented at Nicaea 325[17]. Leontius is usually associated with the one in Cappadocia.

Eortasius appears to be the bishop of Sardes in Lydia, who signed the letter issued by the council of Ancyra 358[18]. He was deposed at Constantinople 360 for having been elected to Sardes without the consent of the Prefect and bishops of the province. He was again active, however, at the synod of Lampsacus and is mentioned in Liberius'/

Notes.
11. Socr. III, 25.Soz.VI, 4.
12. Socr. IV, 12. Soz.VI, 10,11, 12.
13. Basil, Epp. 130, 244, 245.
14. Basil Epp. 226, 237, 239. Le Quien Oriens. Christ. I, 415.
15. Socr. III, 25.
16. cf.A IV, 3.
17. Patres Nic. V, 97.
18. Epiph. Haer. 73, 11.

Liberius' answer to the Lampsacus embassy. Theodoret[19] mentions that Basil of Ancyra, Eustathius of Sebaste and Eleusius of Cyzicus were also members of this embassy. If this is correct, there must have been strong reason for their omission because these bishops were the real leaders of the Semiarian party: (1) it might denote a split in the Semiarian party at this time. There would be great resentment in some circles against Basil and his friends for having given consent to the Dated Creed at Sirmium 359 because this action ruined any chance of success which the Semiarians might have had at Seleucia. (2) the omission might be a diplomatic one, Basil and the others being present but not mentioned because of their conduct at Sirmium 359 or (3) the names might have dropped out accidentally in the course of transmission, though this is as unlikely as that Hilary himself would omit them purposely because of the embarrassment of their action at Sirmium.

Officially only 10 members of the synod of Seleucia had been appointed to take the decisions to the Emperor[20], but for various reasons other members of the synod had come to Constantinople[21]. Even after their defeat at Seleucia, the Semiarians had not given up hope but had come to Constantinople, hopeful of snatching victory there. None of the bishops mentioned in B VIII, 1 were necessarily, of course, members of their embassy to Constantius.

Notes.
19. H.E. II, 23.
20. Theod. II, 23. Soz. IV, 23.
21. Soz. l.c.

p.174 L.11, 12 ex synodi..renitentes - according to Philostorgius[22], Constantius had called the synod in favour of the Anomoeans, but this is unlikely in view of the Semiarian victory at Ancyra 358. Sozomen[23] is of the opinion that it was called to put an end to the Anomoean doctrine. Socrates[24], however, is probably to be trusted when he says that the aim of Constantius was to reconcile the various divisions among the Arians. The Emperor's desire was to secure unity and true peace through agreement on the doctrinal issue.

p.174 L.12 quae circa ecclesiam aguntur - i.e. at Constantinople, where affairs had reached an advanced state, when both the Semiarians and the Anomoeans had lost favour, and the Acacian standpoint, which had gained strength at Seleucia, was being confirmed.

L.13 tantae impietatis - i.e. the acts and doctrine of the Acacians.

L.14,15 totius synodi legatos - the Semiarians probably base this claim on the fact that they were by far the most numerous and most widely represented of the parties at the synod. According to their statement in this letter, they had over 100 representatives[25], whereas their opponents had only 40-50 bishops present[26].

Notes.
22. H.E. IV, 10.
23. III, 19: IV, 16.
24. II, 27.
25. Hil. c. Const. 12 says 105. Ath. De Syn.12 gives 160.
26. Socr. II, 39 says 36. Epiph. Haer.73, 26 says 43. Hil.c.Const. 12 says 19.

L.16 nunc usque..abstinere - the Semiarians would probably take this course of action when they perceived that the Acacians were in control and enjoyed the favour of the Emperor at Constantinople, just as they had done at Seleucia.

L.18sq heresis invalescat etc - not only did the Acacian formula, like the creed of Nike, reject the terms"ousia" and "homoousios"[27], it also rejected the watchword of the Semiarians "homoiousios". To the Semiarians "like to the Father" meant likeness in everything, including substance, whereas the Acacians interpreted it as likeness only in will.

L.22-24 nam et...voluit - when the Semiarians arrived at Constantinople, they found Constantius already inclined to favour the Acacians. They tried to counteract this by drawing attention to the blasphemies of Eudoxius, and Eustathius produced a profession of faith which he attributed to Eudoxius and which was openly Anomoean. While disowning this profession and successfully transferring the blame to Aetius, Eudoxius was still compelled verbally and formally to repudiate Anomoeanism[28]. This will be what is referred to here.

L.24,25 Aetius..haeresis - Aetius was the chief inspirer of the most extreme section in the Arian party. He has been described as "the first/

Notes.
27. Ath. De. Syn. 29. Socr. II, 40. Epiph. Haer.73, 25.
28. Socr. IV, 23. Theod.II, 27.

first to carry out the doctrines of Arius to their legitimate issue[29] and the chief proposition of his sect was that the Son is unlike (ἀνόμοιος) the Father. From this watchword they were called Anomoeans[30].

He first came into prominence at Antioch where he was ordained deacon c.350 by Leontius, bishop of that city[31], but, on the protest of Flavius and Diodorus, he was inhibited from performing his office.[32] In 356 he was in Alexandria, supporting the Arian party; there he served as deacon under George, and began his association with Eunomius[33]. Even before the councils of Ariminum and Seleucia he had been exiled because of his extreme views but, despite that, his doctrine continued to spread in the Church[34]. At Constantinople, after confessing authorship of an Anomoean profession of faith[35], he was deposed and sent into exile, first to Mopsuestia, then to Amblada in Pisidia[36],

That the writers of this letter were correct in accusing their opponents of having surrendered the person of Aetius, while still retaining his doctrine, is proved both from the compromise solution adopted by the Acacians and from subsequent events. The condemnation of Aetius convinced the Acacians that the use of terms of manifestly Arian character would not be tolerated. They were, therefore, compelled to select a term, which, while apparently innocuous in/

Notes.
29. D.C.B.I, 51.
30. or sometimes Eunomians after Aetius' pupil, Eunomius.
31. Philost.III, 17. Socr.II, 35. Ath. De Syn. 38.
32. Theod.II, 24.
33. Socr. II, 22. Philost.III, 20.
34. cf. the letter of George of Laodicea in Soz. VI, 13.
35. cf. L.22-24 note.
36. Soz. IV, 23,24. Theod.II, 27. Philost.IV, 12.

in itself, could still be imbued with Arian meaning, a term which would seem akin to that of the Semiarians and still be useful for their own purposes. The word eventually adopted by them was ὅμοιος. "We distinctly acknowledge that the Son is like (ὅμοιον) the Father in accordance with what the Apostle has declared concerning Him Who is the image of the invisible God"[37]. But the Acacians declared that this likeness extended only to the will and not to the substance[38]. So far as similarity in substance was concerned, the Acacians still held the position of Aetius.

This impression is confirmed by later events, for example, the favour shown Aetius by Julian[39]; the removal of the ecclesiastical censure from Aetius by the Arian, Euzoius of Antioch, and the defence of his doctrines issued by the Arians[40]; the synodal letter sent by the Acacians in 360 from Constantinople to George of Alexandria reports only generally on the deposition of Aetius without mentioning the Aetian teaching[41].

p.175 L.1 haec - i.e. the impieties of the Acacians.

L.2-4 ceterum non..nuntianda - the Semiarians evidently hoped that, if they gained an alliance with the Westerns, they might still secure the favour of Constantius. There is no doubt that an union between Eastern Semiarians and Western Nicenes would have had great influence upon him in his desire for unity in the Church; indeed it was to avoid/

Notes.
37. Socr. II, 40.
38. Hil. c. Const. 14. Socr.II, 40. Soz.IV, 22.
39. Ep. Julian 15 in Loeb III (1923)p.35. Soz.V,5. Philost IX, 4.
40. Philost. VII, 5; VIII, 2.
41. Theod. II, 28.

avoid such a possible union that the Arians had persuaded Constantius in the first place to call two separate synods, one for the West and the other for the East.

CONCLUSION. This letter has obviously been written before the surrender of the Semiarians and their signature of the formula of Nikê on 31st. Dec. 359. It gives an interesting indication of the position and hopes of the Semiarians during the meetings in the Emperor's palace at Constantinople. Undismayed by the happenings at Seleucia, they had come to Constantinople, still hoping to recapture Constantius' favour, but, on arrival, found that the Acacians had already gained the confidence of the Emperor. Their last hope of victory seemed to them to lie in the prestige to be gained from an alliance between East and West[42] and so, with the arrival of the legates from Ariminum, they had written this letter, warning them to beware of the deceits of the Acacians. It is obvious that they were totally unaware of what had taken place at Ariminum. But they were not kept long in ignorance, because Valens and his associates immediately attached themselves to the Acacians, represented their formula as being in accordance with the wishes of the Western synod, secured Acacian approval of it, and thus completely reversed the hopes and plans of the Semiarians.

Notes.
42. It would be interesting to conjecture how great a part Hilary had played in advocating this proposal.

Series B VIII, 2 Narrative Text.

SUMMARY. (1) After stating that they had added the afore-mentioned blasphemies to this letter, the author of the narrative text makes a strong, direct address to the Western legates at Constantinople, urging them to make their faith known : "If they do not approve of the "liber" of Valens and Ursacius, then why do they not condemn it? If they do not condemn it, they must approve of it". He rebukes them for their conduct at Constantinople because they had paid no attention to the warnings of the Seleucian legates but had joined themselves to heretics, and also because they had previously yielded to the blasphemous book of Valens and Ursacius and thus failed the synod of Ariminum.

(2) When asked why they did not say that the Son of God is a creature, they replied to the bishop of Ariminum that they did not deny that but asserted that He was different from all the other creatures. Their deceit was obvious in the phrase "He is not from anything existing but from God" because they meant that His birth came not from the substance but from the will. Then, too, they profess Him "eternal with the Father" but they mean not an already anterior, but a future eternity. Their deception is also revealed in the phrase "like according to the Scriptures".

So their impiety cries out against them. (3) They had heard Christ denied as true Son of God and Only-begotten God, and had not raised a protest, nay to say the opposite would be more correct. Their falsity at Nikê is known everywhere. Previously they had deceived men, now they professed hatred of the God Christ.

COMMENTARY.

p.175 L.7 calumnia..intenditur - Schiktanz[43] suggests that the "eum" (L.7) might refer either to the person who was the originator of this letter or to the bearer of it, but, in that case, it is difficult to give any explanation of the "calumnia". It seems better to refer it to Aetius, and the "calumnia" then indicates the trick practised on him by Eudoxius at Constantinople whereby Aetius, as self-confessed author of an Anomoean profession of faith, suffered deposition and exile, while Eudoxius and the other Acacians were able, not only to preserve his doctrine unchanged, but also to enjoy the favour of the Emperor[44]. In their letter B VIII, 1, the Easterns had made it quite clear to the Acacians that, though the Emperor was deceived, they themselves were fully aware of this artifice. cf. p.175 L.8 tantus detectae..furor and also p.174 L.22-24, 24 notes.

"has blasphemias" has to be inserted before "suscepit" (L.7) to complete the sense.

L.9 ut periculum..constituerent - subsequent events prove that the Acacians would probably have tried to save Aetius if it had been at all possible, but Eudoxius found himself too hard pressed by the Semiarians, and to save himself had to sacrifice Aetius[45]. First

of/

Notes.

43. p.119.
44. This interpretation is strengthened by the phrase L.9 "periculum depositionis in eo".
45. cf. Soz. IV, 23. Theod. II, 27.

of all a sentence of banishment was prepared against Aetius, and finally he was deposed at the council of Constantinople 360[46].

L.9sq. qui convictae etc - the falsity of the Acacians and their fear of the truth, as revealed in the above letter, gives Hilary a lead for his attack on the legates of Ariminum. They, too, had been guilty of deceit by failing to anathematise the heresies contained in the book of Valens and Ursacius, and by denying what they knew to be true, they had betrayed the trust placed in them.

L.11 liber iste Valentis et Ursacii - i.e. the one accepted at Nikê on 10th Oct. 359[47] and put forward at Constantinople for signature by the Seleucian legates of both parties, Acacian and Semiarian[48]. It would consist of the creed of Nikê and the proposals which had to be added to secure the assent and approval of the bishops of Ariminum[49].

Some, at least, of the legates of Ariminum had evidently been trying to apologise for their conduct. Hilary upbraids them because though they had not been completely won over by the arguments of Valens and Ursacius, they had yet allowed themselves to be hustled by the extremists and had lacked the courage to voice their protest.

L.17,18 post synodum..venientes - the context reveals that this does not refer to the bishops coming from Seleucia to Constantinople, but to/

Notes.
46. Theod. II, 28.
47. cf. A V, 3.
48. Soz. IV, 23. Basil Epp. 244-263.
49. Sulp. Sev. H.S.II,44. Jer. Dial. c. Lucif. 17sq.

to the legates who arrived in Constantinople from Ariminum after the synod of Seleucia was ended (but still before the council of Constantinople 360).

L.18 dampnatis hereticis - i.e. the Acacians, whom Hilary regards as having been condemned when the Anomoean doctrine was anathematised. cf. p.174 L.22-24 note.

So fixed was the determination of the legates of Ariminum to join the Acacians that the warning of the Semiarians, contained in their letter B VIII, 1, had not caused them to delay their purpose even for a moment. Hilary seems to have felt that if they had not been so impetuous, there might still have been some hope of an alliance between the Semiarians and themselves.

L.21 episcopis - i.e. the Acacians. legati - i.e. the Semiarians who wrote B VIII, 1.

L.22,23 dominantem..haeresim - cf. p.174 L.17,18 note.

L.23 vel nunc - i.e. at the time when the Easterns made their approach to the Western legates.

L.24-26 sed nescio.. recepistis - i.e. by joining the heretics, they have of their own accord and in full knowledge rejected the rightful course of action.

L.26 vestris - i.e. the Acacians with whom they have chosen to associate. Similarly "blasphemiarum vestrarum" refers to the blasphemies

of the Acacians which they have now accepted as their own.

p.176 L.1, 2 sin pudor aliquos fefellisset - this is another indication that not all the legates had agreed completely with the extremists, Valens and Ursacius.cf. p.175 L.11 note. Rufinus[50] and Augustine[51] attribute the deception of very many at Ariminum to ignorance.

p.176 L.2 Ariminensem synodum aestimari - it was not only their own reputationswhich were at stake, but that of the whole synod of Ariminum. By their conduct would the synod be judged.

L.2 dolum - cf. p.175 L.9sq.note. The deceit latent in their claim to represent the whole synod of Ariminum, though as yet concealed, was also to be revealed by later events.

