

Universitatea „Alexandru Ioan Cuza” din Iași
Facultatea de Istorie • Centrul de Studii Clasice și Creștine

Nr. 19-1/2024

CLASSICA & CHRISTIANA



EDITURA UNIVERSITĂȚII „ALEXANDRU IOAN CUZA” DIN IAȘI

Classica et Christiana

Revista Centrului de Studii Clasice și Creștine

Fondator: Nelu ZUGRAVU

19/1, 2024

Classica et Christiana

Periodico del Centro di Studi Classici e Cristiani

Fondatore: Nelu ZUGRAVU

19/1, 2024

ISSN: 1842 – 3043

e-ISSN: 2393 – 2961

Comitetul științific / Comitato scientifico

Moisés ANTIQUEIRA (Universidade Estadual do Oeste do Paraná)
Sabine ARMANI (Université Paris 13-CRESC – PRES Paris Cité Sorbonne)
Immacolata AULISA (Università di Bari Aldo Moro)
Andrea BALBO (Università degli Studi di Torino)
Antonella BRUZZONE (Università degli Studi di Sassari)
Livia BUZOIANU (Muzeul Național de Istorie și Arheologie Constanța)
Marija BUZOV (Institute of Archaeology, Zagreb)
Dan DANA (C.N.R.S. – ANHIMA, Paris)
Maria Pilar GONZÁLEZ-CONDE PUENTE (Universidad de Alicante)
Attila JAKAB (Civitas Europica Centralis, Budapest)
Fred W. JENKINS (University of Dayton)
Domenico LASSANDRO (Università di Bari Aldo Moro)
Carmela LAUDANI (Università della Calabria)
Patrizia MASCOLI (Università di Bari Aldo Moro)
Dominic MOREAU (Université de Lille)
Eduard NEMETH (Universitatea Babeș-Bolyai, Cluj-Napoca)
Evalda PACI (Centro di Studi di Albanologia, Tirana)
Vladimir P. PETROVIĆ (Serbian Academy of Sciences and Arts, Belgrade)
Luigi PIACENTE (Università di Bari Aldo Moro)
Sanja PILIPOVIĆ (Institute of Archaeology, Belgrade)
Mihai POPESCU (C.N.R.S. – ANHIMA, Paris)
Julijana VISOČNIK (Archdiocesan Archives of Ljubljana)
Heather WHITE (Classics Research Centre, London)

Comitetul de redacție / Comitato di redazione

Claudia TĂRNĂUCEANU (Universitatea „Alexandru Ioan Cuza” din Iași)
Nelu ZUGRAVU, director al Centrului de Studii Clasice și Creștine
al Facultății de Istorie a Universității „Alexandru Ioan Cuza” din Iași
(*director responsabil / direttore responsabile*)

Correspondența / Corrispondenza:

Prof. univ. dr. Nelu ZUGRAVU
Facultatea de Istorie, Centrul de Studii Clasice și Creștine
Bd. Carol I, nr. 11, 700506 – Iași, România
Tel. ++40 232 201634 / Fax ++40 232 201156
e-mail: nelu@uaic.ro

Toate contribuțiile sunt supuse unei duble analize anonime (*double-blind peer review*), efectuate de specialiști români și străini.

All contributions are subject to a double anonymous analysis (*double blind peer review*), carried out by Romanian and foreign specialists.

La redazione sottopone preliminarmente tutti i contributi pervenuti a un procedimento di doppia lettura anonima (*double-blind peer review*) affidato a specialisti romeni e stranieri.

UNIVERSITATEA „ALEXANDRU IOAN CUZA” din IAȘI
FACULTATEA DE ISTORIE
CENTRUL DE STUDII CLASICE ȘI CREȘTINE

Classica et Christiana

19/1
2024

Tehnoredactor: Nelu ZUGRAVU

ISSN: 1842 – 3043
e-ISSN: 2393 – 2961

Editura Universității „Alexandru Ioan Cuza” din Iași
700511 - Iași, tel./fax ++ 40 0232 314947

SUMAR / INDICE / CONTENTS

SIGLE ȘI ABREVIERI – SIGLE E ABBREVIAZIONI / 7

STUDII – STUDI / 9

Marco ALMANSA FERNÁNDEZ, Religious crimes in the Acts of the *collegium* of the *fratres aruales* / 9

Maria AMBROSETTI, *Historia proxima poetis*: osservazioni sul lessico di Sisenna e Accio [*Historia proxima poetis*: Observations on Sisenna and Accius' Lexicon] / 31

Antonella BRUZZONE, *Il “gran finale” del De consulatu Stilichonis di Claudiano* [*The “gran finale” of Claudian's De consulatu Stilichonis*] / 57

Alessandro CAPONE, Il carcere del corpo e la sanità dell'anima nell'*Apologeticum* di Tertulliano [The prison of the body and the soundness of the soul in Tertullian's *Apologeticum*] / 77

Alenka CEDILNIK, Dominic MOREAU, How Ulfilas became an Arian Bishop? Contribution (I) to the Christian Prosopography of the *Dioecesis Thraciarum* / 95

Alenka CEDILNIK, Dominic MOREAU, Demophilus, the Last Arian Bishop of Constantinople? Contribution (II) to the Christian Prosopography of the *Dioecesis Thraciarum* / 121

Alenka CEDILNIK, Dominic MOREAU, Macedonius of Constantinople, a True Eusebian? Contribution (IV) to the Christian Prosopography of the *Dioecesis Thraciarum* / 149

Agapie CORBU, Formația clasicistă a unui autor patristic: Evagrie Ponticul [The classical education of a Patristic author: Evagrius Ponticus] / 175

Pierre-Jacques DEHON, Poètes latins et zones climatiques : Heurs et malheurs d'un topos [Latin Poets and Climatic Zones : Ups and Downs of a Topos] / 191

Iulia DUMITRACHE, Character, Ridiculousness and Shame in the Latin Satire. The Use of Proper Names at Martial / 227

Lee FRATANTUONO, Herodotus' Artemisia and Virgil's Camilla / 245

Antonio IBBA, Tappi fittili da *Ibida* in *Scythia Minor* (V-VI sec.): riflessioni su una tipologia poco nota dell'*instrumentum inscriptum* [Clay plugs from *Ibida* in *Scythia Minor* (5th-6th century): reflections on a little-known typology of the *instrumentum inscriptum*] / 267

Anca MEIROȘU, Challenges in the Literary Representations of the Self. Case Study: *Accidia (Secretum, Petrarch)* / 297

Daniela SCARDIA, *E uestris codicibus eradendum*. Nota a Hier. *Ep.* 106, 73 [*E uestris codicibus eradendum*. Note about Hier. *Ep.* 106, 73] / 307

RECENZII ȘI NOTE BIBLIOGRAFICE – RECENSIONI E SCHEDE BIBLIOGRAFICHE / 315

M. TULLI CICERONIS *Actionis secundae in C. Verrem: Liber V* = M. TULLIUS CICERO, *A doua acțiune împotriva lui Verres: Cartea a V-a*, editori Luigi PIACENTE și Claudia TĂRNĂUCEANU, Editura Universității din București, 2023 (*Julian-Gabriel HRUȘCĂ*) / 315; AURELIO VITTORE, *De Caesaribus*, traduzione, introduzione e commento a cura di Mario IERARDI, Amazon Fulfillment, Wrocław, 2023 (*Nelu ZUGRAVU*) / 322; Fanny DEL CHICCA, *L'importanza di nascere clarissimus: per l'interpretazione dell'oratio VIII di Simmaco*, Morlacchi Editore U.P., Perugia, 2023 (*George IVAȘCU*) / 323; PAUL N. PEARSON, *The Roman Empire in Crisis, 248-260. When the Gods Abandoned Rome*, Pen & Sword Military, South Yorkshire, 2022 (*Flavian-Pavel CHILCOȘ*) / 327