L.3 vestris - sc. blasphemiis.

L.5 in conventu..arguentium - from the context it appears that this assembly took place at Ariminum on the return of Valens, Ursacius and the other legates from Nikē. They returned to find strong opposition from the bishops who had remained at Ariminum and who now refused to acknowledge the action of their legates. Gradually this opposition was worn down until at last only 20 bishops remained firm/

Notes.
50. H.E. i (X) 21.
51. c. Maxim. Ar.II, 14,3.

firm in spite of all threats and violence. So Valens and his associates had to resort to a different method in order to overcome them. They asserted that the formula in question had been composed in an entirely orthodox sense, but, if it did not fully satisfy them, they could make further additions. To this, the 20 bishops agreed, and Phoebadius of Agen and Servatius of Tongres were chosen by their colleagues to make the additions, in the first of which Arius and his whole doctrine were anathematised. To make it seem even more convincing, Valens himself proposed the further addition that "the Son of God is not a creature, like the other creatures". Because all the other additions sounded orthodox, Phoebadius and his friends thought they had gained the victory, while Valens and his followers were satisfied at having achieved their aim through the acceptance of the original confession[52]. The creed of Nikê and its additions must be identified with the book of Valens and Ursacius mentioned in § 1 of B VIII, 2. In addition to these passages in Hilary's work information can also be gained concerning these additions in Jerome Dial. c.Lucif. 18 P.L. 23 col.180.

In § 2, Hilary proceeds to demonstrate how Valens and his party were able to interpret these additions in a heretical sense.

The 'vos' refers to the Western legates who came to Constantinople.

Notes.
52. Sulp. Sev. H.S.II, 44.

L.5,6 cur etiam..diceretis - Coustant[53] wants to insert another "non" before "diceretis", but this does not seem necessary. The bishops of Ariminum were asking in what sense Valens and his group said that the Son is not a creature. Their answer was that He is not a creature like the other creatures[54]. As the author of the narrative text shows, though this phrase might seem to the unwary to be quite orthodox, the real aim of Valens was to assert, not the dissimilarity of the Son of God from the creature, but that while in some respects the Son was dissimilar, He was still in essence a creature.

L.11 aliud - i.e. different in substance.

L.12,13 testes sunt qui audierunt - this might be taken as an indication that Hilary has contact with other Western bishops in addition to the legates who came to Constantinople. The information given in § 2 as a whole gives justification for thinking that this part has been composed when Hilary has gained more knowledge about the events at Nikê and Ariminum, and has had time for further reflection upon them.

L.14 liber vester - cf.p.175 L.11 note.

Notes.
53. P.L. X col. 707 f.
54. "non esse creatum velut ceteras facturas" would be the phrase used in their book.

L.16 "non de nullis.. ex deo" - Valens had confessed that Christ is not from nothing[55] but from God; Hilary now shows that by this he meant, not that Christ is from the substance of God, but that He came from the will of God like the other creatures.

L.19-22 mentior plane..voluntate dixissent - it is most probable that this is a reference to the signature of the Ancyran (358) synodal letter and anathemas by all the court bishops at Sirmium, of whom Valens was one[56]. In the eighteenth anathema is condemned "whoever says the Son is only of the power (that is, of the will of the Father), not of the power and the substance of the Father together"; and there are others similar in content.

L.20 libelli - probably a reference to the Ancyran synodal letter and anathemas.

L.22 aeternum..cum patre - Valens and his supporters proclaimed the Son to be eternal with the Father, but they meant this only in the sense in which angels and human souls are eternal i.e. a future eternity. So they could still teach that "there was when He was not" and "before He was born, He was not", and that "the Son of God was not 'ante saecula'"; cf. B II, 6 p.144 L.7sq.

Notes.
55. cf. the anathema in the Nicene creed.
56. Epiph. Haer. 73 n.2sq. Hil. De Syn. 12 sq.

L.27 similem secundum scripturas - lastly, Valens and his party asserted that the Son is like the Father according to the Scriptures. Hilary shows that this phrase also is an evasion because the likeness need not extend to the substance but only entail a parabolic likeness, as, for example, a grain of mustard seed to the kingdom of heaven, and "all likeness which is not identity implies difference if the comparison is only pushed far enough"[57].

The phrase could also be taken to exclude all likeness not found in Scripture.

p.177 L.1-3 sed percurrere..vestrae opera - this sentence shows that the whole book was known to Hilary, although he has selected only the most important of the impieties to prove his case.

L.9 vos - Hilary is still addressing the Western legates at Constantinople.

L.11 reclamantibus - i.e. the Semiarians at Constantinople. cf.B VIII, 1.

L.12 obstrepentibus - i.e. the Acacians at Constantinople.

p.177 L.12 ex biblioteca vestra - this probably refers to the book of Valens and Ursacius with the additions of Phoebadius and Servatius/

Notes.
57. Gwatkin Studies p.174.

Servatius. Valens and the other legates came to Constantinople with the creed which they asserted had been accepted by the whole of the West; on their union with the Acacians, the latter adopted it as their creed, and so they were in a strong position to compel the Semiarians also to accept this creed of Nikê. On 31st. Dec. 359, Constantius extorted the signatures of the Semiarians to this "Nicene" creed. In this way the Western legates had actively helped to spread impiety and wage war against God.

L.14,15 ubi igitur...dampnatas esse? - Hilary treats scornfully their statement at the end of the creed of Nikê "and all the heresies, both those which have been afore condemned already, and whatever are of modern date, being contrary to this published statement, be they anathema".

Apud Nicheam Thraciae - i.e. the council held at Nikê in the autumn of 359 when Valens and his associates broke down the resistance of the representatives of the orthodox bishops of Ariminum secured their signature to the creed of Nikê, and so began the process which culminated in the Acacian victory at Constantinople.

L.15,16 in lumen..protracta est - i.e. their false assertion about condemning all heresies is revealed through the heresy of their own creed of Nikê.

L.18 haereticos - i.e. the Acacians.

L.18/

L.18,19 quod antea..fefellistis - i.e. all the deceitful practices, creeds and synods of the heretics since Nicaea, such as the pretended submission of Valens and Ursacius to Julius[58], the deceit practised on the orthodox bishops by Valens at the close of the synod of Ariminum[59].

At the end of this document in the MSS came the words "Explicit sci Hilarii ex opere historico".

CONCLUSION. Duchesne is of the opinion that this narrative text formed an address delivered by Hilary in Constantinople on the arrival of the Western legates. Feder agrees that this is not impossible, but feels that there is no direct evidence for it, and that it seems more probable that he wrote it later when composing his book in Constantinople, that is, that it is a rhetorical address.

Perhaps both views have an element of truth. In its direct appeal and in its fervour, it sounds like a personal address, which would be later entrusted to writing and incorporated among the rest of the material. This would account for its disjointed character, part of it[60] having been originally included in the address, and part[61] having been written later when the material was being pieced together.

Notes.
58. cf. B II, 6.
59. cf. p.176 L.5 note.
60. for example § 1 p.175 L.11sq. § 3.
61. for example § 2.

That Hilary did make an approach to these Western legates finds confirmation in the letter of the synod of Paris[62], and §§ 1 and 3 of B VIII, 2 give an idea of the substance of this approach. A I § 4 informs us that this approach was unsuccessful.

Because the author of the narrative text disregards Valens and Ursacius when addressing the Western legates, Feder[63] and Schiktanz[64] think it necessary to assume another narrative text giving an account of the earlier events and explaining this distinction made between the Arian leaders and the rest of the legates. It is questionable if this is necessary. By this time, after all their deceits and volte-faces, Hilary was well aware of their real character and knew that it was useless to make any appeal to them. The narrative text itself indicates that he had approached the Western legates only because he felt that there was still hope of detaching some of them at least from the extreme course of action purposed by Valens and Ursacius. In his address, Hilary disregards Valens and Ursacius, simply because of the futility of such an appeal.[65]

Notes.
62. cf. A I § 4 p.45 L.11-13 neque eos..nuntiaverit.
63. p.112.
64. p.120.
65. This address of Hilary at Constantinople could be one of the three "libelli" mentioned by Sulpicius Severus, Chron.II, 45.

Appendix A:

Oratio Synodi Sardicensis Ad Constantium Imperatorem et Textus Narrativus S. Hilarii (the so-called Liber I ad Constantium).

Introduction.

Among the works of Hilary have been transmitted three letters addressed directly to the Emperor Constantius, namely Ad Constantium I and II and c. Constantium. Both ad Const. II and c. Const. belong to the time of Hilary's sojourn at Constantinople in 359/360 and correspond readily with the otherwise attested facts of that time. But the Ad Const. I has, until comparatively recently, raised many difficult problems for commentators. For long it was regarded as a treatise which was issued c. 355 by a Gallic synod under the presidency of Hilary[1]. In his edition of 1693 Coustant raised several difficulties with regard to this writing but offered no satisfactory solution. It was not until A.Wilmart published his work[2] that most of the problems surrounding this treatise were resolved, and his findings have won general acceptance[3].

Wilmart shows that the earliest traces of this work are to be found in the writings of Phoebadius of Agen (c. Arr. written c.357) and Gregory of Elvira (De fide, written c. 358), and, as these two writers are also known to have used the work of Hilary published c.356[4], it seems a reasonable conclusion that this letter and narrative/

Notes.
1. cf. Reinkens Bk. II ch. 1.
2. in Rev. Ben. XXIV (1907) p.149-179, 291-317 "L'Ad Constantium I,I de St. Hilaire de P. et les Fragments Hist."
3. cf. Feder Stud. I p.138sq. Chapman in Rev. Ben. 1910. E.Griffe "La Gaule Chretienne"I. Glorieux "Hilaire et Libere".
4. cf. Max Schiktanz "Die Hilarius - Fragmente".

narrative text date from the same time and were indeed a constituent part of this work.

Though Jerome[5] mentions the so-called Ad Const.II and the c. Const., he makes no reference to the present work. But Sulpicius Severus[6] speaks of three "libelli" of Hilary directed to the Emperor and requesting an audience, and Wilmart suggests that he thus indicated Ad Const. I and II and c. Const[7] and that the letter and narrative text had by this time become already separated from the main work. More certain is the fact that, in his Chronicle, he used the description of the council of Milan given in the Ad Const. I and indeed in a more complete form than exists today.

It is not until the sixth century that there is definite evidence of the existence of this writing in its present form. A sixth century codex, Vaticanus Basilicanus S. Petri D. 182, transmits a "lib.I sc̄ hilari ad constantium imp.", and, about the same time, at the beginning of the sixth century, in a letter to Pelagius and Anatolius, Fulgentius Ferrandus mentions a SECOND book which Hilary wrote to the Emperor Constantius[8], evidently referring to the Ad Const.II and distinguishing it from the Ad Const. I.

These ancient testimonies provide evidence for the conclusion that the so-called Ad Const. I formed part of Hilary's work of 356 and existed in its present form as early as the sixth century, if not before.

Notes.
5. De vir. ill.100, written c. 392.
6. Chron. II, 45, written c. 403.
7. For different interpretation cf. Commentary on B VIII, 2 and section on "Hilary and the Arian Controversy"
8. P.L. LXVII, 922.

So far as the actual contents are concerned, Wilmart divides the book into two parts (a) a synodal letter (b) the narrative text. He shows that the letter has been issued by an assembly of bishops desirous of settling the religious troubles of the time and especially the question concerning Athanasius; but which Assembly? Two names and two dates, he asserts, emerge - Sardica 343 and Milan 355. Because the letter, though addressed to Constantius, indicates that there are, at the time of writing, two emperors[9], also because of the absolute tone employed by Hilary in speaking of the council of Milan[10], and because of the fact that the letter protests, not against the exile of several Italian bishops perpetrated at Milan, but of previously consummated violences, Wilmart concludes that the synod to be preferred is that of Sardica 343. He proceeds to give more definite proof of this by a comparison of facts collected from the other Sardican documents; for example, there is the same plea for the recall of the exiles made by the Sardican embassy to Constantius, reported in Ath. Hist. Ar.20,as in this letter; there is a parallel in the Sardican letter to Julius in the description of Valens and Ursacius, and a reference to a letter sent to the Emperors by the council of Sardica, which must be the Ad Const. I; there is also a reference to this letter in the letter to the Mareotis[11]; the Sardican letter to the church of Alexandria and the bishops of Egypt and Libya[12] also affords a parallel.

Notes.
9. cf. p. 182 L.6-8 iccirco laboratis...potiantur.
10. cf. p.186 L.19sq. Venio nunc etc.
11. P.L. LVI, 848.
12. Ath. Apol. c. Ar. 39, 43.

That Hilary did indeed use the letter of Sardica to Constantius in his work is known from the ending of B II, 11. Thus Wilmart upholds the claim of the letter to be considered among the authentic documents remaining to us from the council of Sardica.

Closely united with the letter is the narrative text which deals partly with the preceding letter and partly with the synod of Milan 355, the latter section being only imperfectly preserved. The contents of the N.T. make its connection with Hilary's historical-polemic work of 356 most obvious. Both are concerned with the justification of Athanasius, the defence of the Nicene creed, and the exposition of Arian deceit shown through the councils of Sardica, Arles and Milan. Its proper position in this work would seem to be after the narrative text B II, 11 which closes with the words "sed multum ad cognitionem proficiet, si, quae post absolutionem Athanasi ad Constantium imperatorem synodi Sardicensis, oratio fuerit, cognoscatur". In addition, Wilmart shows how this N.T. has the style and vocabulary of Hilary and the same spirit with its earnest devotion to preserving the Nicene creed pure and undefiled.

In view of all this, it seems reasonably safe to assume that both letter and N.T. formed an integral part of Hilary's work of 356.

The books Ad Const. I and II and c. Const. were first edited by G. Cribellus at Milan 1489 and his text was adopted in the edition of Badius, published at Paris in 1510, and, with only minor corrections in those of Erasmus, M. Lypsius and J. Gillot. Not until Coustant's edition of 1693 was any real attempt made to correct the text, but he unfortunately erred in relying too exclusively on one particular family of Gallic codices. In his edition of 1916 Feder has tried to avoid this danger.

SUMMARY. (1) The bishops request the Emperor to end the persecutions and injuries inflicted upon the catholic churches by their brother Christians. They protest against civil judges interfering in ecclesiastical affairs and also (2) against the use of violence to secure harmony in the Church. The only way to secure peace is for everyone to have full personal freedom so that all blasphemies may be rejected and faithful bishops supported. (3) It is not the orthodox but the Arians who are spreading dissension, corrupting the Gospel and apostolic teaching, concealing heretical teaching behind fair words. (4) They plead that all exiled, faithful bishops may be restored to their sees, and (5) pour scorn on this Arian heresy, which is only of recent origin and reduces to nothing the Christian faith of past centuries. The men who have invented those falsehoods are well-known, and those who enter into communion with them are in danger of eternal punishment since they thus participate in their crimes.