CRONICA – CRONACA / 341

PUBLICAȚII – PUBBLICAZIONI / 347

SIGLE ȘI ABREVIERI / SIGLE E ABBREVIAZIONI*

ANRW	<i>Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt. Geschichte und Kultur Roms im Spiegel der neueren Forschung</i> , II, <i>Prinzipat</i> , Berlin-New York
CSEL	<i>Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum</i> , Turnhout.
CCSL	<i>Corpus Christianorum. Series Latina</i> , Turnhout.
<i>Cod. Iust.</i>	<i>Codex Iustinianus</i> .
<i>Cod. Theod.</i>	<i>Codex Theodosianus</i> .
DELL	<i>Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue latine. Histoire des mots</i> , par Alfred Ernout et Alfred Meillet, tirage de la 4 ^e édition, Paris, 1959.
EDR	<i>Epigraphic Database Roma</i> (http://www.edr-edr.it/default/index.php).
GCS	<i>Griechische Christliche Schriftsteller</i> , Berlin.
MGH	<i>Monumenta Germaniae Historica</i> .
OLD	<i>Oxford Latin Dictionary</i> , Oxford, 1968.
PG	<i>Patrologiae cursus completus. Series Graeca</i> , Paris.
PL	<i>Patrologiae cursus completus. Series Latina</i> , Paris.
PLRE I	<i>The Prosopography of the Later Roman Empire</i> , I, A. D. 260-395, by A. H. M. Jones, J. R. Martindale, J. Morris, Cambridge, 2006
PSB	<i>Părinți și scriitori bisericești</i> , București
SC	<i>Sources Chrétiennes</i> , Lyon.
SCIV (SCIVA)	<i>Studii și cercetări de istorie veche (și arheologie)</i> , București.
ThLL	<i>Thesaurus linguae Latinae</i> .

* Cu excepția celor din *L'Année Philologique* și *L'Année Épigraphique* / Escluse quelle segnalate da *L'Année Philologique* e *L'Année Épigraphique*.

DEMOPHILUS, THE LAST ARIAN BISHOP OF CONSTANTINOPLE? CONTRIBUTION (II) TO THE CHRISTIAN PROSOPOGRAPHY OF THE *DIOECESIS THRACIARUM*

Alenka CEDILNIK (Univerza v Ljubljani),
Dominic MOREAU (Université de Lille / UMR 8164-HALMA)*

Keywords: *Demophilus I of Constantinople, Arian controversy, Eusebians, Pope Liberius, Constantinopolitan episcopal see.*

Abstract: *This paper discusses the role of an important bishop, Demophilus of Beroe/Constantinople, in the Arian controversy. Two issues are dealt with in particular: the role of Demophilus as representative of the most influential group of Arian/Homoean bishops, and his involvement in the politico-religious strategy of Constantinople at the time, when its episcopal see still had to affirm itself as the most important see in the Eastern part of the Empire.*

* alenka.cedilnik@ff.uni-lj.si and dominic.moreau@univ-lille.fr. This article is derived from a paper given in Yambol on the 3rd of October 2019, at the conference *Late Antique Christianity in Southeastern Europe*, which was organised by Zlatomira Gerdzhikova and Ivo Topalilov, within the framework of the LABedia project (<https://labalkans.org/bg/activities/conferences/conference-2019>). It was first supposed to be published in the “Annales Balcanici” series of the same project (and not in “Folia Balcanica”, as mentioned in Cedilnik-Moreau 2021, 473, n. 130). It should be added that the article is the second of a series of papers given by the same authors, which are linked to each other, as a preliminary contribution to the volume of the *Prosopographie chrétienne du Bas-Empire*, dedicated to *Dioecesis Thraciarum*, *Cherronesus Taurica*, *Bosphorus Cimmerius* and *Zechia*, prepared within the framework of the DANUBIUS Project (<https://danubius.huma-num.fr>). This research programme on Christianisation of the Late Antique Lower Danube was financially supported from 2018 by both the I-SITE ULNE Foundation up to 2021 and the French National Research Agency (ANR-18-CE27-0008) up to 2022. It is based at the University of Lille, within the HALMA-UMR 8164 research centre, with Dominic Moreau as principal investigator. The third paper of the series was the first to be published. See Cedilnik-Moreau 2021. Dominic Moreau takes advantage of this initial note to thank the École française de Rome, where he was as visiting scholar for a period of 10 months (01/09/2022-30/06/2023), when this article was modified to be submitted to *Classica & Christiana*. Moreover, both authors want to thank Irina Achim (Institute of Archaeology “Vasile Pârvan”, Romanian Academy), for her translation of their keywords, title and abstract in Romanian.

Cuvinte-cheie: *Demophilus I de Constantinopol, controversa ariană, eusebieni, papa Liberius, scaunul episcopal constantinopolitan.*

Rezumat: *Demophilus, ultimul episcop arian al Constantinopolului? Contribuție (II) la prosopografia creștină a Dioecesis Thraciarum.* Această lucrare discută rolul unui important episcop, Demophilus de Beroe/Constantinopol, în controversa ariană. Sunt abordate, în special, două aspecte: rolul lui Demophilus ca reprezentant al celui mai influent grup de episcopi arieni/homoeusieni și implicarea sa în strategia politico-religioasă a Constantinopolului la acea vreme, când scaunul său episcopal trebuia încă să se afirme ca cel mai important sediu episcopal din răsăritul Imperiului. [traducere: Irina Achim]

Despite the importance of this period for the subsequent development of the Patriarchate of Constantinople, the history of the Arian/Homoean bishops of Constantinople is not a subject that has caused much ink to flow, as if it is some kind of taboo. This paper will focus on the last and one of the most intriguing figures among these bishops, *viz.* the controversial Demophilus, who first occupied the see of Beroe in Thrace, before being translated to Constantinople. On the basis of written sources (principally Philostorgius, then Socrates Scholasticus, Sozomen and Hilarius of Poitiers), two main issues will be dealt with: (1) his role as representative of the most influential group of Arian/Homoean bishops during the Arian controversy; (2) his involvement, as a successor of Eusebius of Nicomedia, in the politico-religious strategy of Constantinople, at a time when its episcopal see still had to affirm itself as the most important see in the Eastern part of the Empire. In order to highlight these questions, we will especially analyse Demophilus' participation in the Church meetings of Serdica in 343, Antioch in 344, Milan in 345 and Sirmium in 351. We will thus focus on his role in persuading Pope Liberius to sign the Sirmian Formula, as well as on his participation in the Council of Ariminum (Rimini) in 359, his consecration as bishop of Constantinople in 370, his attitude towards the Eunomians, and his role in the consecration of new bishops in Cyzicus and Antioch. All this will help to understand an important phase of the constitution of the power of the Constantinopolitan Church, at a time that was somewhat embarrassing for its episcopal see, a time which is documented in a very partial way by the narrative sources.

1. *At the councils of Serdica (343), Antioch (344), Milan (345) and Sirmium (351)*

According to Philostorgius, Demophilus was born into a noble family of Thessalonica.¹ However, the oldest testimony about him is a decree proclaimed by the so-called “Eastern [*viz.* pro-Arian] Council” of Serdica (343), which he signed as bishop of Beroe in Thrace.² Because this is the only known mention of Demophilus in connection with the meeting of Serdica and as he was the 69th signatory of the decree, he is not generally considered among the most prominent participants. However, can this really be an argument, since Valens of Mursa, whose role at this meeting was by no means insignificant, is the 73rd and last signatory of the same decree?³

Shortly after Serdica, the “Eastern” bishops made it clear they had full confidence in their counterpart in Beroe. Together with bishops Macedonius of Mopsuestia, Eudoxius of Germanicia and a certain Martyrius, perhaps of Naupactus in Achaea, Demophilus was sent by the Synod of Antioch of 344 to meet the “Western” bishops, with the task of bringing them a synodical letter and the so-called “Long Creed”.⁴ The “Western” bishops discussed this epistle and the creed at the Synod of Milan in 345. We know that Demophilus attended that meeting as a member of the “Eastern” delegation⁵ and he most probably took part also in the Synod of Antioch (344), although the sources don’t give

¹ Philost. *h.e.* 9, 14.

² Hil. *coll. antiar.* A, IV, 3 (69).

³ Hil. *coll. antiar.* A, IV, 3 (73). Because of his role in the Arian controversy, Valens of Mursa was deposed by the “Western” bishops at the same Council of Serdica. The other “Eastern” bishops who were also condemned as heretics by the same meeting were: Theodorus of Heraclea, Narcissus of Eirenopolis, Acacius of Caesarea, Stephanus of Antioch, Ursacius of Singidunum, Menophantus of Ephesus and George of Laodicea. See Ath. Alex. *apol. sec.* 40, 3; 47, 3; Ath. Alex. *h. Ar.* 17, 2; Hil. *coll. antiar.* B, II, 1, 7 and 8; Soz. *h.e.* 3, 12, 3.

⁴ Ath. Alex. *syn.* 26, 1; Hil. *coll. antiar.* A, VII, 4; Socr. *h.e.* 2, 19, 1; Soz. *h.e.* 3, 11, 2. See also Simonetti 1975, 189-190; Barnes 1993, 88. The possible see of Martyrius is deduced here from Hil. *coll. antiar.* B, II, 4 (47). Without a decisive argument, A. L. Feder (1911, 129; 1916, 281) and H.-G. Opitz (1940, 251, n. 18 [cf. Ath. Alex.]) are, however, thinking that the Martyrius who was sent to Milan in 344 was a different bishop, from an unknown see.

⁵ Liberius of Rome is writing about Demophilus’ participation at the Synod of Milan, in his letter to Constantius of 353/354. See Hil. *coll. antiar.* A, VII, 4. For the date of the letter, see Barnes 1992, 263.

us clear information about this last point. The task of his deputation was of extreme importance. We can believe that in the atmosphere of political tensions between the brother Emperors, Constans and Constantius II, especially after the failure of the Council of Serdica, the creed presented to the “Western” bishops was an attempt at reconciliation in the theological field between a then weaker East and stronger West. If the bishops assembled in Milan had accepted the conclusions of the Synod of Antioch, there would have been no reason for Constans to threaten war, unless Constantius had not allowed Athanasius and other exiled Nicene bishops from his *pars* to return home.⁶

Still, the arrival of “Eastern” bishops at Milan in 344/345 was not entirely without influence on the outcome of the synod. In the so-called “Long Creed”, Photinus, a disciple of Marcellus of Ancyra and bishop of Sirmium, is mentioned for the first time as a heretic.⁷ As a likely consequence, the bishops assembled in Milan – perhaps because of some decision taken in Antioch – were the first who condemned Photinus in the West.⁸ As long as Constans was the emperor in that *pars*, however, nothing happened to put their decision into effect. Therefore, it was not until 351, when the West came under Constantius’ rule, that the Council of Sirmium not only condemned Photinus, but, in fact, deposed him and consecrated a new bishop, Germinius, in his place. Hilarius of Poitiers preserved the names of the participants at Sirmium:

“These are the signatories to the false creed, written at Syrmium, Libe-
rius calls ‘catholic’ and says was set forth to him by Demofilus: Narcis-
sus, Theodorus, Basil, Eudoxius, Demofilus, Cecropius, Silvanus, Ursa-
cius, Valens, Evagrius, Hireneus, Exuperantius, Terentianus, Bassus,
Gaudentius, Macedonius, Marcus, Acacius, Julius, Surinus, Simplicius
and Junior.”⁹

⁶ Based on Ath. Alex. *apol. Const.* 3, we can suppose that the meeting between Constans and Athanasius of Alexandria in Aquileia in 345 was an important part of the emperor’s decision to threaten his brother Constantius with war. The meeting must have taken place after the Synod of Milan (345) had rejected the conclusions of the Synod of Antioch (344), which were presented by Demophilus and his colleagues, but before this delegation of “Easterners” left Poetovio, accompanied by the *comes* Thalassius, on its way home. Cf. Cedilnik 2004, 142-144.

⁷ Socr. *h.e.* 2, 19, 15-16. Cf. also Jones-Martindale-Morris 1971, 886 (Thalassius 1); Simonetti 1975, 191.

⁸ Barnes 1993, 88.

⁹ Hil. *coll. antiar.* B, VII, 9 (7) (transl. Wickham 1997, 78).

If Hilarius' list is correct, the participants of the Council of Sirmium of 351 were:¹⁰ Narcissus of Neronias (also known as Eirenopolis) in Cilicia; Theodorus of Heraclea in Europe; Basil of Ancyra in Galatia; Eudoxius of Germanicia in Coele Syria; Demophilus of Beroe in Thrace; Cecropius of Nicomedia in Bithynia; Silvanus of Tarsus in Cilicia; Ursacius of Singidunum in Moesia Superior; Valens of Mursa in Pannonia Superior; Evagrius, most probably of Mytilene on Lesbos;¹¹ Hireneus, most probably Eirenaios of Tripolis in Phoenice;¹² Exuperantius, whose episcopal see is unidentified; Terentianus, also from an unidentified see; Bassus, most probably of Carpathos in the Cyclades;¹³ Gaudentius, whose see is unidentified;¹⁴ Macedonius of Mopsuestia in Cilicia; Marcus of Arethusa in Coele Syria; Acacius of Caesarea in Palestine; together with Julius,¹⁵ Surinus, Simplicius and Junior, whose sees are unidentified.

Among these twenty-two bishops mentioned by Hilarius, up to ten also participated in the Council of Serdica: Narcissus of Eirenopolis, Theodorus of Heraclea, Basil of Ancyra, Eudoxius of Germanicia, Demophilus of Beroe, Valens of Mursa, Bassus of Carpathos, Macedonius of Mopsuestia, Marcus of Arethusa and Acacius of Caesarea. So, twelve of the participants at Sirmium in 351 are not listed among those of the Council of Serdica and the identity of nine of them is very uncertain (Evagrius, Hireneus, Exuperantius, Terentianus, Gaudentius, Julius, Surinus, Simplicius and Junior). Regarding the other three bishops (Cecropius of Nicomedia, Silvanus of Tarsus and Ursacius of Singidunum), we know that Cecropius was the head of the Church of Laodicea in Phrygia before being translated in Nicomedia in 351.¹⁶ Athanasius ascribes Cecropius' second appointment as bishop solely to his

¹⁰ The list of bishops is supplemented with the names of episcopal sees after Feder 1911, 101-103. See also Brennecke et al. 2014, 344-345.

¹¹ Feder 1911, 102.

¹² Feder 1911, 102.

¹³ As this Bassus could be the same bishop who attended the Council in Serdica. Cf. Feder 1911, 102.

¹⁴ At that period, there were two bishops of that name: Gaudentius of Naissus, who attended the Council of Serdica among the "Western" bishops, and Gaudentius of Ariminum. As they both opposed Arianism, none of them could be the Gaudentius from Hilarius' list. Cf. Feder 1911, 102.

¹⁵ It is hardly possible that this Julius could be the bishop of Thebae in Achaia, because he attended the so-called "Western Council" of Serdica. Cf. Feder 1911, 103.