COMMENTARY. The letter and narrative text are preserved only in the works of Hilary. The title given to the letter in Feder's edition is adapted from the ending of B II, 11 p.154 L.24,25.cf. Wilmart l.c. p.198. Before Wilmart's article, this letter was attributed to Hilary.cf. the title in Coustant's edition P.L. X. col. 557-8.

p.181 L.1 synodi Sardicensis - the contents show this to be Western Sardica.

L.3,4 et textus narrativus S. Hilarii - Feder adds this for the sake of clarity.

p.181 L.5 Liber I ad Constantium - i.e. the designation commonly given in the MSS.

L.11sq. ne diutius catholicae etc - cf. Ep. syn. Sard. ad Iulium B II, 3 §3 p.128, L.10sq.[13]

catholicae - i.e. those supporting the council of Nicaea. As the friends of Arius gradually recovered the favour of Constantine, they began to attack the leading supporters of the Nicene creed. Through the sufferings of their bishops, the catholic churches were thus grievously afflicted.

Notes.
13. On the correspondence between this letter and the various Sardican documents cf. Introduction.

L.13 a fratribus nostris - though supporters of Arius, they were still regarded as brothers in Christ. Sozomen[14] has a similar passage in which he declares that persecution of this kind seemed even more severe than that suffered under heathen emperors.

L.13 - p.182 L.2 provideat et decernat etc - cf. ep. syn. Sard. ad eccl. Alex. in Ath. Apol. c. Ar.39 and en. syn. Sard. ad episc. Aeg. in ibid 43.

L.14 iudices - Telfer[15] states that it is significant of the difference of view of East and West that "iudices", for the Westerns at Sardica, means exclusively civil magistrates[16] while the Easterns there apply it to the bishops commissioned to try Athanasius at Tyre[17].

In cod. Theod. Bk XVI, Tit. II, No 12 Law of Sept.355 "de episcopis et clericis" it is ordered that episcopal causes are to be judged only by bishops, and Baronius[18] thinks that this ruling was laid down in answer to this entreaty.

This protest indicates that not only the Emperor but also his civil officials were interfering in church affairs, and that, in this particular instance at least, the Western Nicene group (who, it may be noted, here stood to lose by this interference) favoured

Notes.
14. IV, 26.
15. Harvard Theol. Review XLIII p.69.
16. cf. also B II, 1 §3 p.111 L.5.
17. cf. A IV, 1 §10.
18. ad ann. 355 n.78.

complete separation of church and civil matters. Ossius adopted the same position in his famous letter to Constantius[19] where he declared that God had put the kingdom into the hands of the Emperor but had entrusted the affairs of His Church to the bishops. (But again this was written at a time when the Nicenes could hope for no advantage whatever from the imperial power). It must be admitted that the Nicenes were not always consistent in this attitude. cf. the imperial pressure used to gain adherence to the decisions taken at Nicaea and the use made of the favour of Constans towards them in procuring the synod of Sardica and then the return of Athanasius to Alexandria in 346.

Many instances could be given of the use made by the Arians of the civil power - in their letter the Sardican bishops are probably referring to the events at Tyre 335 and the work of the Mareotic commission.

It would seem that neither side was absolutely free from this stigma, and that both were prepared to seek the assistance of the civil power when it suited their purpose.

p.182 L.1 innocentes homines - e.g. Athanasius.

L.4-6 his..qui non cessant...aspargere - e.g. those who participated in the synod of Eastern Sardica. cf. ep. syn. Sard. B II, 1 § 7 p.119 L.4sq; and B II, 2 § 4 p.129 L.9sq.

Notes.
19. in Ath. Hist. Ar.44.

L.8-11 non alia ratione..vivendi arbitrium - cf. ep. syn. Sard. ad eccles. Alex.in Ath. Apol. c. Ar. 39.

L.11sq. certe vox exclamantium etc - cf. Lucifer[20]: certimus una hac voce religiosa "Christianus sum, nolo esse ut tu es, Constantius, apostata", omne crimen excludi.

L.18 praepositos - "praepositus" had been used as the equivalent of "episcopus" from Cyprian onwards.

L.19 foedera caritatis - i.e. the bonds of love which unite the people with their bishop and both with Christ.

L.22 lux et tenebrae confundantur - cf. ep. syn. Sard. B II, 1 § 8 p.125 L. 2, 3.

L.24 non insitam sed ingenitam - "not implanted by nature but (rather) inherited (from his father)."

p.183 L.1, 2 ut non studium..praestent - cf. p.181 L.13sq. provideat et decernat etc.

L.6sq Non quisquam perversus etc - to secure peace in the Church was the overruling purpose in Constantius' ecclesiastical policy. Knowing/

Notes.
20. P.L. XIII, col.1011 "Moriendum esse pro dei filio".

Knowing this, the Arians always made it a principal charge against the orthodox that not only were they wrong theologically but also were to blame for all the quarrels and strife which disrupted the Church.cf. A IV, 1 the letter of Eastern Sardica.

L.8sq. et nunc, qui Arriana etc - after answering the charge of sedition, the bishops bring a three fold accusation against the Arians, similar to that made by Hilary in his Preface. cf. B I §5 p.102 L.3,4 "corruptio evangeliorum, depravatio fidei, et simulata Christi nominis blasphema confessio".

p.183 L.11 rectam apostolorum regulam - cf. Ad Const. II §6 fidem apostolicam. Hil. De Syn. 63 perfectam atque apostolicam fidem.

L.12-16 callidi et astuti..reos faciant - cf. Phoebadius[21]: "vos tamen idem sentientes abrupta blasphemia, verba vitantes, ambigua sectamini ad decipiendos simplices et incautos...quod venenatum virus exquisitorum verborum velamine tegitis".

L.17sq. Et hoc obsecramus etc - cf. ep. syn. Sard. ad episc. Aeg. in Ath. Apol. c. Ar.43.

eos qui adhuc..tenentur - e.g. Athanasius.

L.21,22 post quadringentos ferè annos - cf. note on A IV, 1 p.49 L.26 "ante quadringentos annos"

Notes.
21. c. Arr. 15 in P.L. XX col. 23.

In some quarters in the East, the Nicene creed was regarded as a needless innovation, and while it would still be too early and dangerous for this opinion to be directly expressed in the actual controversy at this date (i.e. c.342), it is quite probable that it was being commonly propagated. In this passage, the orthodox bishops counter such a charge by showing the novelty of the Arian doctrine which has found expression only after three centuries of the Christian era.

p.184 L.1, 2 quasi ante..Christiani - trans. "as if before there were not apostles, (as if) after their martyrdoms and deaths there were not Christians."

L.5-10 nuper didicimus...audierint - cf. ep. syn. Sard. B II, 1 §7 p.119 L.5-10.

L.6 a duobus Eusebiis - i.e. of Caesarea and of Nicomedia, cf. Ath. De Syn. 17[22].

L.7,8 imperitis..Valente - cf. ep. syn. Alex. in Ath. Apol. c. Ar. 13; ep. syn. Sard. ad eccl. Alex. and ep. ad episc. Aeg. in Ath. l.c. 37, 41; and B II, 2 §4 p.129 L.7. Use of such language in describing Valens and Ursacius gives practically no help in the dating of this document because it is not definitely known when they were born.

Notes.
22. For notes on all these bishops cf. B II, 1 §7 etc.

L.8 epistulae - these would include the letter sent to Julius of Rome[23], which has not been preserved, and would be similar in content to the letter of Eastern Sardica A IV, 1.cf. also B II, 1 p.111 L.6sq.

L.8-10 et idoneis..audierint - cf. B II, 2 §3 p.129 L.2; ep. ad eccl. Alex. in Ath. Apol. c. Ar.38

L.8-9 idoneis testibus - e.g. B II, 1 p.106 L.5sq. p.109 L.8sq.

L.12,13 qui iam..abdicati - e.g. at the synod of Western Sardica, cf. B II, 1§ 7; B II, 2 §5.

II. Narrative text.

SUMMARY. (1) The members of the synod of Sardica were undoubtedly right thus to inform the emperor of their absolution of Athanasius. But indeed the real substance of their request was simply that the faith should be kept free from the contagion of Arianism and that an end should be made to new investigations against the accused. Just as God, the Lord of the universe, desired the service and adoration of a free will and spurned a forced acknowledgment of Himself, so ought the use of violence to have been rejected in human affairs because it compels all to be, not Christians, but Arians. Even the emperor himself has been led into error on this account and/

Notes.
23. cf. Ath. Apol. c. Ar.21.

and his authority used for their nefarious purposes. (2) Their wickedness was seen at its worst in the case of Athanasius, where those, who have already been denounced as Arian heretics, have attempted to condemn an innocent person. (3) It was also seen in the recent events at Arles where Paulinus had opposed it, and at Milan where, on the suggestion of Eusebius of Vercelli, Dionysius of Milan was about to sign a confession of the Nicene creed when Valens violently tore pen and paper from him and forbade him to do so. When this became generally known, it occasioned great grief and, for fear of public displeasure, the assembly was transferred to the palace. The decision concerning Eusebius, which was written long before they entered the Church, now follows (This part has not been preserved).

COMMENTARY. p.184 L.15-19 Iam nemini..oportuerit - Coustant[24] has a slight suspicion that these words might be said ironically concerning the Arian acts and letters which did not show very much episcopal clemency. But this opinion does not seem very probable and the context gives no evidence to support it. It seems better to regard them as representing common agreement to the procedure adopted by the synod of Western Sardica in sending the above letter to Constantius. It may have occasioned some surprise because it was Constans, not Constantius, who held sway in the West and many would think it sufficient for their purposes to enjoy the favour of Constans. Hilary, it would appear, did not share this view, though/

Notes.
24. P.L. X col. 560-1.

though, in his narrative text, he seems a little on the defensive for the simple reason that, despite the Westerns' plea for Church independence[25], their letter represents, in a sense, an appeal to the state: But he gives several reasons in justification of the letter. First of all, there was the precautionary measure of making Constantius fully aware of the decisions of the synod with regard to the innocence of Athanasius, thus removing the excuse of ignorance. But more important than this was the fact that already[26] the Arians were gaining great influence over Constantius, and it was obvious that, in order to thwart them, put an end to the rule of violence which oppressed the catholics, and gain universal acceptance of the decrees of Western Sardica, it was necessary to make a strenuous effort to acquire his favour by revealing to him the strength of their case. Their failure to achieve this is indeed one of the principal reasons that the synod of Sardica did not succeed in bringing the controversy to a satisfactory conclusion, for there can be no doubt that, especially in the West, and to a certain extent in the East, the Arian cause relied almost entirely on the favour and power of Constantius. Its chief victories were gained through his support[27] and, on his death, Arianism began to wane and final victory for the orthodox became certain.

p.184 L.16 synodi - i.e. the synod of Western Sardica which wrote the above letter.

Notes.
25. cf. p.181 L.13sq.
26. cf. p.185 L.20sq.
27. cf. Arles, Milan, Ariminum, Seleucia and Constantinople.

L.18, 19 legationem - i.e. those deputies sent with the letter to the Emperor.

p.185 L.3 reos - e.g. Athanasius, Marcellus, Julius and the other catholics, cf. A IV, 1 §27.

L.6sq. si ad fidem veram etc - Hilary here gives answer, in the name of the episcopate as it were, to the violent methods employed by the Arians in their attempt to overcome the orthodox and secure their own victory[28]. Similar thoughts are to be found in his other works cf. In Ps.118, 5, 12; 118, 14, 20; 118, 16,10. De Trin. I, 11.

L.15 sq. sacerdotes carceribus - cf. ep. syn. Sard. B II, 1 §3 p.111 L.9sq.

L.15,16 plebs in custodia..disponitur - trans. "the ordinary people are set in order and restrained in the custody of a fettered methodical arrangement" i.e. the only way in which the Arians can secure uniformity among the people is through holding them in check with fetters.

L.18 -20 cogunt nempe...conpellunt - cf. De Trin. X, 58.

L.20 nominis sui - i.e. the name of the emperor.

Notes.
28. cf. p.182 §2.

L.21 imperatorem - i.e. Constantius.

p.186 L.1sq. et nec sic etc - cf. B II, 9 § 4 p.148 L.6sq.

L.3,4 Haec si...de rebus fuisset - cf. p.183 L.21sq. If these Arian theories had had the authority of age, they would have necessitated more attention.

L.5 reus - i.e. Athanasius.

L.6 litterarum - cf. p.184 L.8 "epistulae" note.

iudicum - probably not the civil judges referred to at the beginning of the letter, but rather the Arian bishops who set themselves up as judges at Tyre and Eastern Sardica (i.e. the Eastern use of "iudex" cf. p.181 L.14 note)

L.6 accusatorum - i.e. those who brought charges against Athanasius at Tyre, Rome and Eastern Sardica.

L.7 hominis - i.e. Athanasius.

L.7sq. moveret enim absolutionem etc - Hilary here defends the attitude adopted by the synod of Western Sardica in refusing to consider Athanasius and the others as guilty right from the beginning of the council before a new inquiry has been made into the accusations/

accusations. He pleads that the condemnation of the Arians (at Nicaea) automically involves ( i.e. p.186 L. 8 "iuncta") the innocence of Athanasius, and that therefore all the authority of antiquity as well as the correct doctrine of the faith are on the side of Athanasius.

L.12 tunc - i.e. at the synod of Western Sardica 342.

L.12,13 regnum exagitent etc - cf. Gregor. Elvir. de fide 4 "qui etiam nunc vi, ambitione et potentia exagitans, turbas omnia; quomodo putas me ignoscere tibi posse frequentius eadem retractanti?"

L.14 adhuc - i.e. at the time when the N.T. was written c.355/6.

L.16 sq. quae obtunsio etc - cf. Phoebadius[29]: "Quae ista est, rogo, cordis hebetudo? quae oblivio spei?"

L.19 recens - i.e. from 353 onwards at the synods of Arles and Milan.

L.19,20 in quo...continere - with the final victory of Constantius in 353, the Arians were able to shed their cloak of secrecy and come out into the open with their intentions.

L.21 Eusebius Vercellensis episcopus - see note on him in A II p.46 L.11.

Notes.
29. c. Arr. 15 P.L. XX col. 24.