¹⁶ Feder 1911, 101.

theological opinions – similarly as for Auxentius of Milan and Epictetus of Centumcellae –, with the purpose of bringing false charges against Nicene prelates.¹⁷ About Silvanus of Tarsus, we know nothing of him before 351. Later he was a supporter of Basil of Ancyra and for that reason he was deposed by the Council of Constantinople of 360.¹⁸ As for Ursacius of Singidunum, we meet him for the first time in 335, when he was sent by the Synod of Tyre as a member of a delegation of Eusebian (pro-Arian) prelates to the Mareotis, near Alexandria, in order to investigate the charges against Athanasius.¹⁹ He was later an important representative of the Homoean Party until to the end of his life.

Based on the material presented here, it is obvious that, since his first mention in the sources, Demophilus of Beroe/Constantinople was consistently one of a group of prelates whose theological belief was not only pro-Arian, but which was also closely connected with Eusebius of Nicomedia, at a time when the latter was still alive. Socrates names five bishops among Eusebius' close collaborators, who – as he writes – assumed all his authority after his death: Theognis of Nicaea, Maris of Chalcedon, Theodorus of Heraclea, Ursacius of Singidunum and Valens of Mursa.²⁰ All five bishops were sent by the Synod of Tyre to the Mareotis in 335. A sixth member was added to that latter delegation: Macedonius of Mopsuestia. Furthermore, Theognis, Maris, Theodorus, Ursacius and Valens would have signed, together with their patron, Eusebius of Nicomedia (so before 341), a letter for Julius of Rome, condemning Athanasius of Alexandria and Marcellus of Ancyra.²¹ Eusebius and Theognis died before the Council of Serdica,²² but all the other bishops should have attended this meeting.²³ In addition,

¹⁷ Ath. Alex. *ep. Aeg. Lib.* 7, 5.

¹⁸ Thdt. *h.e.* 2, 27, 20-21; Feder 1911, 101-102. Silvanus played an important role at the Council of Seleucia of 359. See Socr. *h.e.* 2, 39, 19; Thdt. *h.e.* 2, 26, 9; 2, 27, 4.

¹⁹ Ath. Alex. *apol. sec.* 13; 72, 4-73, 1; 75, 1; 76, 2; Socr. *h.e.* 1, 27, 7; 1, 31, 2-3; Soz. *h.e.* 2, 25, 19; 2, 28, 13.

²⁰ Socr. *h.e.* 2, 12, 2-5.

²¹ Hil. *coll. antiar.* B, II, 1, 2. On the various letters sent by the Eusebians to Julius of Rome between 335 and 341, see Thompson 2015, 28.

²² Feder 1911, 111.

²³ Hil. *coll. antiar.* A, IV, 1, 18. However, Maris of Chalcedon and Ursacius of Singidunum are not in the list of "Eastern" signatories copied by Hilarius of Poitiers. See Hil. *coll. antiar.* A, IV, 3; Feder 1911, 93-94; Brennecke et al. 2007, 275-279.

four of these bishops, Theodorus, Macedonius, Valens and Ursacius, were present at the Council of Sirmium of 351.²⁴

If the Council of Serdica was organised as an oecumenical meeting where as many bishops as possible from the whole Empire were supposed to gather, the Council of Sirmium of 351 had no such ambition. Yet, almost all surviving closest collaborators of late Eusebius of Nicomedia were present at Sirmium – even if the ambitions were smaller than at Serdica. Another bishop attended both synods: Demophilus of Beroe. If we could not say much about his participation at Serdica, we can – relying on his participation at Sirmium – reasonably assume that he was already not an insignificant member of the group,²⁵ whose most important representatives were formerly Eusebius' closest collaborators. It is even possible that his theological belief was not the only link that connected him with this group of bishops. Since we first met Demophilus as bishop of Beroe at the Council of Serdica, it is possible – although there is no real proof – that he was consecrated by Eusebius of Nicomedia himself, the bishop of Constantinople from 338 to 341, what is, less than two years before the Council of Serdica met in autumn 343.²⁶

2. *Liberius' Signature of the First Sirmian Formula*

A little more than four years after the Council of Sirmium of 351, Pope Liberius²⁷ was exiled²⁸ because he refused to obey Constantius II's order to condemn Athanasius of Alexandria. Beroe was chosen as

²⁴ Hil. *coll. antiar.* B, VII, 9 (7).

²⁵ In Ath. Alex. *ep. Aeg. Lib.* 7, 2-6, which was written in 356, Demophilus is listed among the men who had been promoted by the Eusebians because of their conviction in the Arian faith: Secundus of Ptolemais, George of Laodicea, Stephen and Leontius of Antioch, Theodore of Heraclea, Ursacius of Singidunum, Valens of Mursa, Acacius of Caesarea, Patrophilus of Scythopolis, Narcissus of Neronias (Eirenopolis), Eustathius of Sebasteia, Demophilus of Beroe, Germinius of Sirmium, Eudoxius of Germanicia, Basil of Ancyra, Cecropius of Nicomedia, Auxentius of Milan, Epictetus of Centumcellae, and George of Cappadocia (bishop of Alexandria). Cf. also Gwynn 2007, 113.

²⁶ For the date of Eusebius' death, see Barnes 1993, 213.

²⁷ Liberius was consecrated bishop of Rome in the spring of 352. Cf. Barnes 1992, 257.

²⁸ Liberius was first arrested and sent to the imperial court in Milan (autumn 355 or summer 356), then he was sent to Beroe in Thrace. Cf. Pietri 1976, 246-249; Barnes 1993, 118.

the place for the banishment. For sure, that choice was also made on the basis of Demophilus' role among the supporters of the emperor's theological position. In fact, the bishop of Beroe was already among the most prominent ones. His own position was well known to Liberius before he was exiled. In his letter to Constantius of 353/4, the bishop of Rome clearly states his opinion about him:

“So what peace can there be, most serene Emperor, if, as has now happened throughout Italy, bishops are obliged to be obedient to the declared opinions of such people?”²⁹

The prelates that Liberius had in mind were the members of the delegation sent from Antioch to Northern Italy in 344/345: Demophilus, Macedonius, Eudoxius and Martyrius, who all refused – as he writes – to condemn, at Milan, the “heretical” views of Arius, and George of Cappadocia, the pro-Arian bishop of Alexandria. That latter was then accused by his detractors of complacent communication with priests and deacons expelled from the Church in the time of Alexander of Alexandria (312-328), and for following Arius' heresy.³⁰ Nevertheless, four years after he wrote this letter and two years after the beginning of his exile, Liberius relented and signed one of the Sirmian creeds, being convinced by Demophilus of Beroe.

The exact dates of Liberius' exile cannot be given with precision and modern historians are still debating them. If we follow Charles Pietri, Liberius was arrested and taken secretly to Milan shortly after Flavius Leontius' nomination to the Urban Prefecture in Rome, which would have occurred necessarily after the 13th of June 356 according to André Chastagnol.³¹ Alternatively, Timothy D. Barnes, questioning the final protocol of the imperial constitution (*Cod. Theod.* 9.17.3) which allows this dating and preferring, in particular, to rely on the order of events in Ammianus Marcellinus, proposes instead the year 355, before the appointment of Julian as Caesar, so necessarily before the 6th of November.³² The date of his return to Rome is also not very clear:

²⁹ *Hil. coll. antiar.* A, VII, 4 (transl. Wickham 1997, 73-74).

³⁰ *Hil. coll. antiar.* A, VII, 4.

³¹ Chastagnol 1962, 147-149; Pietri 1976, 246-247. See also Jones-Martindale-Morris 1971, 503 (Flavius Leontius 22).

³² *Amm.* 15, 7, 6-10; Barnes 1992, 257-260. On the contrary, the specialists of the *Cod. Theod.* do not generally question the dating of the constitution concerned.

- after two years, according to Athanasius of Alexandria;³³
- in the third year of his exile, according to the anonymous author of the *Gesta sunt inter Liberium et Felicem episcopos*, who seems to rely on the same source as Theodoret of Cyrus' *Historia ecclesiastica*;³⁴
- and on the 2nd of August 358 according to the *Liber pontificalis*.³⁵

During his exile, Liberius could have theoretically signed any of the three first Sirmian creeds, which were respectively proclaimed in 351, 357 and 358.³⁶ Could we see Demophilus' position as a clue to the identity of the creed under which Liberius put his name? If so, a signature of the Homoeousian creed of 358 seems almost impossible. Demophilus, who was a true partner for Valens of Mursa and Ursacius of Singidunum from the very beginning of the whole affair, was still in 359 one of the closest collaborators with both "Danubian" bishops. Although Valens and Ursacius participated in the Council of Sirmium of summer 358, they most probably never really supported its Homoeousian conclusions.³⁷ In that sense, a signature of the Third Sirmian Formula by Liberius, under Demophilus' influence, seems impossible.³⁸

See, for example, the commentary in Delmaire et al. 2009, 166-167 (even if the dates given for Flavius Leontius' prefecture are not identical to Chastagnol's proposal).

³³ Ath. Alex. *apol. sec.* 89, 3; Ath. Alex. *h. Ar.* 41, 3.

³⁴ Avell. 1, 3. See also Thdt. *h.e.* 2, 17.

³⁵ Lib. pontif. 37, 6. Cf. Pietri 1976, 259; Brennecke 1984, 275; Hanson 1988, 360-362. As for Barnes 1992, 260-261, and Stevenson 2014, 21, they consider the year 357 as a more likely option for Liberius' return to Rome.

³⁶ Feder 1910, 153-175, argues that Liberius signed the First and the Third Sirmian creeds; Brennecke 1984, 292, the second one; Barnes 1992, 261, the first one.

³⁷ H.-C. Brennecke (1984, 276-277) points out that Liberius most likely could not have signed the Sirmian Formula of 358, because he had to leave for Rome before the council finished its work.

³⁸ The possibility that Liberius signed the Third Sirmian Formula is further reduced by the fact that Eustathius of Sebasteia, one of Basil of Ancyra's associates who attended the Council of Sirmium in 358 as a representative of Macedonians, appealed to the Pope for help against the oppression of both Emperor Valens and Eudoxius of Constantinople in 366. See Socr. *h.e.* 4, 12; Soz. *h.e.* 6, 10, 3-7. His request would hardly be reasonable if Basil and his group of followers had been responsible for Liberius' signing of a "heretical" creed. Furthermore, it might also be possible - although there is no real proof - that Basil facilitated Liberius' return by - at least - not opposing it, even though the Pope did not sign the Third Sirmian Formula. This could be the background of accusations against the bishop of Ancyra at the Council of Constantinople in 360, as he was blamed for causing discord in the

It is much more difficult to determine which one of the two remaining creeds the bishop of Rome could have signed. As Athanasius' condemnation was not the only condition for Liberius to return to Rome,³⁹ he also had to prove his support for the then most influential group of "Eastern" bishops by signing a "proper" creed. If he really returned to Rome on the 2nd of August 358, the signature must have taken place in the spring, so before the Third Sirmian Formula was written. At the same time, the Second Sirmian Formula was – due to the warnings of the Basilians (followers of Basil of Ancyra) – quickly losing the Emperor's favour. Could we thus really believe that Constantius – who, after a fast and unanimous condemnation of Athanasius by the bishops gathered at the synods of Arles in 353 and Milan in 355, wanted the Church to be united on the Christological level as well – would have permitted Liberius to return after he had signed a creed that aroused an energetic protest among the "Eastern" bishops?

In fact, the signing of the First Sirmian Formula was undoubtedly part of the original plan, since the Second and the Third Sirmian creeds had not yet been written at the time Liberius was sent to exile. To do so, Beroe was undoubtedly a first-choice place for banishment, as its bishop, Demophilus, had attended the Council of Sirmium of 351 and was one of the signatories of its creed. However, Liberius, as can be seen from the letters he wrote during his exile, resisted the signing of the new creed and was, for this reason, not allowed to return in Rome.⁴⁰ Immediately after the composition of the Second Sirmian Formula in 357,⁴¹ we can thus imagine the duplication of efforts to

Roman Church (Soz. *h.e* 4, 24, 6). We could imagine that he was seen as responsible for the so-called troubles by not preventing Liberius' return, while he was influential enough to do that in 358. Cf. Cedilnik 2004, 282-283.

³⁹ Liberius may have fulfilled this condition at the very beginning of his exile. Cf. Brennecke 1984, 278.

⁴⁰ Liberius mentions his signing of a Sirmian creed only in one of the three letters he wrote during his exile at Beroe. See Hil. *coll. antiar.* B, VII, 8, 2 (6) = Herbers 2016, n° †492. There is a debate about the authenticity of this letter, but also of others attributed to the same Pope during his exile in Beroe (*infra*, n. 44), that we find in the *Collectanea antiariana Parisina*. Cf. Pietri 1976, 253-255.

⁴¹ The synod met in the summer or, more probably, in the autumn of 357. Cf. Brennecke 1984, 312.

persuade him to sign it. Sozomen⁴² and Philostorgius⁴³ even imply that he put his signature to the Second Sirmian Formula. Moreover, the bishops to whom Liberius appeals in his letters from the exile,⁴⁴ begging them to intercede for him within Constantius, were not only supporters of the First Sirmian Formula, but, at least for some of them,

⁴² Soz. *h.e.* 4, 15, 1-4 (transl. Hartranft 1890, 309-310): “Not long after these events, the emperor returned to Sirmium from Rome; on receiving a deputation from the Western bishops, he recalled Liberius from Beroe. Constantius urged him, in the presence of the deputies of the Eastern bishops, and of the other priests who were at the camp, to confess that the Son is not of the same substance (ὁμοούσιος) as the Father. He was instigated to this measure by Basil, Eustathius, and Eusebius, who possessed great influence over him. They had formed a compilation, in one document, of the decrees against Paul of Samosata, and Photinus, bishop of Sirmium; to which they subjoined a formulary of faith drawn up at Antioch at the consecration of the church, as if certain persons had, under the pretext of the term “consubstantial,” (ὁμοούσιος) attempted to establish a heresy of their own. Liberius, Athanasius, Alexander, Severianus, and Crescens, a priest of Africa, were induced to assent to this document, as were likewise Ursacius, Germinius, bishop of Sirmium, Valens, bishop of Mursa, and as many of the Eastern bishops as were present. They partially approved of a confession of faith drawn up by Liberius, in which he declared that those who affirm that the Son is not like unto the Father in substance and in all other respects, are excommunicated. For when Eudoxius and his partisans at Antioch, who favored the heresy of Aetius, received the letter of Hosius, they circulated the report that Liberius had renounced the term “consubstantial,” and had admitted that the Son is dissimilar from the Father. After these enactments had been made by the Western bishops, the emperor permitted Liberius to return to Rome.” Sozomen’s report on Liberius’ exile (Soz. *h.e.* 4, 11-15), which was written from various sources, is contradictory in its content. Cf. Brennecke 1984, 288-292.