L.21 sq. hic post Arelatensem synodum etc - cf. Sulp. Sev. Chron. II, 39. The synod of Arles was held in the winter of 353.

p.187 L.1 Paulinus - see note B I p.102 L.10.

L.2 Mediolanium - the synod of Milan met early in 355.

L.6 una cum Romanis clericis - i.e. Pancracius and Hilary cf. A VII p.93 L.10,11.

Lucifero Sardiniae episcopo - see note in A VII p.89 L.3.

L.9 Niceam - the council of Nicaea 325.

L.10 cuius superius meminimus - before Wilmart published his work on the Ad Const. I and its narrative text, this was usually regarded as a reference to a part which had been lost[30]. Now that this letter and its N.T. have been given their rightful place in Hilary's work, it is obvious that it must refer to B II, 9,10.

L.12 Dionisius Mediolanensis episcopus - see note in B VII, 1 p.164 L.15. This section gives us almost all the information we now possess concerning this synod of Milan.

L.20 sq. The part containing the decision concerning Eusebius has not been preserved.

Notes.
30. cf. Coustant P.L. X col. 562 (j).

CONCLUSION. No satisfactory explanation has yet been given as to how the letter and narrative text have become detached from their place in the work of 356 and been given an erroneous title. Wilmart conjectures that it was caused by a scribe who had not understood the nature of this synodical letter and N.T. but, possessing the other letter of Hilary to Constantius (i.e. the so-called Ad Const II), had grouped both together under Hilary's name as Ad Const. I and II.

It might also, of course, have resulted from the disordered state in which these documents were, from the first, transmitted[31]. Even granting the possibility of a work having been published by Hilary in 356, we can find no evidence of any further publication. Rather does it seem as if the later documents have been loosely tagged on to the original work. If this assumption is correct, then even before the death of Hilary, the outline, contents and purpose of the work of 356 could easily have been obscured, and it would become increasingly difficult to distinguish between the original contents and the later additions. In such a situation, it would not be surprising for some pieces to be lost, others to be detached and misplaced (especially if, as in the case of the so-called Ad Const. I, they formed the final section of a document) and the whole to become intermingled. Has some later editor, knowing something of this original distinction between the work of 356 and the later additions, attempted to restore order by dividing/

Notes.
31. cf. Conclusion on whole work.

dividing the documents into the two sections in which they have been transmitted in the MSS? and, presuming that the final section in B II (i.e. the synodal letter and N.T) had already become detached from the rest, could it have been he who, in the interests of order, has united this synodal letter and N.T. with the other letter to Constantius (which, with the c. Const., would undoubtedly be transmitted in close contact with these historical documents) and so given rise to the false designation Ad Const. I and II? Such a possibility seems reasonable.

Appendix B.
Six B.

## The Liberius Letters.

Not the least interesting portion of Hilary's collection of documents is the group of letters written by Liberius, bishop of Rome. It consists of eight letters, or extracts from letters, accompanied by six editorial notes, all dealing with events prior to, and during, the exile of the bishop of Rome, and then another one, written much later, dealing with the problem of the bishops who had lapsed at Ariminum[1].

The letters written before the exile of Liberius to Beroea in Thrace[2] depict him as following in the orthodox Nicene tradition of most Western bishops, and, if not a zealous defender of Athanasius, still anxious to secure a fair trial for him in face of the unjust accusations of his enemies.

Those written during the exile, however, show him weakened and broken by the tedium of exile, resolved to surrender Athanasius and willing to make any concessions demanded by the Arians[3].

The striking contrast between these two representations has caused great controversy and given rise to the suggestion that the two series of letters can not have come from the same hand. Because of the weak, lamentable tone and attitude adopted by Liberius in the exile letters, writers of the Roman communion[4] have been especially anxious to denounce them as unauthentic and forged, while maintaining the authenticity of the first set.

In the main, there are three chief bodies of opinion on the exile/

Notes.
1. viz A VII, B III, B VII and B IV, 1.
2. A VII, B VII, 2, 4, 6.
3. cf. B III, B VII, 8,10,11.
4. e.g. Baronius, Stilting, Chapman.

exile letters (1) those who reject all four as forged. (2) those who have doubts concerning B III, 1 "Studens" but accept the other three. (3) those who accept all four as genuine letters of Liberius.

A typical exponent of the first group is Hefele[5]. The keystone of his proof of the forged character of the letters is his allegation that the events mentioned in them do not correspond to historical fact.[6] Hefele contends that the forger was really out of touch with the historical stituation, and illustrates this chiefly from B III, 1 "Studens", relying on the alleged kinship between the four exile letters to prove his point in the case of the other three. First, he argues, if we take "Studens" as written at the beginning of Liberius' pontificate, then the facts stated therein are simply not true. We have no evidence to suggest that Liberius really had broken communion with Athanasius at that time - on the other hand, we have the clearest evidence that Liberius had defended Athanasius, and actually went into exile because of his refusal to condemn him.[7] Nor does Athanasius ever give the slightest intimation that Liberius, before his exile, had broken communion with him.

Now a superficial reading of "Studens" might seem to favour this opinion. In the beginning of the letter at any rate, it would seem as if the author were writing from Rome and describing events/

Notes. Tüb.

5. Tüb. Theol. Quartal. 1853 p.263sq. Councils II p.231sq.
6. This is the usual basis adopted by those who contest the authenticity. cf. Savio, Saltet, Wilmart.
7. Ath. Hist. Ar. 35-39. Theod. II,16.

events which must have taken place there c.352. But closer study would seem to indicate a lapse of time between the events mentioned in the first half and those described in the second, denoted only by the word "denique"[8]. The bishops mentioned in the narrative text (BIII, 2) also seem to favour a much later date than 352[9]. Moreover, if one understands the letter as having been written at the beginning of Liberius' episcopate, the last part of it is too great an absurdity for a forger to derive the least benefit from it. The first and principal component of a forgery must be probability, and Liberius' defence of Athanasius until the time of his exile had been so consistent as to exclude any possibility of even a momentary break in relations between them. The rupture, of which the author writes, must therefore, even on the grounds of probability alone, be placed in the years following upon the decree which sent Liberius into exile, as Athanasius himself witnesses[10].

Understood in this way, the letter "Studens" does not contradict the historical fact of Liberius' support of Athanasius at the beginning of his episcopate and agrees with the evidence given by Athanasius himself of a subscription of Liberius during his exile in Beroea[11].

With regard to the other three letters, Hefele states first that there is an undoubted resemblance in language, style and manner between "Studens", which on his interpretation is undoubtedly/

Notes.
8. cf Commentary note on p. 155 L.6.
9. cf notes in Commentary on Potamius and Epictetus p.155 L.25.
10. see later.
11. Hist. Ar. 41.

undoubtedly spurious, and the other three, showing that all four are the work of one author, and are all apochryphal. He supports his argument with other reasons: (1) he says it is very improbable that Fortunatian of Aquileia should bring Liberius' letters to the Emperor because, if Constantius was already at Sirmium, Aquileia was twice as far from Beroea as Sirmium itself and the way to Aquileia lay through Sirmium, not vice versa. And even if the Emperor had been still at Rome then, neither in that case would Aquileia have been the middle station between that city and Beroea.

This objection might carry some weight if it could be proved that bishops always remained in the see to which they were elected. Such, unfortunately, was not the case; indeed one feels that if the bishops of that time had paid less attention to wrangling after power at the imperial court and more to the work of their own see, the Church of the fourth century would have had a less troubled history. Furthermore there is no evidence that the letter was actually given to Fortunatian at Aquileia.

(2) Then Hefele brings an objection based on the delay between Liberius' fall and his return to Rome. This delay might indeed seem strange but it is a very flimsy argument on which to base the forgery of the letters. Several explanations might be given of it: reasons of state, the difficult position in which the Emperor would find himself with regard to his puppet Felix on the return of Liberius; it might only be the delay between ecclesiastical acts and imperial confirmation.

Another supporter of this view is Chapman[12] but with this difference that/

Notes.
12. Rev. Ben. 1910.

that he admits the force of Duchesne's argument[13] that it is inconceivable that a forger should try to represent Liberius' rupture with Athanasius as taking place at the beginning of his episcopate. But Chapman goes on to say that Duchesne's alternative that it was Liberius himself who did so is just as inconceivable. His own suggestion with regard to the author of "Studens" is that Fortunatian of Aquileia, having fallen at Milan, was anxious to justify his fall by showing that four years earlier Athanasius had been contumacious when summoned by the bishop of Rome and that Liberius had then, for the moment at least, renounced him and had joined the Easterns. It would be admitted, continues Chapman, that this attitude had not been maintained by Liberius , but it would be a great point to show that the bishop of Rome had not been consistent throughout, that the question was no easy one.

The question begged by Chapman's solution is of course "Why should Fortunatian wish to justify his fall, especially at this time, and to whom?" If, two years after the sorrowful events of the synod of Milan, there had been a sudden reversal of fortunes in favour of the orthodox, then the solution suggested by Chapman might have been feasible. In this situation one might have imagined Fortunatian writing such a letter in order to regain the favour of the orthodox and to excuse his own temporary lapse by showing that even the bishop of Rome, though later a supporter of Athanasius, had, at the beginning of his episcopate, committed a like, temporary act. But, so far from this being the case, Arianism had gone on from strength to strength after its victory at the/

Notes.
13. see later.

the synod of Milan 355. Fortunatian could therefore have gained no advantage for himself from a justification of his fall. In such a situation to whom would he seek to justify his cause? He could gain no advantage from justifying himself before the orthodox because most of the supporters of orthodoxy were in exile at this time, and it is unlikely that the bishop who gave way at Milan would implicate himself with them now - that would be to court the same fate. Nor is there any evidence to support this contention. On the other hand, what purpose would there be in seeking to justify himself before the Arians? At Milan he had done all that the Arians could require; his submission there would be sufficient for them without asking the why and the wherefore.

Such a justification as Chapman has supposed would be possible only in one particular situation, namely, in the case of a bishop, who himself had fallen rather than suffer exile, trying to persuade another bishop, to whom he was bound by the bond of friendship, to compromise rather than endure the sufferings of a weary and lonely exile; and what more natural way of persuasion would there be than to try and justify his own fall? From what is known of the relations between Fortunatian and Liberius, it seems quite possible that such a thing did actually take place. It is known that, prior to the synod of Milan, Liberius had a high regard for Fortunatian[14]; such a regard can have sprung only from a warm and close friendship, and it is noteworthy that this friendship continued/

Notes.
14. cf. Liberius' letters to Eusebius of Vercelli. P.L.VIII, 1350sq.

continued after Liberius' banishment because the exile letters show Fortunatian continually in communication with the bishop of Rome. In these circumstances it seems very probable that Fortunatian would attempt to persuade Liberius to act as he had done and thus escape from the rigours of exile.

All this, of course, does not help Chapman's theory, but, if there was any question of justification, it seems a more natural explanation than the one Chapman has given.

He develops this theory by stating that it is absurd to suppose that Fortunatian was acting for Liberius or was trying to deliver him from exile. But why? Does not a consideration of the friendly relations existing between these two bishops and the position of the bishop of AQuileia since Milan remove all absurdity? Again, he says that by ignoring the fact that Athanasius had been acquitted by the Roman council under Julius and by the council of Sardica, Fortunatian had condemned himself as a forger, for Liberius could not have ignored that. But the fact that there is no mention of the Roman and Sardican decisions in the letter does not mean that the author had ignored their authority or regarded them as invalid. Nor can the mention of a new summons to Athanasius to appear at Rome in order to defend himself be used in support of this argument because, after the council of Sirmium, a new situation had arisen, or seemed likely to arise, calling for new action. The political situation had changed; with his victory over Magnentius, Constantius had become sole Emperor, and whatever else he may have been, he certainly was no supporter of the Nicene creed. The situation was changing too, with regard to Athanasius; in the past

the/

the charges brought against him had been of a personal nature but now they were beginning to take on a doctrinal aspect, his name was becoming synonymous with the Nicene creed. It was, therefore, only natural that Liberius should wish a personal interview with Athanasius before deciding on the charges brought against him.

This particular part of Chapman's theory, then, must be rejected. He gives no real reason why Liberius should not be the author.

Nor is he any more convincing with the other explanation which he advances. This time he places the production of "Studens" just after the fall of Fortunatian at the synod of Milan in 355, before Liberius had had time to send Eutropius and Hilary to repudiate the work of the council. It is easy to suppose, he continues, that Fortunatian had not accompanied Eusebius and Lucifer to Milan, as Liberius had suggested; so he will not have been the actual bearer with the others of A VII "Obsecro".

Here it seems that Chapman has allowed his interpretation of the historical facts to be controlled and directed by the result which he wishes to obtain. Though the task he has set himself is to prove that the letters are forged, he never really tackles the problem; rather he sets out from the presumption that they are forgeries, that anything in them, therefore, can not correspond to the real, historical situation and since this is so, and, in defence of this presumption, every liberty can be taken with the historical facts.

An embassy was sent by Liberius to repudiate the council of Arles, but there is no evidence of one having been sent to repudiate the/

the work of the council of Milan; nor is there any evidence that Fortunatian, after the invitation of Liberius, had not accompanied Eusebius and Lucifer to Milan. If he had indeed refused, it would certainly have been recorded; his refusal could not have been passed over in silence. Chapman has recourse to this evasion only because he wants Fortunatian to be ignorant of the existence of A VII "Obsecro". But it would have been well-nigh impossible for anyone in the midstream of the controversy, as Fortunatian was, not to have known of its existence and its connection with the summoning of the council of Milan.

Finally, if "Studens" was a forgery, could Fortunatian have been so insane as to produce it at this time when the name of Liberius was untarnished in the public mind? What advantage could he have gained by it? The falsity of the charge brought against Liberius would have been so obvious that Fortunatian would have become a laughing-stock. To say that the falsity of "Studens" must come out some day, as Chapman does, is an understatement; it would be blatant from the very moment of its production.

If, as Chapman suggests, Fortunatian's aim was simply to possess his see in peace, his action at the synod of Milan was sufficient to secure this; no further act was necessary.

As to the forger of "Pro" (B VII, 8), "Quia" (B VII,10) and "Non" (B VII,11), Chapman thinks he is a different person from the author of "Studens". "For, though he (the forger) seems to place the writing of "Studens" shortly before the Pope's exile, he imagines that the second Sirmian formula might have been signed by him very soon afterwards, though it was drawn up when he had been

in/

in exile about two years." This historical perspective, continues Chapman, is not accurate enough for one who was an actor of the tragedy, as Fortunatian was, but it might very well pass muster even a very few years later[15].

Chapman is led into error here because of his presupposition, which, as has been seen, is no more than a presupposition, that "Studens" was published before the exile of Liberius. On historical grounds, it has been seen that there is no basis for this assumption, nor is there any evidence that the author of "Pro", "Quia" and "Non" regarded "Studens" as belonging to a time prior to Liberius' exile; everything points in the opposite direction, to the very close connection in time, place, thought and purpose of the four letters. It is not the historical perspective of the author of the three letters which is inaccurate, but only another example of Chapman making the facts suit his theory. It is indeed a suspicious weakness in Chapman's argument that he is driven to assume two forgers despite the proof which has been given by various scholars of the common style and language of the four letters[16]. He seems prepared to multiply the forgers "ad infinitum" to suit his own theory.

For the sake of argument, however, let us suppose that Chapman has proved his point and that there are two forgers. The question then is: Who is to be responsible for the composition of "Pro", "Quia" and "Non?. Chapman (following Saltet), argues that it is to be/

Notes.
15. L. c. p. 203.
16. cf. Hefele, Duchesne, Feder on this.

be attributed to the Luciferians as being persons with every reason to depress the reputation of Liberius. The Luciferians taught that the bishops who had fallen at Ariminum could not be restored to their office even on their repentance and that their subsequent episcopal acts were invalid. Now, continues Chapman, in the West it was Liberius who decreed their restoration[17], provided they condemned their past error. He had not fallen on this occasion himself and it was imperative for the Luciferians to show that his ruling was invalidated by a previous fall.

This argument might possess some weight if it could be proved that it was Liberius, alone of the Western bishops, who had adopted the cause of this reconciliatory attitude, or even if he had been the leader in the West in propagating this opinion. But, unfortunately for Chapman, such is not the case. We learn from Athanasius that this view had been propounded first at the synod of Alexandria 362 and had then been accepted by synods in Gaul and Spain. We also know that about this same time Hilary had supported this view by holding councils in Gaul and also, in co-operation with Eusebius of Vercelli, in Italy. So Liberius, far from being the only bishop in the West decreeing the restoration of the fallen, was, in fact, not even in the forefront of this movement. It would, therefore, not benefit the Luciferian cause to disparage Liberius since he played only a secondary role in this, and, in any case, to gain an advantage from this mode of attack, they would also have had to calumniate Athanasius, Hilary and Eusebius of Vercelli, and there is no authoritative evidence of this.

Notes.

17. cf. B IV, 1.

But Chapman has another argument by which he seeks to show that the letters "Pro", "Quia" and "Non" are forgeries. He states that their author has written them as a defence of "Studens" and that he has deliberately reversed everything found in the genuine letters A VII "Obsecro", B VII, 2 "Quamvis" and BVII, 4 "Nolo" in order to do this. Hilary has then adopted them into his work simply to show that they are forgeries[18].

Now it might be true that there is a relation of this kind between the two sets of letters, but to admit this is by no means to admit that the second set is thereby a forgery. The correspondence between the two sets could be explained by consideration of the circumstances in which they were written. In both sets, Athanasius is the central, dominating figure, everything centres on him. This provides the similarity between the two sets of letters. The contrast is provided by the different attitudes adopted by the author towards him, attitudes quite in accordance with the historical situation.

But even if this were not the case, in order to prove his theory Chapman would still have to demonstrate that the dependence is on the side of "Pro", "Quia" and "Non". Glorieux, for instance, who is no less anxious to defend Liberius, takes the opposite view and places the dependence on "Obsecro", "Quamvis" and "Nolo"!

Moreover, to say that "Pro", "Quia" and "Non" studiously reverse "Obsecro", "Quamvis" and "Nolo" could be used equally as well/

Notes.

18. It is perhaps significant that Chapman does not attempt to work out the relation of this to his theory of the Luciferian authorship!

well in favour of their authenticity. If such an act is to be presumed, who would be more likely to do it than Liberius himself in order to show that he had now completely renounced his former attitude towards Athanasius.

If the letters are to be proved forgeries, the proof must be based, not on the superficial comparison, such as Chapman has given, but on something more solid, something intrinsically at variance with the historical situation[19].

Chapman, then, makes out no case for the forgery; his theory is full of contradictions and raises more problems than it solves.

There is still another group of those who reject all four exile letters as forged; their most recent representative is Glorieux[20].

He repudiates the view that "Studens" and the other three exile letters are interpolations, whether Luciferian or Arian; he declares that it would be too obvious a fraud to try and introduce in an already existing work, solidly compounded like all Hilary's polemic works, four such documents important both by their dimensions, and by their tenor. According to Glorieux, it is Hilary himself who has introduced the Liberius letters into his work with the sole purpose of showing them to be forgeries. He says it would have been a fault of method, of which Hilary could not/

Notes.
19. see later for Chapman on B III, 2 "Quid in his".
20. Melanges de Sciences Religieuses 1944.

not possibly be guilty, to introduce those letters into his work on the council of Ariminum, which was directed against Ursacius and Valens. If they had been genuine, he would have passed them over, preferring to keep silent about them since they formed no integral part of his work; indeed they would have broken the unity by putting Ursacius and Valens into the background. Moreover, he continues, it would have been bad tactics to insert the exile letters at this time when Hilary and Liberius were working together to secure the reconciliation of the bishops who had fallen at Ariminum; it would have made this policy of reconciliation savour of laxity. Since this is so, there can be only one solution. Hilary has inserted the Liberius dossier because he knew from a certain source the apochryphal character of these letters and he intended to denounce them as such. The Liberius dossier becomes yet one more accusation of the dishonourable ways of the Arians.

From all this it is evident that the thesis of Glorieux rests on the supposition that Hilary had included the Liberius letters as forgeries. But one must ask if it is convincing to say that, although there is no evidence in the letters or narrative text to this effect, yet this is only because the part in which this was stated has fallen out of the collection? To construct elaborate theories on such a basis is sheer folly.. There is absolutely nothing in the four letters which gives even the slightest hint that Hilary had included them in his work to show their apochryphal character; on the contrary, for instance, the way in which he introduces "Studens" shows that he regards it as a genuine letter of the Bishop of Rome.

As/

As for the alleged fault of method. The fall of the bishop of Rome would be considered as a great blow to the orthodox cause, contributing greatly to the shameful collapse at Ariminum. It was fitting, therefore, that Hilary, in giving a history of the council of Ariminum and the events leading thereto, should give information about this fall, no matter how awkward it may have been at that particular time; not to have done so would have been a breach of historical method. Viewed in this light, the exile letters of Liberius form an integral part of his work, fully in keeping with his aim and purpose.

Then with regard to the alleged error in tactics. Even if this were so, we have seen that Hilary would still feel himself bound to include the Liberius dossier. If the facts were genuine, it would have been dangerous to omit them, from the point of view not only of his case but also of his own prestige as a historian; he would have been accused of trying to conceal the facts by this omission. But was it really an error in tactics? It is asserted that at that particular time Hilary and Liberius were working to secure the reconciliation of the lapsed bishops. What better advertisement could there be for this policy than the example of Hilary, the steadfast confessor, and Liberius, the fallen but now restored bishop, working together in harmony. Here was an example in practice of the policy for which they were striving. Surely this was no error in tactics?

So Glorieux is no more convincing than the others.

These three accounts cover most of the points raised by those who contest the authenticity of the exile letters. Wilmart[21], under the influence of Duchesne, modifies the view he had previously propounded in Rev. Ben.1907, rejecting all four letters, but reaches no definite conclusion.

We pass now to the second group, those who have doubts concerning "Studens" but accept the other three exile letters as genuine. This group has no great following today because (1) of the proofs given of the kinship of the four letters in thought, speech and style[22] and (2) of the removal of the historical objections to "Studens"/

Notes.

21. Rev. Ben.1908.

22. cf. (1) "Studens": litteras de nomine Athanasii, de nomine supradicti Athanasii. "Pro": litteras adaeque super nomine eius. "Quia": de nomine ipsius litteras. "Non": a nomine Athanasii, litteras desuper nomine eius. (2) "Studens": quod..sciret se alienum esse ab ecclesiae Romanae communione; sciatis.. Athanasium alienum esse a communione mea sive ecclesiae Romanae. "Pro": dico me cum omnibus vobis et cum universis episcopis Orientalibus..pacem et unanimitatem habere. "Quia": me autem cum omnibus vobis episcopis ecclesiae catholicae pacem habere.. scire debetis; scire..volo..pacem me et communionem ecclesiasticam cum ipsis habere. "Non": cum omnibus episcopis Orientalibus pacem habemus. (3) "Studens": quod..sciret se alienum esse ab ecclesiae Romanae communione; sciatis.. Athanasium alienum esse a communione mea sive ecclesiae Romanae. "Pro": amoto Athanasio a communione omnium nostrum. "Quia": ab ecclesiae Romanae communione est separatus; ut sciret.. (ab) Athanasii communione me esse separatum. "Non": -. (4)"Studens": Studens paci et concordiae; ad unanimitatem nostram. "Pro": dico me..pacem et unanimitatem habere. "Quia": pro bono pacis et concordiae, bono pacis et concordiae, a pace et concordia. "Non": de unanimitate nostra et pace. (5) "Studens": -."Pro": quando deo placuit. "Quia": volente deo. "Non": deo volente. (6) "Studens": nomen Iulii bonae memoriae episcopi. "Pro": bonae memoriae Iulius episcopus. "Quia": - , "Non": -.(7)"Studens": -."Pro": litteras..per fratrem nostrum Fortunatianum dedi perferendas ad imperatorem Constantium. "Quia": fratrem Fortunatianum petii, ut litteras meas ad clementissimum imperatorem Augustum perferat."Non": -. (8)"Studens": -."Pro": dignemini..elaborare quatenus..ad sedem, quae mihi divinitus credita est, revertar. "Quia": (ut) me ad ecclesiam mihi divinitus traditam iubeat reverti "Non": -.

"Studens". Those who have supported it include Baronius[23], Coustant[24] and Duchesne[25].

Interpreting "Studens" as having been written at the beginning of Liberius' episcopate, they found difficulty in relating the events mentioned therein to the historical facts elsewhere attested[26]. In his "History of the Church"[27], Duchesne had stated that the letter "Studens" was the work of a forger while he reserved his judgment on the other three. However, the common traits brought out by Saltet[28] caused Duchesne to study the question more closely and to ask if the letter "Studens" must really be separated from the others. In this way he came to a new historical interpretation of "Studens", one giving a satisfactory explanation of the objections formerly raised, and hence concluded that, like the other three, "Studens" is a genuine letter of Liberius. About the same time and quite independently Schiktanz[29] had reached the same conclusion.

So finally, we come to those who accept all four letters as genuine. The chief advocates of this theory are Duchesne[30], Schiktanz[31] and Feder[32].

Notes.
23. ad ann.352 and 357.
24. Epp. Rom. Pont. Appendix p.95 (Paris 1721) and in his Commentary on the documents in P.L. X.
25. prior to 1908.
26. We have already seen that Chapman suggested two forgers, one of "Studens", the other of the three other exile letters.
27. II, p.254 n.2.
28. Bull. Litt. Eccles. 1907 p.280sq.
29. Die Hilarius - Fragmente.
30. in Melanges d' Archeologie et d'Histoire(1908) p.31 -78.
31. l.c.
32. Studien I.

Duchesne finds nothing in "Pro", "Quia" and "Non" to suggest that they are forgeries. His main object is to defend "Studens" which he finds closely linked in style and thought with the other three. He admits that the letter "Studens" does not make sense if one tries to understand it as having been written in 352. It would have been the greatest absurdity for a contemporary (and it would be a contemporary, even if it was a forger, who had composed the letter) to put forward the idea that Liberius had broken communion with Athanasius at the beginning of his episcopate when all knew that he had in fact supported him right up to the time of his exile. So Duchesne declares that it is not of the year 352 that the redactor thinks but rather of 357, the year when the rupture was actually produced. Wearied by exile, Liberius has been induced to change his former attitude towards Athanasius. Now, to make the transition appear as slight as possible, Liberius has linked the rupture of 357 with events taking place at the beginning of his episcopate and avoided speaking of what has happened in the interval. Schiktanz and Feder give a similar explanation.

As Duchesne admits, the artifice is gross and Liberius must have had very little hope of success, but, in the circumstances, it is not impossible. That is the merit of Duchesne's theory. Whereas it is inconceivable that any forger would ever try to represent Liberius as having been in 357 for approximately four years out of communion with Athanasius, and in communion with the Easterns - such a theory might have had some success in the case of a little-known bishop but not in the case of one in the midstream of the controversy as the bishop of Rome; nor, as we have seen, was/

was Chapman's suggestion that it was produced just after the synod of Milan any the more conceivable - it is just possible that Liberius himself, and he alone, could have attempted this pretermission.

It is not fully understandable why Liberius should have resorted to such a puny artifice. He must have known that this letter had scant hopes of a favourable reception. Most probably he had reconciled himself beforehand to its failure and issued it merely as a feeler to test public opinion. After all, he must have told himself, the bishops to whom I am writing will be only too pleased to forget about my past defence of Athanasius and only too eager to grasp the fact that, whether in 352 or 357, I have actually condemned Athanasius.[33]

Notes.

33. Tillemont (Mem. I, (1699) 357, VIII (1702) 695sq) suggests that Liberius wrote "Studens" at the beginning of his episcopate as answer to the Easterns but first published it only later when in exile. The evidence given in A VII, however, contradicts this opinion.

As interpreted by Duchesne, the information given in the exile letters of Liberius corresponds with that given by other writers of the same period. We have already seen that the most likely date for the composition of these letters is sometime in the first half of 357[34]. This finds further confirmation in Athanasius[35] who writes that Liberius yielded after two years and subscribed from fear of death. Against this testimony it has been contested[36] that the "Historia Arianorum" was written when Leontius Castratus of Antioch was still alive and therefore before the weakness of Liberius, which would make this passage a later addition. But even so, it does not follow that this addition is spurious and not ~~from~~ from Athanasius himself; it has every appearance of being a genuine part of the work of Athanasius[37]. Moreover, in his Apol. c. Ar.89, Athanasius states that even if he did not endure the miseries of exile to the end, still Liberius remained two years in banishment. It has been objected that these words, too, are an addition to the text in its first form[38]. But again, even if this/

Notes.