⁴³ Philost. *h.e.* 4, 3 (transl. Amidon 2007, 65-66): “Constantius himself went to Sirmium and stayed there. It was at that time that he brought back from exile the bishop of Rome, Liberius, who was eagerly requested by the Romans, and gave him to those who were asking for him. He also says that Liberius too at this time subscribed against the consubstantialist doctrine, and against Athanasius to boot, as did Bishop Hosius, a council having met there and drawn them into unanimity. Once they had subscribed, Hosius [he says] returned to his bishopric of Cordova and governed his see, while Liberius did likewise in the church of Rome. As for Felix, who had been made bishop of Rome in the meantime, he retired, keeping the title of bishop but not governing any church.”

⁴⁴ Hil. *coll. antiar.* B, VII, 8, 10 and 11 = Herbers 2016, n^{os} †492 (*Pro deifico*), †493 (*Quia scio*) and †494 (*Non doceo*). Cf. also Brennecke 1984, 271-284; and *supra*, n. 40.

also of the second one.⁴⁵ So, there is still a possibility that Liberius also signed the Second Sirmian Formula, if he really returned to Rome in 358. However, it is hardly plausible, as mentioned above, that this deed would have ended his banishment.

Could we therefore believe that the fulfilment of the original plan – the signing of the First Sirmian Formula – saved Liberius from his exile, since only then was the Emperor Constantius willing to allow the Pope to return to Rome? This is what Hilarius tells us. Furthermore, we can read in Liberius' letter *Pro deifico*:

“... because my lord and common brother Demophilus kindly saw fit to set forth your creed, which is also the Catholic faith, as discussed and set forth by the majority of our brothers and fellow bishops at Sirmium and accepted ... by all present, I have accepted it gladly ... I have not contradicted it in any respect, I have concurred with it, follow it and hold to it.”⁴⁶

We can imagine that Liberius, no matter what Sirmian creed he signed, would have tried to justify his action by referring to the widespread support the creed received among bishops. Of course, it cannot be ruled out that the bishop of Rome was exaggerating, in order to justify his adhesion to the “Eastern” position. Yet we must not bypass Barnes' warning that neither the Second nor the Third Sirmian creeds ever enjoyed the sort of widespread support that Liberius refers to in the passage above.⁴⁷

3. *The Councils of Ariminum (359), Seleucia (359) and Constantinople (360)*

Regardless of which Sirmian Formula Liberius signed, we can be quite certain that Demophilus accomplished his task well enough to perfectly satisfy Valens of Mursa's and Ursacius of Singidunum's expectations. At the Council of Ariminum (359), convened by Constantius II to unite the so-called “Western” bishops on theological issues,

⁴⁵ Fortunatianus of Aquileia, Demophilus of Beroe, Ursacius of Singidunum, Valens of Mursa, Germinius of Sirmium, Epictetus of Centumcellae, Auxentius of Milan and Vincentius of Capua.

⁴⁶ Hil. *coll. antiar.* B, VII, 8, 2 (6) = Herbers 2016, n° †492 (transl. Wickham 1997, 77-78).

⁴⁷ Barnes 1992, 261.

the Emperor entrusted the realisation of his plan to Valens' and Ursacius' party. Both were the major initiators of the Fourth Sirmian Formula,⁴⁸ which at the meetings of Ariminum and Seleucia served as a basis for achieving consensus on theological issues. Among the bishops of their group who attended the Councils of Ariminum, we meet in the sources, beside Germinius of Sirmium, a certain Gaius, whose episcopal see in Pannonia is unknown, alongside Auxentius of Milan and Demophilus of Beroe.⁴⁹ The presence of this latter in Ariminum is surprising, since only the bishops of the western part of the Empire were supposed to participate in the council, while Beroe was a city in Thrace. Thus, we can only speculate whether his presence in Ariminum was due to his reputation as a persuasive promoter of Arian/Homoean ideas and positions, as he had succeeded in persuading the bishop of Rome, one of the most important "Western" bishops, to sign a pro-Arian Creed.⁵⁰

Along with other bishops of the Homoean Party, Demophilus was, however, condemned as a heretic and deposed by the Council of Ariminum on the 21st of July 359.⁵¹ After that, he is not mentioned in the sources in connection with the further course of events at this meeting. We do not know, therefore, whether he was a member of the Homoean delegation which, after the condemnation, returned to Constantius in order to give him a report on the meeting. We also do not know if he attended the following negotiations in Nike (in Thrace) or if he was in Constantinople at the end of 359,⁵² when the Homoean Party

⁴⁸ The creed was written at the Council of Sirmium on the 22nd of May 359. The following participants of the synod are known to us from the sources: Valens of Mursa, Ursacius of Singidunum, Germinius of Sirmium, Marcus of Arethusa, Basil of Ancyra, George of Cappadocia/Alexandria. Cf. Simonetti 1975, 244; Löhr 1986, 99; Brennecke 1988, 13-15.

⁴⁹ Ath. Alex. *syn.* 8, 1; 9, 3; Socr. *h.e.* 2, 37, 13-14; 28; 51; Soz. *h.e.* 4, 17, 3 and 7; Thdt. *h.e.* 2, 23, 4.

⁵⁰ Could we suppose that, in his presentation at the Council of Ariminum, Athanasius mentioned Demophilus because the latter was one of those who persuaded Liberius to condemn the Alexandrian prelate, whereas, in reality, Demophilus' role at this meeting was not so important that Hilarius did not feel the need to mention him?

⁵¹ Ath. Alex. *syn.* 9, 3; Socr. *h.e.* 2, 37, 51-52; Soz. *h.e.* 4, 17, 7 and 9; Thdt. *h.e.* 2, 23, 4. As for Hil. *coll. antiar.* A, V, 1, 2; V, 3, 1 (5) and IX, 3, they list only the names of Ursacius, Valens, Germinius and Gaius.

⁵² The letter of the "Eastern" bishops - gathered in Seleucia - sent to the members of the delegation returning from Ariminum and on its way to Constantinople

achieved its victory, by proclaiming the replacement of the Nicene Creed by the Sirmian(-Nikean) Formula.

To better understand Demophilus' role in the events of that time, it seems necessary to look who were the most important supporters of the Fourth Sirmian Formula at the Council of Seleucia, where the so-called "Eastern" bishops gathered. These were, as Socrates writes: Acacius of Caesarea, George of Cappadocia, Uranius of Tyre and Eudoxius of Antioch.⁵³ Patrophilus of Scythopolis is added to this group by Sozomen and Athanasius.⁵⁴ Almost 20 years before that, they all – with the notable exception of George, who was chosen as the bishop of Alexandria not later than the beginning of 357,⁵⁵ and Uranius, who was elected on the see of Tyre at an unknown date – attended the Synod of Antioch in 341, together with Eusebius of Nicomedia and Theodorus of Heraclea,⁵⁶ both of whom had been dead for several years in 359.⁵⁷

The group of bishops who assembled in Antioch in 341 and Seleucia in 359 was not only associated with Eusebius of Nicomedia, but also with Demophilus of Beroe. Like the latter, Theodorus of Heraclea, Acacius of Caesarea and Eudoxius of Germanicia also attended the councils of Serdica in 343⁵⁸ and of Sirmium in 351.⁵⁹ Eudoxius was, as we have already seen, together with Demophilus, a member of the delegation sent from Antioch to Milan in 344/345. Furthermore, he fully accepted the Second Sirmian Formula, that of 357, when he was

lists only these names: Ursacius of Singidunum, Valens of Mursa, Magdonius, Megasius, both from unidentified sees, Germinius of Sirmium, Gaius, Justinus, Optatus and Marcialis, the four of them also from unidentified sees. However, Marcialis's name is followed by *et ceteris Ariminensis synodi legatis*. See Hil. *coll. antiar.* B, VIII, 1.

⁵³ Socr. *h.e.* 2, 39, 16.