34. cf. the mention of Potamius and Epictetus in BIII, 2; Liberius' signature of the first Sirmian creed of 351; Constantius' knowledge in May 357 of a change of mind on the part of Liberius.
35. Hist.Ar.41.
36. eg. by Stilting Acta SS. VI, 601sq. Reinerding "Beitrage zur Honorius and Liberiusfrage (1865)p.34sq).
37. The "Historia" was written by Athanasius before the fall of Liberius and sent to the monks to whom it was addressed, but the author received his manuscript back again. He tells us this in the third chapter of the letter prefixed to the work. Then, later, Serapion of Thmuis wrote asking him to give an account of the Arian heresy, of his own welfare, and of the death of Arius. To do this Athanasius sent him the "Historia Arianorum" and the "De Morte Arii". In the interval between the original composition and its despatch to Serapion must have occurred the weakness of Liberius, which prompted Athanasius to make this addition.
38. cf. Stilting L.c.

this were so, there is no reason to doubt their authenticity as a genuine part of Athanasius' work[39]. This confirmation is all the more important coming as it does from the one person above all other Nicene champions who had most interest in distinguishing true from false, facts from rumours and forgeries.

Then, in his c.Const.11 (written at the end of 359), Hilary writes that he did not know which was the greater presumption on the part of the Emperor, the banishment of Liberius or his recall to Rome. Now Reinerding[40], Zaccaria[41], and Savio[42] take this to mean that Constantius had annoyed the bishop of Rome upon his return in various ways or to refer to the painful situation in having two bishops, Liberius and Felix, in Rome.

In answer to this, it must be confessed that Hilary does not explicitly say that it refers to a fall on the part of Liberius, but he does intimate that the recall of Liberius was not altogether void of blame, that the return has been granted only on concessions, and the emphatic words point to a well-known fact such as the fall.

Again, it has sometimes been asserted[43] that the omission of Liberius' name among the great confessor-bishops in Hil.c.Const. 2 signifies only that Liberius was not exiled in 355. But it has been already seen[44] that he was exiled soon after the council of Milan 355 because (1) Theodoret[45] makes Liberius' interview with the/

Notes.

39. This "apologia" is a collection of pieces which Athanasius put together c.350 but which he enlarged and supplemented as time went on.
40. L.c.p.29.
41. Dissert. de Commentitio Liberii Lapsu.
42. Nuovi Studi p.57-58.
43. e.g. Zeillier La Question du Pape Libère p.29sq. Savio "Nuovi Studi" p.41sq. "Punti Controversi" p.63sq.
44. cf. B VII, 2.
45. II, 15sq.

the Emperor's ambassador, Eusebius, and then with the Emperor himself follow closely upon the happenings at the council of Milan; (2) it is known that at the conclusion of the Milan synod Constantius sent notaries and officers into the provinces to secure confirmation of its decrees by the bishops; he would naturally be very anxious to secure the signature of the Roman bishop and so the journey of the eunuch Eusebius to Rome must be placed very soon after the council; (3) as the Emperor returned to Milan at the end of June or the beginning of July, after his Alamanni campaign, the arrival of Liberius in Milan and his conversation there with the Emperor must have taken place in the course of July[46]. So the most likely date for the beginning of the exile seems to be August 355. This is supported by the evidence of the Preface to the "Libellus precum" of Faustinus and Marcellinus[47] where it is said that the sojourn of Constantius at Rome during May 357 took place two years after the beginning of Liberius' exile. Sulpicius Severus[48], too, places it in the consulship of Arbitio and Lollianus i.e. in 355.

So closely is the exile of Liberius linked in time and cause with that of the other bishops mentioned in c. Const. 2 that Hilary could not have excluded him except for a special reason, viz: that he had not "endured to the end the rigours of exile".

As noted previously, the Preface to the "Libellus precum" attests that Constantius came to Rome two years after the exile of Liberius and knew at that time about his fall. It also places his return in 357/8.

Notes.
46. Amm. Marc. 15, 4.
47. 3 C.S.EL. 35, 2.
48. Chron. II, 39.

Jerome continues the confirmation both in his Chronicle[49] and in his De Vir. Ill.97. He relates that Fortunatian first solicited Liberius as he was going into exile[50] and that the latter eventually gave way and signed a heretical formula. Stilting[51], Palma[52], Reinerding[53] and Chapman[54] are unwilling to give any authority to Jerome's words, but this attitude can not be justified. It may be true that Jerome often goes astray on chronology but it is quite a different thing with regard to his testimony on historical facts, and especially these particular ones because he would have a special interest in them. As a young student, he had been in Rome in 358 and therefore in a position to discover at first-hand what had actually taken place with regard to Liberius. Moreover, c.370-373, Jerome had lived at Aquileia under Valerian, the successor of Fortunatian; he would therefore be able to find out about the relations of Fortunatian with Liberius and verify the former's share in the fall of the bishop of Rome.

These facts, then, give Jerome's testimony all the more value.

Rufinus[55] testifies that he has heard a rumour about Liberius giving way before the Emperor in order to secure his return to Rome, but he will not vouch for its authenticity.

The Arian historian Philostorgius[56] asserts that, at a synod of Sirmium, Liberius signed a formula which suppressed the "homoousios"/

Notes.

49. ed.Schonell, 194.
50. Jerome does NOT say that Liberius was won over straightway by Fortunation's solicitations.
51. Acta SS. VI, 605sq.
52. Praelectiones Hist. Eccles. I, ii (1838) p.94sq.
53. L. c. p.38sq.
54. Rev.Ben. 1910 p.203.
55. H.E. I, 27.
56. H.E. IV, 3.

"homoousios" and subscribed a condemnation of Athanasius.

In the fifth century, Sozomen[57] states that, on the request of a Western legation, Constantius summoned Liberius from Beroea to Sirmium and there Liberius was induced to sign a creed which omitted the "homoousios" and united the decrees of Sirmium 351 with the creed of the Dedication council of Antioch 341.

Into this historical framework fit readily the four exile letters of Liberius, as preserved in Hilary's collection, with their information about the weakness of Liberius in exile, his condemnation of Athanasius and signature of the Sirmian formula.

It might have been thought that in view of so large and authoritative a body of evidence, no one would have dared to doubt this fall of Liberius, and indeed until the sixteenth century it was accepted as one of the indisputable facts of Church History[58]. Only when the Roman Church became more sensitive about the reputations of the early popes, was it found necessary to attempt to remove the stain which attached itself to the name of Liberius. As we have seen, it was suggested that the passages dealing with Liberius in the works of Athanasius were interpolations, that the exile letters of Liberius in Hilary's collection should be rejected on/

Notes.
57. H.E. IV, 15.
58. cf. the "Liber pontificalis", the "Gesta Liberii", the Martyrologies of Bede (19 Kal. Sept.) and Ado (14 Aug).

on grounds of style[59], and to the positive testimonies and definite affirmations of Athanasius, Jerome and the others was opposed the dubiety of Rufinus and the silence of Sulpicius Severus, Socrates and Theodoret. It is obvious that little credence can be given to those who commit such an open and inexcusable breach of historical method in largely preferring later authors with their incomplete and defective compilations to the clear testimony of contemporaries like Athanasius and Jerome.

Finally, the glad welcome which Liberius received on his return from exile and the respect in which he was held by several of his clerics[60] is not incompatible with this fall in exile. There is the case of Vincent of Capua, of whose fall there is no doubt and who, nevertheless, a few years later attained a position of high respect[61]. Several reasons may be given to account for this: (1) even by the time of the council of Ariminum, the question concerning Athanasius had fallen completely into the background of the controversy and was soon forgotten; (2) the imperial intruder, Felix, had never been

able/

Notes.

59. Le Page Renouf (The Condemnation of Pope Honorius p.44) is undoubtedly right in asserting that the question of style is quite out of place here because there is no evidence to show that the actual composition of the letters is to be attributed to Liberius himself, cf. Duchesne's argument (L.c.p.52sq.) in favour of Fortunatian being the actual author i.e. acting as the secretary of Liberius. But even if we were to admit differences between the letters of Liberius written before his exile and those written during it (which is by no means certain cf. Feder Stud.I p.175sq), the straightened circumstances and sufferings of exile easily account for any aridity of thought or less dignified speech which may be found in the exile letters in contrast to the pre-exilic ones.

60. cf. Amm. Marc.15, 7. Soz. H.E. IV,15. Lib.prec.35, 2. Jer. Chron. ed Schone II, 194. Siricius Ep. ad Himerium Tarraconensem.

61. cf. the praise bestowed upon him by Damasus in his letter to the Illyrian bishops. Theod. II, 22.

able to command any great support in Rome and with his death in 365 the rebels among the Roman clergy would be only too pleased to become reconciled with Liberius; (3) the policy of reconciliation advocated by the Council of Alexandria also shows that the majority of the orthodox were prepared to forget the past in order to regain their former supporters and close their ranks in face of the Arian pressure.

To sum up, while it is probably true, as Feder[62] asserts, that no compelling or watertight proof can be given of the authenticity of the exile letters of Liberius, as preserved in Hilary's collection, the forgery theories so far expounded undoubtedly raise more problems than they solve.

There is no doubt that in the interpretation of B III, 1 lies the crux of the problem. From what is known elsewhere of Liberius' attitude towards Athanasius prior to his exile it is obvious that its composition can not be placed either at the beginning of his episcopate or in the intervening years up to 355; not even the most foolish of forgers would have attempted to establish this. It can only have been written about the same time as the other exile letters with which it is related in style, purpose and subject. It is noteworthy, too, that, while mentioning the threat to condemn Athanasius given at an early stage in his episcopate, Liberius does not explicitly claim in B III, 1 that it was ever carried out at that particular time. Rather is the actual execution of the threat associated, not with the sending of that/

Notes.
62. Stud. I p.162.

that embassy to Athanasius, but with the arrival of the second letter of the Easterns; and indeed it is through this threat and its execution that Liberius bridges the gap and is enabled to make the transition between the events of 352 and those of 357.

Thus interpreted, B III, 1 fits into the situation depicted in the other exile letters, and all find their confirmation in the other contemporary sources.

On the other hand, those who would deny the authenticity of these letters, can give no weighty reason for the actual forgery[63]; in their anxiety to clear the name of Liberius, they are led into every kind of contradiction[64] and indeed tend to cancel each other out[65].

To the unbiased reader only one conclusion is possible: the letters of Liberius, preserved in the collection of Hilary, are undoubtedly authentic.

It might be useful to add a note on the narrative text B III, 2 and Chapman's interpretation of it[66].

Chapman interprets it thus: - "After giving the letter "Studens" in full, which he regards as a forgery, Hilary describes it sarcastically/

Notes.

63. cf. Saltet. Either in his eagerness to provide a reason or conscious of the weakness of his arguments, he actually tries to give three solutions, an Arian, a Luciferian, and a Felician, but never commits himself to any!
64. cf. the theories of Saltet and Chapman.
65. e.g. the Savio-Chapman theories, and the Glorieux - Saltet theories are mutually destructive.
66. in Rev. Ben. 1910 p.28sq.

sarcastically as a "holy and God-fearing epistle indeed" but says that you will see in the acts of the council of Ariminum that it did not impose upon Potamius and Epictetus - it was too obviously untrue - though they were anxious to condemn Liberius (i.e. they were claiming that the Roman bishop was on their side, while they tried to inveigle the bishops into agreement). Fortunatian sent it to various bishops (as an excuse for his own fall, or perhaps because he was accused of leading Liberius into error and he wished to show that at an earlier period for a short time the Pope had deserted Athanasius and joined the Eastern party) but he got no advantage. The remainder of the note follows logically and naturally. Fortunatian had forged the letter in his own interest but he got no good from it for no one believed him; on the contrary he burdened himself, he imperilled himself for the letter of the Orientals to Pope Julius, which he mentions, is not supposed by Hilary to be some unknown letter of the year 352 but he identifies it with the letter of the Eusebians of 340; the accusations contained in that letter were rejected by the council of Sardica and by ignoring that council, Fortunatian had condemned himself as a forger for Liberius could not have ignored it. Further, just as the letter of the Eusebians to Julius was followed and refuted by a letter from an Egyptian council, so was the letter to Liberius refuted by a similar letter". So far Chapman. But that he was not entirely satisfied with his interpretation is shown in Rev. Ben. 1910 p.202sq. where he attempts to give another explanation. This time he asserts that the reference contained in the mention of the council of Ariminum must be to some letter

presumably/

presumably of the orthodox at the council, now lost, but originally contained in Hilary's collection of documents about the council. It will have been a complaint or accusation with regard to Potamius and Epictetus. The natural thing to say of them if their character was to be taken away in order to discredit their actions, was that they had rejoiced in condemning the bishop of Rome to exile and the venerable Hosius to torture. Hilary has understood some such phrase as though both crimes were attributed to both bishops, and he says that Potamius and Epictetus were described in some document of the council of Ariminum as rejoicing in the condemnation of Liberius to exile; "but Potamius and Epictetus when they were condemning the Pope with glee (as the council of Ariminum says of them) would not accept the authenticity of the letter", for they would not have wanted to condemn him if they did accept it.

Now with regard to Chapman's first theory: - even granting that Hilary introduced "Studens" as a forgery (which assumption has been already rejected), there are still many difficulties in Chapman's reconstruction. For instance, if the forger's work did not even impose on Potamius and Epictetus, two rabid Arians, then whom could the forger have hoped to convince? If we are to assume the forger theory, then it must also be assumed that it was written as a support to the opponents of the orthodox; but if even extreme Arians could not accept it as a POSSIBLE letter of Liberius, it is difficult to understand why it should ever have been produced at all.

Nor does the second part follow so logically and naturally as Chapman would have us suppose, for it is Liberius, and not

Fortunatian/

Fortunatian, who is intended in this part[67].

Chapman's second theory fares even worse for it is based upon pure conjecture. There is no evidence that both Potamius and Epictetus were concerned in the condemnation of Liberius. We do know that Epictetus was one of the instigators of his exile but there is nothing to show that Potamius was concerned in the events at Milan in 355. He comes into prominence only later at the Sirmian council of August 357. Nor does the fact that "they were unwilling to hear these things" imply that they doubted the authenticity of the letter.

A more satisfactory explanation would seem to be: - The Narrative text opens with an ironical exclamation which indicates the way in which the preceding letter was received. Then the reason that Liberius' letter did not find any favour either with Potamius and Epictetus or with the other bishops to whom Fortunatian sent it, was probably that this concession on the part of Liberius was not now sufficient and that these bishops at this time were concentrating, not on Athanasius, but on preparations for the Sirmian council to be held in August 357.

The ending is a conclusion on the letter "Studens" itself and the first part of the narrative text. The writer states that a letter had come from Egypt warning Liberius that so long as the authority of the council of Sardica remained firm, he would only embarrass and imperil himself by breaking off communion with Athanasius. The reader is left to add the final conclusion "And this is indeed just what has happened!"

Notes.

67. The implied subject of "decerperet" is Liberius, not Fortunatian.

## CONCLUSION

Because of the confusion which exists among the documents in the Collection, there has been much speculation as to the original form of Hilary's work.

Because the collection is now divided into two groups, Du Pin[1] asserts that the fragments are a selection of many pieces made by an unknown author from two books of Hilary and from some passages of his other works. A.Viehhauser[2] suggests that the fragments are only preliminary material for a work on the synods of Ariminum and Seleucia because among the individual fragments there are only a few small remarks of the author extant and not the slightest indication of a conclusion; and that, since B VI can not have been written before 367 and Hilary died in that year, the compilation of the work has been hindered through the death of the author. Like Viehhauser, M. Schanz[3] holds that the fragments are not excerpts from a completed work of Hilary, because no clear principle or purpose is visible in them, but rather represent material for an unfinished work.

Reinkens[4], on the other hand, argues that in the Preface (B I), which is acknowledged by all as genuine, the description of the events denotes the end of 359 or beginning of 360, and that so far from being preliminary material for a history of Arianism, the

Preface/

Notes.
1. Eccles. Hist. I. Eng. transl. 1723 p.197.
2. "Hilarius Pict., geschildert in seinem Kampfe gegen den Arianismus (Klagenfurt 1860) p. 47sq.
3. Geschichte der Röm. Litt. vol. IV p.266sq.
4. Hilarius von Poitiers p.210.

Preface promises a concluded work. In view of this, he concludes that no fragment which shows a later date than 360 belonged to the work introduced by B I and so rejects A I, A II, A III, B IV, B V, and B VI without doubting the authenticity of the rest.

According to Schiktanz[5] the two groups of fragments represent two books of Hilary, the first written at the end of 361 or beginning of 362, the second written earlier, probably begun in exile and completed at Constantinople; both have been circulated together and fragments A III, B IV, B V, and B VI have been inserted later by Hilary.

Wilmart's opinion[6] is that B I, B II, the so-called Ad Const.I, A VII, B VII and A IV represent the debris of Hilary's book against Valens and Ursacius, published in 356 between the close of the synod of Biterrae and his going into exile. A VIII, A IX, A V, A VI, A I, A II, B IV, and B VIII form another book published in 363, and A III, B V, B VI a third "adversus Valentem et Ursacium", published in 367. It was probably also in 367, he continues, on the occasion of the supplementary section, that the three writings were united under one single title to form a volume similar to that consulted by Jerome in 392 and by Sulpicius Severus c.400.

Following Wilmart, Chapman[7] takes B I, B II, A IV, and the Ad Const. I to be the remains of a work of Hilary published in 356 after the synod of Beziers, at the very beginning of Hilary's exile, and representing/

Notes.
5. Die Hilarius - Fragmente §§ 20, 24, 26.
6. Rev. Ben. 1907 p.149sq; 1908 p.225sq.
7. Rev. Ben. 1910 p.328sq.

representing an apology, containing matter to which the synod had refused to listen. A VII, B III and B VII form a separate group whose introduction and conclusion are now lost and which were published only after the synod of Ariminum along with A VIII, A IX, A V, A VI, A I, A II, B VIII, and B IV. A III, B V, and B VI were added, in his opinion, after Hilary's death. He does not agree with Wilmart that the descriptions of Jerome and Rufinus fit B I, B II, and A IV, as well as A VIII, A IX, A V, A VI, A I, A II, B VIII and B IV, because, he asserts (p.329), the former group is not so much concerned with Valens and Ursacius as with explaining Hilary's own position. So his conclusion is that the fragments represent two separate books, the one, a letter written to the episcopate of Gaul in 356, the other, an account of the council of Ariminum, composed c.360-361; but both were probably bound up together. The letters of Liberius belong to the later work.

Feder[8] declares that A IV, B I, and B II belong to a historical -polemic work of Hilary, which he composed before the summer of 356, after the unsuccessful issue of the synod of Biterrae. A VII, A V, A VI, A VIII, A IX, B IV, B VII and B VIII belong to a polemical work of Hilary which he composed in Constantinople in the winter of 359/360, to annul the decrees of Ariminum, Seleucia and Constantinople. Then, because of their being placed together with the other fragments, A I, A II, A III, B IV, [illegible] B V and B VI may be parts/

Notes.
8. Stud. I p.121sq.

parts of a third historical-polemic work of Hilary which he published a short time before his death or from whose publication he was hindered by death.

Feder considers that the superscription at the beginning of Series B is a very old one, for Hilary is not given the title "sanctus" - perhaps it may have come from Hilary himself - and that it has been put in its present position through the general confusion in which the fragments have reached us.

His conclusion is that Hilary published his work of the winter of 359/360 under the title "Opus Historicum II", his earlier work of 356 he denoted Book I, and to these he added later a Book III.

After this review, it becomes imperative to give one's own conclusions on this problem.

First of all, it must be noted that, because of the general confusion in which the documents have reached us, the two groupings of documents do not necessarily denote two original books of Hilary, as some writers have maintained. The present division into two groups is an artificial one, probably resulting from accidents in transmission. It is obvious, for example, that the Germinius letters and Liberius letters form, in themselves, independent units, and yet, in each set, some are found in Series A and others in Series B. This also serves to show that the two series are very intimately connected and have been compiled by the same collector, namely, Hilary.

As has been seen, according to Wilmart and Feder, Hilary published/

published not only a first book in 356 but also a second in 360 and a third about the time of his death. Now it is true that the documents can be roughly classified into 3 groups. a) those dealing with events up to 356 ie. A IV, A VII, B I, B II and the so-called Ad Const I. b) the Liberius letters B III and B VII, and the Ariminum-Seleucia documents A II, A V, A VI, A VIII, A IX, and B VIII and c) the material belonging to the time after 360, A I, A III, B IV, B V, and B VI. But only in the case of the first group is there any evidence that publication has been attempted. In B I and B II can probably be glimpsed the way in which Hilary intended to treat his work with preface and commentary on the various documents; and Phoebadius of Agen provides external evidence for the circulation of such a work[9].

As opinions have differed on the time and place of composition of this work, a discussion of this question must here be given. Coustant[10] and Reinkens[11] suppose the work to have been written at Constantinople when Hilary hurried there after the synod of Seleucia. But internal evidence gained from B I and c. Const. seems to denote a much earlier date and therefore a different place of composition. (1) Firstly, c. Const. 2[12] speaks against the composition of a historical-polemic work at Constantinople in 360. (2) In B I the adverbial/

Notes.

9. cf. B. Marx "Die Herkunft der Fragmente I und II und das sogenannte Opus historicum".
10. P.L. X col. 624.
11. l.c. p.210sq.
12. " toto hoc tempore in exilio detentus..nihil in tempora maledictum, nihil in eam, quae tum se Christi ecclesiam mentiebatur, nunc autem antichristi est synagoga, famosum ac dignum ipsorum impietate scripsi, aut locutus sum".

adverbial phrases "proxime" concerning the events at Arles 353 and "recens" recalling Milan 355 seem to denote an earlier date than 360. (3) In his Preface Hilary refers to the intrigues of the Arians in condemning to exile the Western bishops faithful to the person and principles of Athanasius. But he himself still lives in his own country, the decree of banishment has not yet befallen him. In all his writings composed in exile, he speaks of his banishment, but in B I there is no mention of it. (4) The land, in which Hilary is living when he writes his Preface is far from the chief theatre (i.e. the East) of the Church's confusion. (5) The quietly developed thoughts on I Cor. 13,13 in B I could hardly belong to so agitated a time as that of Constantinople 360. (6) There is also a great difference between B I and c.Const. in their tone towards the Emperor so far as obtaining an audience is concerned. (7) Many allusions to the events of the time in B I can be applied only to 346. A hypocritical peace had lasted a long time until the quarrels had been renewed through the malice of deceitful men. This can refer only to the apparent submission of Valens and Ursacius c. 346 and of their renewed enmity towards Athanasius at Arles and Milan. There had been an uneasy peace from 346 until Constantius' victory over Magnentius gave the Arians a further opportunity to cause trouble in the Church. B I § 4 "quo etiam in romani imperii negotiis quies carpitur..turbatur" is a fitting description of the events, following the synod of Milan 355[13]. Since Arles, the

enemies/

Notes.

13. cf. the narrative text § 3 to the Or. Syn. Sard. (i.e. the so-called Ad Const. I).

enemies of the Nicene creed had contrived to intrude their condemnation of Athanasius on the rest of the bishops and especially those in Gaul: "ita ubique agitur, trepidatur, instatur, ut plane iniquitatem huius adsertionis optinendi labor et cura prodiderit". (§ 4 BI). Then at Arles, Paulinus of Trèves had been exiled for his support of Athanasius, and in his Preface (§ 6), Hilary still refers to him as being alive and calls him "frater et comminister meus". Paulinus died in 357 in exile in Phrygia and so, in his c. Const.11, Hilary refers to him as "beatae passionis vir". Furthermore the question concerning Athanasius was the one of most importance in 356 but by the time of Ariminum and Seleucia, it had dropped completely into the background simply because the Arians had by then discarded this subterfuge and come out in open opposition to the Nicene creed. In 356 it took a man of vision and foresight, like Hilary, to perceive that what was at stake was, not Athanasius, but the Nicene creed - it was the purpose of Hilary's book to make this common knowledge (cf. B I §§ 4,6) - by 360 it had become common knowledge (and so there would have been no need for such a book).

B II also fits into this scheme of things. For instance, Hilary's appeal to the bishops, who have allowed themselves to be seduced into condemning Athanasius, to renounce this scandal, is out of place in 360 because he testifies in his De Synodis 2 that the Gallic bishops have already for three years avoided communion with Saturninus. The scandal could have been given only at Arles 353 and Milan where so many bishops had been constrained by the violence/

violence of Valens, Ursacius and Saturninus into condemning Athanasius.

In addition to all this there is the external witness provided by Phoebadius of Agen who seems to have used Hilary's work before 360[14].

So it seems safe to assume that, before going into exile, in 356, Hilary has published in Gaul a work of which B I, B II, A IV, and the so-called Ad Const. I have been preserved.[15]

But the same evidence is not obtainable for the publication either of a second or a third book by Hilary. A further introduction would have been necessary, but there is no trace of this. The absence of narrative text from so many of the other documents also does not favour the view of Feder and Wilmart. c. Const. 2 "toto hoc tempore..locutus sum"[16] is further testimony against their theory. According to Feder, B VIII, 2 seems to indicate the composition of a second book, but, as seen in the Conclusion to the document, it is better to regard this as an isolated personal address incorporated later with the rest of the documents. He also takes the title which Jerome gives the work as evidence for the publication of a second book. But, again, this is not necessarily so. It has been already noted[17] that the titles which Jerome attributes to works in his catalogue are often neither accurate nor authoritative; in any case, since about half of the material extant concerns the synods of Ariminum and Seleucia, this is

sufficient/

Notes.

14. cf. B. Marx l.c.
15. Though A VII belongs in time to this section, it seems better to place it among the other Liberius letters.
16. see n.12.
17. cf. Introduction.

sufficient warrant for the title given to the work by Jerome, without needing to assume the publication of a second book.

That Hilary did intend to publish the rest of the documents at some future date must be admitted - the narrative text attached to some of the Liberius letters and Ariminum documents points to this - but there is no evidence available to prove that he ever carried out his intention.

There is no doubt that the presumption of a second book would furnish an easy solution for the "liber secondus" which is found in the MSS as superscription to Series B. But just as acceptable an explanation is that a copyist, not understanding the arrangement and disposition of the material, has attached this title to the unpublished documents in order to distinguish them from the published work of 356, the "liber primus" so to speak.

To his published work of 356, then, Hilary has appended additional material, similar in subject but later in time. Though probably intending to form these additional documents into another work, of like purpose and plan with the first, he has somehow been prevented from completing his task. It may have been an untimely death which caused this because the last document in his collection must have been added just shortly before he died[18].

The published work of 356 and the unedited documents have thus been transmitted together and, in course of time, some documents, in whole or in part, have been lost (their haphazard arrangement would contribute greatly to this), while the original disposition has/

Notes.
18. cf. Conclusion of B VI.

has been altered, perhaps intentionally through some copyist trying to give a new "order", as he thought, to the documents, perhaps accidentally in course of transmission, and the unpublished material has become mixed with the published. All this makes it now impossible to discover any purpose or order in the present arrangement of the documents in the MSS.

Because of the gaps in the work, as it is now preserved[19], and the fact that so much of the material is peculiar to Hilary's collection, the task of evaluating Hilary as a historian is a difficult one. Almost three-quarters of the material contained in the collection is found now only in this work. The reason for this is probably that Hilary's collection is essentially a personal one; all the documents in the work are those which vitally affect either Hilary himself or the Western episcopate. Furthermore, his dominant interest in Western affairs has preserved many a document which an Eastern historian would have overlooked as unimportant. It is Hilary alone who has preserved the encyclical of the Easterns at Sardica and given us an account of the synods which took place with regard to Photinus, Ursacius and Valens during the period of stalemate between 343 and 351. In his work is found almost all the information now available concerning the synods of Arles, Milan and Biterrae, and the events concerning Liberius. To Hilary we owe many interesting details concerning the synods of Ariminum, Nike and Seleucia, the happenings at Constantinople 360, the effects of these synods/

Notes.
19. cf. Introduction.

synods on Gaul, and the later actions of Valens, Ursacius and Germinius.

In his choice of documents, and, above all, in his narrative texts, he shows an intimate knowledge and understanding and a firm grasp of the issues at stake in the Arian controversy of his day, regarded from the Western point of view. The deceits of the Arians, especially as seen in the conduct of Valens, Ursacius and Saturninus, whom he detests as the ringleaders of the Arian cause in the West, the Liberius question, his interest in securing an alliance and closer co-operation between Western orthodox and Eastern Semiarians, the problem of the lapsed bishops, the change of mind on the part of Germinius, are all in keeping with his original plan and purpose as set forth in the Preface to his book of 356. In all are seen his passionate desire for the resuscitation of the Nicene creed, his strong castigation of those who knowingly depart from the true faith, his hatred of the impious creeds and treachery of the Arians.

In only one part of his work, as now preserved, does he manifestly allow his bias to override his critical judgment. That occurs in the narrative text B II, 9, where, though he earns praise for his insight in exposing the indirect attack on Athanasius, he yet can not escape censure as a historian for his partiality towards Athanasius. This "slip" can, however, be excused when one remembers the circumstances and extreme provocation under which this section was written.