⁵⁴ Ath. *Alex. syn.* 1, 3; 12, 2; Soz. *h.e.* 4, 22, 7. Because of their theological belief they were also deposed by the Council of Seleucia. See Ath. *Alex. syn.* 12, 5; Socr. *h.e.* 2, 40, 43-44; Soz. *h.e.* 4, 22, 25.

⁵⁵ For the date of George's appointment as bishop of Alexandria, see Hanson 1988, 325; Barnes 1993, 98-99; Wipszycka 2015, 137 and 439; Cedilnik 2022, 93-94.

⁵⁶ Ath. *Alex. syn.* 36, 6; Soz. *h.e.* 3, 5, 10.

⁵⁷ In addition to those whose name was already raised for the Synod of Antioch of 341, we can still mention: Gregorius of Cappadocia/Alexandria, George of Laodicea, Narcissus of Neronias (Eirenopolis) and Dianius of Cappadocian Caesarea. Cf. Hanson 1988, 284.

⁵⁸ Feder 1911, 93-94.

⁵⁹ Feder 1911, 101-103.

already the bishop of Antioch, *viz.* in 358. Besides Eudoxius, we also find at the synod held in Antioch in 358: Acacius of Caesarea and Uranius of Tyre, who were both supporters of the Fourth Sirmian Formula at the Council of Seleucia.⁶⁰

Among the most prominent supporters of the formula at this meeting, it seems that Eudoxius was the one who had been most often in contact with Demophilus in the past. They were both in Serdica (343), probably in Antioch (344), in Milan (345), in Sirmium (351), and, between 355 and 358, they perhaps worked together in order to persuade Liberius to condemn Athanasius and to sign a “proper” creed.⁶¹ At that time, Eudoxius was certainly one of the most influential “Eastern” bishops.⁶² This is unambiguously proven by the fact that he was chosen to replace Macedonius⁶³ on the see of Constantinople, at the

⁶⁰ Soz. *h.e.* 4, 12, 5.

⁶¹ Eudoxius is mentioned by Sozomen among the bishops who were present when Constantius sent for Liberius, in order to persuade him to accept his theological point of view. As Liberius refused compliance, he was exiled to Beroe. See Soz. *h.e.* 4, 11, 3. Sozomen does not tell us where Constantius and Liberius met, but from other sources we know that it was in Milan. Cf. Hanson 1988, 340; Barnes 1993, 118; also Demandt 2007, 113. Although Sozomen is the only one to report that Eudoxius took part in the meeting, his presence being only partly confirmed by Socrates, the latter writes that Eudoxius was in Rome when Leontius of Antioch died in 357. See Socr. *h.e.* 2, 37, 7. As the new head of the Church of Antioch, Eudoxius convened a synod at the beginning of 358 and enthusiastically welcomed the conclusions of the Council of Sirmium of 357. See Soz. *h.e.* 4, 12, 5-7. He even claimed that Liberius admitted that the Son is dissimilar to the Father. See Soz. *h.e.* 4, 15, 1-4. Because of the accusations coming from Basil of Ancyra and his group of bishops, the chief of the Church of Antioch was then exiled by Constantius. See Soz. *h.e.* 4, 13, 4-6; Philost. *h.e.* 4, 8. However, thanks to the intercession of Patrophilus of Scythopolis and Narcissus of Neronias (Eirenopolis), with the consent of the Emperor, Eudoxius could return before the council assembled in Seleucia, since Eudoxius is mentioned among the bishops who were the most active organisers of the meetings of Ariminum and Seleucia. See Philost. *h.e.* 4, 10; Soz. *h.e.* 4, 16, 19-22.

⁶² Sozomen writes that Eudoxius became bishop of Antioch with the consent of the Emperor and with the support of his eunuchs, whereas the bishops (the Syrians and the others who had the right of ordination) gave him no sanction. See Soz. *h.e.* 4, 12, 4. Eudoxius especially enjoyed the support of Constantius’ influential eunuch Eusebius for the organisation of the councils of Ariminum and Seleucia (Soz. *h.e.* 4, 16, 22) and was, with the consent of the Emperor, soon afterwards translated from Antioch to Constantinople (Philost. *h.e.* 5, 1).

⁶³ E. Manders (2019, 257) argues that Macedonius’ succession to Eusebius of Nicomedia as bishop of Constantinople in 341 seems to reflect the increasing influence of the new bishop rather than the emperor’s dominance in ecclesiastical

council gathered in that city on the beginning of 360.⁶⁴ The *Chronicon Paschale* mentions Demophilus as a participant in this meeting.⁶⁵ During the next ten years, further contacts between both bishops can only be guessed as the sources are silent about them. However, it was Demophilus who was chosen to succeed Eudoxius as a bishop of Constantinople, at his death in 370.

4. Demophilus, Bishop of Constantinople

Demophilus became bishop of Constantinople in 370⁶⁶ and kept this position until 380, when he was, on the 26th of November, expelled from the city by Emperor Theodosius I.⁶⁷ He was the fourth and at the same time the last official Arian/Homoean prelate of the imperial city. It is by no means irrelevant that he was – as his two direct predecessors, Macedonius⁶⁸ and Eudoxius – most probably in Eusebius of Nicomedia's inner circle. After Eusebius' death, Demophilus was closely connected with the so-called Eusebian party, which means with Eusebius' former collaborators, who were supporters of his policies.

Philostorgius relates that the head of the Church of Heraclea played an important role in placing Demophilus on his new see, because it was the privilege of the metropolitan bishop of the province of

affairs. The conditions of Eudoxius' appointment could indeed give the impression that the emperor didn't play a significant role in his election. More important was the influence the bishop had gained among the most important Eastern bishops of the time.

⁶⁴ *Chronicon Paschale* (s.a 360 [PG XCII, 736]); Soz. *h.e.* 3, 5, 10; 4, 25, 6; 4, 26, 1; 4, 28, 1; Socr. *h.e.* 2, 43, 7-8; 4, 43, 11; 2, 44, 3; Philost. *h.e.* 4, 12 and 5, 1.

⁶⁵ *Chron. Pasch.* s.a 360.

⁶⁶ Socr. *h.e.* 4, 14; Soz. *h.e.* 6, 13, 1; Philost. *h.e.* 9, 8. Philostorgius writes that Demophilus' consecration was approved by the emperor while many of the people who were present at the consecration thought the bishop was unworthy of his new dignity. See Philost. *h.e.* 9, 10.

⁶⁷ Barnes 2017, 187.

⁶⁸ Socr. *h.e.* 2, 12, 2-3 (transl. Zenos 1890, 41): "... the Arians, however, ordained Macedonius at the same time, in the church dedicated to Paul. This those who had formerly co-operated with Eusebius (that disturber of the public peace) brought about, assuming all his authority. These were Theognis, bishop of Nicaea, Maris of Chalcedon, Theodore of Heraclea in Thrace, Ursacius of Singidunum in Upper Mysia, and Valens of Mursa in Upper Pannonia." See also Soz. *h.e.* 3, 7, 4.

Europe to consecrate his colleague in Constantinople.⁶⁹ However, he is wrong when he writes that it was Theodorus who consecrated Demophilus, because that event took place about fifteen years after the first one died.⁷⁰ Four paragraphs after presenting Demophilus' translation to Constantinople, Philostorgius gives the name of another bishop of Heraclea: Dorotheus.⁷¹ Although there is no absolute proof that he was the one to be sitting on that see when Demophilus was consecrated, this possibility cannot be ruled out.

In 360, Eudoxius of Constantinople made Eunomius bishop of Cyzicus. However, Eunomius left his episcopal see within a year of his elevation. According to Philostorgius, there was no bishop in Cyzicus from the day that Eunomius left the place until the day that Demophilus consecrated a new bishop on this see, so for 9 years.⁷² In fact, this consecration would have been Demophilus' first act, as the new bishop of Constantinople. On this occasion he would not have been alone in Cyzicus, but together with Dorotheus of Heraclea.⁷³ Therefore, we may suppose that Dorotheus was the one who ordained Demophilus.