Comparison with material preserved elsewhere reveals that, while the lists of bishops given in the collection are usually incomplete/

incomplete, no great difference is found in substance between Hilary's text of the documents and that found in the other contemporary sources.

One is left with the impression of a shrewd and careful collector, who, like every historian, could on rare occasions be misled by his passions, his own natural inclinations and bias.

Faber[20] admirably sums up this collection when he states that in number of pages it is not a great work, but in subject matter it is most weighty. When the "Edict of Milan" (March 313) brought peace to the Church, the production of Christian literature in the West seemed to come to a standstill[21], and until Hilary published his book in 356, no Christian writer of any note had arisen in the West to meet the challenge of Arianism. To Hilary goes the distinction of being the first Western bishop to attack the Arians in writing, and indeed it is generally admitted that none of those who arose later, such as Phoebadius of Agen, Eusebius of Vercelli, or Lucifer of Cagliari, ever approached the high standard set by the bishop of Poitiers. Fragmentary as it now is, the collection still stands as an imposing tribute to the genius of Hilary in attempting to fulfil this need, in realising how necessary it was to combat the deceits of the Arians, not only by the spoken word and personal actions, but by written testimony and documents, of whose authenticity there could be no doubt, and whose value, therefore, abides for ever, a perpetual witness to the truth.

Notes.
20. P.L.X col. 888 Praef. § 1.
21. cf. Bardy "Christian Latin Literature".

If his work had been completed, it would have given an authoritative Western sketch of the Arian controversy comparable to that given in the East by the writings of Athanasius. But even as it now stands, it is invaluable for a full appreciation and understanding of the Arian controversy as seen through Western eyes, andprovides many interesting aspects of the struggle, evoked partly by the peculiar circumstances and situations in which Hilary found himself, partly by the particular persons with whom he came in contact, partly by his own standpoint and interpretation of the issues at stake.

Bibliography.

M. R. Aigrain in Bull. de la Soc. Des Antiq. de l'Ouest. (1938): N. Alexandre, Hist. Eccles. (1734): Alzog, Grundrisz der Patrologie und der altern Christlichen Literargeschichte (1866): E. Amann, The Church of the early centuries (Cath. Lib. of Rel. Know. t.15): A.Antweiler, Des hl. Bisch. Hil. von P.zwolf Bucher uber die Dreieinigkeit (Introd. 1933): C. A. Auber, Hist. gen., civ., rel. et litt. de Poitou vol. I (1865) and Vie des saints de l'Eglise de Poitiers (1858).

Babut, Life of St. Martin of Tours: X.Le Bachelet, art. Hilaire in D.T.C. VI: J. Baltzer, Die Christologie des hl. H.v.P. (Rottweil 1889): P. Barbier, Vie de S.H. (1887): O. Bardenhewer, Geschichte der Alterkirchlichen Literatur, and Patrology: G. Bardy, Hist. de l'Eglise (1947), Christian Latin Lit. of the first 6 centuries (Cath. Lib. Rel. Know. t12) (Unable to consult Bardy L'Occident en face de la crise Arienne, L'Eglise et l'enseignement au IV^e siecle, La cultrue grecque dans l'occident chretien au IV^e siecle): P. Batiffol, La paix constaninienne (1914): F. C. Baur, Die Christl. Lehre Vol. I: A. Beck, Die Trinitatslehre des hl. H.v.P. in Forschungen zur Christl. Lit. und Dogmengeschichte t 3, 1903 and Die Lehre des hl. H.v.P. uber die Leidensfahigkeit des Leibes Christi in Zeitschrift fur Kath. Theol. t30, 1906: Bigg, Christian Platonists of Alexandria: W. S. Bishop, Development of Trinitarian doctrine in the Nicene and Athanasian creeds: Blondell, De primatu ecclesiae (Geneva 1641): Bouchet, Les annales d'Aquitaine: Bright, Notes on the First Four General Councils (1882): J.P. Brisson, H. de P. Traite des Mysteres (Pref.1947): de Broglie, L'Eglise et l'empire romain au IV^e siecle: A. E. Burn, Council of Nicaea (1925) and Niceta of Remesiana.

Cabrol, "Les ecrits inedits de S.H." in Rev. du monde cath. 1888: Cave, Hist. Lit. Script. Eccles, Vol. I (1740): J. C. Cazenove, Hil. of Poit. (London 1883): Ceillier, Hist. gen. des auteurs sacr. (1865sq): F. Chamard, Origines de l'Eglise de Poitiers (1874), Saint Martin et son monastere de Liguge (1873): Chapman, The Contested Letters of Liberius (Rev. Ben. 1910): Clinton, Fasti Romani: L. Clugnet, H. of P. (in Cath. Encycl. t8, 1910): D. Conybeare, Analyt. exam of the writings of the Christian Fathers (1839): H. Coquoin, History of Greek and Latin Christian Literature: Correspondance de Rome 1851: P. Coustant, ed.of Hilary's works (P.L. IX and X)and Epist. Rom. Pont. (1721): E. Cunitz, art. H. de P. in Encycl. des sciences relig. (1879): Curtis, History of Creeds (Edinburgh 1911).

E. Diehl, Collection of Christian Inscriptions: Dollinger, Hippolytus and Callistus (Edinburgh 1876) and Die Papstfabeln des Mittelalters: Dorner, Doctrine of the Person of Christ: Dreves, Das Hymnenbuch des hl. Hil. in Zeitschrift fur kath. Theol. (1886): L. Dubois, Saint Hil. (1902): Duchesne, Hist. of Christian Church, Liber Pont., Fastes Episc. de l'ancienne Gaulle, Libere et Fortunatien in Melanges d'Archeologie et d'Histoire (1908) and art. on hymns of Hil. in Bull. crit. 1887): S. W. Duffield, Hilary of Poitiers and the earliest Latin hymns in the Presbyterian Review New York(1883): J. Du Perron, Replique a la response du roi de la Grande Bretagne I: (unable to consult E. Dormagen, S. H. de P. et l'arianisme (1864) and C. Douais, L'Eglise des Gaules et le conciliabule de Beziers (1875)): E. Dumont in Rev. des quest. hist. 1866.

Ebert, Allgemeine Geschichte der Literatur des Mittelalters im Abendlande (1889): Erasmus, S. Hil. Opera (1535): E. Evans, Tertullian's Treatise against Praxeas (1948).

Faber, Pref. in P.L.X: Farrer, Interpretation of Scripture (1885): B. Fechtrup in Wetzer-Welte's Encycl. art. on Hil.: A. L. Feder, Studien zu Hil. v. P. in Sitzungsberichte der K. Akademie 162, 166, 169 (Wien 1910-12), Kulturgeschichtliches in den Werken des hl. Hil. v. P. in Stimmen aus Maria-Laach 81 (1911): C. Foligno, Latin Thought during the Middle Ages, (Oxford 1929): Forster, zue Theologie des Hilarius in Theol. Stud. u. Kritiken 61, 1888: V. Fortunatus, Vita S.H. (in P.L. 9).

Gams, Kirchegesch. Spanien., Ser. Episc: J. F. Gamurrini, S. Hil. Tract. de Myst. et Hymni (1887): Ghellinck, Patristique et Moyen Age: A. Girard, Sainte Hilaire: P. Glorieux in Melanges de science relig. 1944: Goyau, Chronologie de l'empire remain (1891): E. Griffe, La Gaule chretienne, (1947): J. Gummerus, Die homousianische Partei (1900): O. Gunther, Avellana-Studien (1896): Gwatkin, The Arian Controversy (1889), Studies in Arianism (1900).

Haarhoff, Schools of Gaul (1920): Hagemann in Theol. Lit. Bon 1869: A. Hahn, Bibliothek der Symbole (1897): V. Hansen, Vie de S.H.: Hefele, Councils (English 1871sq. French 1907), and art. in Tubingen Rev. Theol. Quartals. 1853: G. Hermant, Vie de S. Athanasius: J. Scott Holmes, Church in Gaul (1911): Hort, Two Dissertations (1876).

Jaffe, Reg. Pontif.: H. Jeannotte, Le Psautier de S. H. de P. and also in Bibl. Zeitschrift (1912): Emperor Julian's letters: Jülicher in Theol. Literaturzeitung 1906: C. Jullian, Hist. de la Gaulle VII.

Kattenbusch, Das apost. Symbol II: Kelly, Early Christian Creeds: Kidd, The Roman Primacy to 461 and Hist. of Church: Kriegel, Corp. Iud. civ.: G. Kruger, Lucifer von Calaris (1886).

de Labriolle, History of Latin Christian Literature, The Pagan Reaction: A. Largent, Saint Hilaire: H. Lietzmann, Geschichte der Altenkirche III, and Lateinische Altkirch. Poesie in Kleine Texte fur Theol. Philol. Vorlesungen 1910: H. Lindemann, Des hl. H. v. P. "liber mysteriorum" (1905): T. M. Lindsay, The Church and the Ministry in the Early Centuries (1902): W. M. Lindsay, Early Latin Verse (1922): F. Loofs, art. Hilarius in Real. fur. Prot. Theol. und Kirche VIII, and art. Synode von Sardica in Theol. Stud. u. Krit. 1909.

J. J. McMahon, De Christo Mediatore (1947): E. Male, La fin du paganisme en Gaule (Paris 1950): B. Marx, Die Herkunft der Fragmente I und II in Tubingen Quartals. 1906: A. S. Mason, The first Latin Christian Poet in JTS 1904: C. Mirbt, Quellen zur Geschichte der Papsttums: Mohler, Ath. der Grosse (1827): Mommsen, Dei Rom. Bischofe Liberius u. Felix in Deutsche Zeitschrift fur Geschichtewissenschaften, N.F.I 1896/7: P. Monceaux, Martin of Tours (Paris 1926): Montalembart, Les Moines d'Occident I: W. N. Myers, The Hymns of Hilary (1928).

L.L. Paine, The Evolution of Trinitarianism (1900): Palma, Praelectiones Hist. Eccles. I (1838): Pie, Oeuvres VI (1870): Pitra, Spicilegium Solesmense: Du Pin, Nouv. Biblioth. des aut. sacr. II (1693): G. Prestige, God in Patristic Thought (1936).

Le Quien, Oriens Christianus; J. A. Quillacq, Quomodo Latina lingua usus sit. S.H.P. (1903).

G. Rasneur, L'Homoiousianisme dans ses rapports avec l'Orthodoxie in Rev. d'Hist. Eccles. 4 (1903): G. Rauschen, Patrologie (1931): Reinerding, Beitrage zur Honorius und Liberius frage (1865): J. H. Reinkens, H. v.P. (1864): Le Page Renouf, The condemnation of Pope Honorius (1868): Rivet, Hist. Litt. de la France I: C. La Rocheposay, Notae ad Litan. SS. Pictav.

Saltet in Bull. de Litt. Eccl. de Toulouse 1905, 1906, 1907: F. Savio, La questione di Papa Liberio in Fede e Scienze 1907, Nuovi studi sulla questione di Papa Liberio 1909, Punti controversi nella questione del papa Liberio 1911: Schanz Gesshichte der Rom. Litt. Part IV, 1914: M. Schiktanz, Die Hilarius Fragmente (1905): E. Schwartz, Zur Geschichte des Ath. in Nachr. v.d. Kgl. Gesells. d. Wiss. zu Gottingen 1904 sq: P. Sinthern, De causa papae Liberii in Slav. Litt. theol. IV (1908) R. Travers Smith, The Church in Roman Caul: P. Smulders, La doctrine trinitaire de S. H. de P. (1944): Stanley, History of the Eastern Church (1862): Stilting in Acta SS.VI: The Early History of the Church and the Ministry ed. Swete (1921) and Swete "Patristic Study".

W. Telfer in Harvard Theol. Rev. XXXVI, 1943, and XLIII, 1950: de la Tour, Les origines religieuses de la France: J. Turmel Le Pope Libere in Rev. Cath. des Eglises 1906, Histoire de la Theologie Positive: C. H. Turner, Eccl. Occ. Mon. Iur. Ant. and articles in J.T.S.

Ughelli Italia sacra: Van Espen Ius Eccl.: A. Viehhauser, Hil. Pict. geschildert in seinem Kampfe gegen den Arianismus (1860).

A. S. Walrole, Hymns attributed to Hilary in JTS.1905: J. Wittig, Papst Damasus I (1902): A. Wilmart in Rev. Ben. 1907, 1908, 1910, 1913, 1931: J. B. Wirthmuller, Die Lehre des hl. H.v.P. uber die Selbstentausserung Christi (1865).

E. A. Zaccaria, Dissert. de Commentitio Liberii lapsu in Petau de Theolog. dogm. t II part 2, 1757: Zahn, Marcellus von Ancyra (1867): J. Zeiller, Les origines chretiennes dans les Provinces danubiennes (1918), and art. in Bull. d'anc litt et d'arch. chret. 1913.

---

General Works and periodicals.

Relevant volumes in P.L., P.G., C.S.E.L., Ante-and Post-Nicene Library: Collections of Councils (Binius, Ballerini, Coleti, Harduin, Labbe-Cossart, Lauchert, Mansi, Maassen): Baronius, Annal: Tillemont, Mem: Hist. Eccles. Wordsworth-White, Novum Testamentum Latine: Pauly Wissowa: Bull. d'ancien. lit. et d'arch.chret. 1913: Bull. de la Soc. des Antiq. de l'Ouest 1938: Bull. Litt. Eccles, 1905, 1906, 1907: Cambridge Text and Studies vols. 3, 7: D.C.B: D.T.C: Die Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart II: Harvard Theol. Rev. 1943, 1950: J.T.S/

J.T.S. 1902, 1904, 1905, 1907, 1909, 1916: Lexikon für Theol. und Kirche V: Melanges de science religieuse, 1944: Real. für Prot. Theol. und Kirche VIII: Rev. Ben. 1907 sq: Rev. Cath. de Eglises 1906: Rev. des Questions Hist. 1866: Rev. d'hist. eccles. 1903: Rev. d'hist. et de litt. rel. 1922: Rev. du monde cath. 1888: Rev. Hist. Egl. France 1941: Schaff-Herzog Encyc. of Rel. Know. t, V: Stimmen aus Maria Laach 1911: Theolog. Iahresbericht XXV: Theol. Stud. u. Krit. 1888, 1909: Tubingen Theol. Quartals. 1853, 1905, 1906: Wetzer-Welte Encycl.: Zeitschrift fur Kath. Theol. 1888, 1906: Zeitschrift fur die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft, 1911, 1925, 1931, 1934, 1941, ...