The task of consecrating the bishop of Cyzicus was entrusted to the head of the Church of Constantinople for many years at that time. Before Demophilus, it was Eudoxius who made Eunomius bishop, just after the Constantinopolitan Council of 360 deposed his predecessor, Eleusius. That latter was himself ordained by Macedonius, in about 356. From Socrates' description of these events,⁷⁴ we understand that the authority of the Church of the imperial city over the neighbouring provinces of Bithynia and Hellespont was recognized even before 360, since Macedonius had already ordained his assistants as bishops in Cyzicus (Eleusius) and Nicomedia (Marathonius) just after the Council

⁶⁹ Philost. *h.e.* 9, 10. Sozomen gives almost the same information when he writes that Paul succeeded Alexander as bishop of Constantinople against the advice of Eusebius of Nicomedia or Theodorus of Heraclea, although both bishops – as being the closest, geographically – had the right of conferring this ordination. See Soz. *h.e.* 3, 3, 1.

⁷⁰ Thdt. *h.e.* 2, 16, 10-11 relates that Theognis of Nicaea and Theodorus of Heraclea were already dead in 355.

⁷¹ Philost. *h.e.* 9, 14.

⁷² Philost. *h.e.* 9, 13.

⁷³ Philost. *h.e.* 9, 13.

⁷⁴ Socr. *h.e.* 2, 38, 3-5.

of Milan of 355.⁷⁵ In reality, this control over the Churches of the eastern shore of the Propontis seems even to go back to Eusebius of Nicomedia's project to make Constantinople the main episcopal see in the Eastern part of the Empire, with the unification of the two banks into a single ecclesiastical "Arian" district as one of its first steps.⁷⁶

During Demophilus' episcopate in Constantinople, the area of authority of his see became more important. The whole of *Asiana* and *Pontica* were already parts of it at the time of the Constantinopolitan Council of 360.⁷⁷ However, Demophilus went perhaps further. After Euzoios of Antioch's death in 376, Dorotheus, the then bishop of Heraclia, was made head of the Church of Antioch.⁷⁸ As implied in Philostorgius, Demophilus could have played a role in these events.⁷⁹ His very close cooperation with Dorotheus in the past lets us suppose that he chose him, at least, as candidate for the see of Antioch, if he was not the one who consecrated him. This would not be the first time Constantinople influenced the consecration of a prelate of this city. Theoretically, bishops of Antioch were elected by regional bishops,⁸⁰ together with the people of Antioch.⁸¹ Ignoring this rule, Eudoxius – if Socrates is right – proclaimed himself bishop of Antioch, with the help of some principal officers of the Emperor's bedchamber.⁸² While writing about his installation as bishop, Sozomen emphasizes – completely in the spirit of the fourth canon of Nicaea – that it was thus done without the sanction of George of Laodicea, of Marcus of Arethusa and of the other Syrian bishops.⁸³ This information implies that it was the right

⁷⁵ Socrates relates that Macedonius sent, with the emperor's permission, four cohorts of soldiers against the Novatians in Paphlagonia. See Socr. *h.e.* 2, 38, 29-31; also Soz. *h.e.* 4, 21, 1-2. On the measures against the Novatians in Mantinium and the consequences of Macedonius' conduct on his relations with Constantius, cf. Manders 2019, 258-261.

⁷⁶ Cedilnik - Moreau 2024.

⁷⁷ Cedilnik - Moreau 2024.

⁷⁸ Socr. *h.e.* 4, 35, 4.

⁷⁹ Philost. *h.e.* 9, 14.

⁸⁰ Thdt. *h.e.* 2, 31, 2-5 (regarding Meletius' case).

⁸¹ Socr. *h.e.* 2, 44, 3 (also about Meletius' case). For some other testimonies about the episcopal elections in Antioch during the third quarter of the 4th century, see Soz. *h.e.* 4, 28, 3 (again Meletius) and 9-10 (Euzoios).

⁸² Socr. *h.e.* 2, 37, 7-9; Soz. *h.e.* 4, 12, 3-4; Thdt. *h.e.* 2, 31, 1. Only Philostorgius relates that it was Eudoxius' supporters and not the emperor who translated him from his episcopal see of Germanicia to Antioch. See Philost. *h.e.* 4, 4.

⁸³ Soz. *h.e.* 4, 12, 4.

of these bishops to choose a new head for the main Church of their region. Later, when Eudoxius was already bishop of Constantinople, he and his supporters installed Meletius as bishop of Antioch.⁸⁴ As we have seen, the rule was broken not only in the case of Eudoxius and Meletius, but also before them, for Leontius who was appointed by Constantius,⁸⁵ and most probably, for Demophilus' ordination of Dorotheus. Both bishops of Constantinople, Eudoxius and Demophilus, who had presumably been part of a common plan in the earlier case of Liberius, would have followed common guidelines also to develop their influence in Antioch. Their motives could have been not only to strengthen the powers of the former collaborators of Eusebius of Nicomedia, but also it is possible that their actions, which are entirely in the spirit of Eusebius, can be understood as a thoughtful plan to expand the influence of the Constantinopolitan see.

As we can conclude from the sources, Demophilus' consecration of Dorotheus as bishop of Antioch was his last success in achieving this endeavour in Syria. In 380, he was expelled from the city by the emperor Theodosius, because of his Arian/Homoean beliefs. His departure is the final moment of the Eusebians in their project to strengthen the power of the Church of Constantinople, a project which was immediately taken over by the new Nicene imperial authorities and their ecclesiastical support. However, the efforts of the Eusebians in Antioch have finally failed, and its episcopal see did not stay a part of the Constantinopolitan sphere of influence.

5. Demophilus – Expelled Bishop

At the Emperor's command,⁸⁶ Demophilus and his followers gave up the *intra muros* churches of Constantinople and found themselves obliged to meet only in an *extra muros* church.⁸⁷ However, it means that the bishop continued to be the unambiguous leader of the Arian/Homoean community of the imperial city, which he also

⁸⁴ Soz. *h.e.* 4, 28, 3.

⁸⁵ Ath. Alex. *fug.* 26, 3; Socr. *h.e.* 2, 26, 9-10.

⁸⁶ Cod. Theod. 16, 1, 2 (edict to the people of the city of Constantinople given on the 28th of February 380).

⁸⁷ Soz. *h.e.* 7, 5, 5-7; Socr. *h.e.* 5, 7, 4-11. Philostorgius writes that Demophilus returned to Beroe after being expelled. See Philost. *h.e.* 9, 19.

represented at the assembly of bishops convened by Theodosius in 383.⁸⁸ Socrates and Sozomenos argue that Demophilus there defended the Arian dogma, Eunomius the cause of the Eunomians, Eleusius of Cyzicus that of the Macedonians, and Nectarius and Agelius that of the Homoousians.⁸⁹ The Emperor's goal was to find a common position on ambiguous points of doctrine, through a conversation in which leaders of different theological orientations would take part.⁹⁰ The meeting, which did not meet these expectations, certainly shows that Demophilus did not only enjoy the confidence of his own followers, but that he was considered as their most credible representative by the Nicene Party. If Socrates' narrative is correct, Theodosius even thought, during his stay in Constantinople, that Demophilus could be the one to unite the Church of his city. The same Church historian relates that the emperor asked Demophilus to accept the Nicene Creed and, thus, to reunite the people, when he found out that Gregory of Nazianzus intended to leave Constantinople.⁹¹ Since Demophilus did not accede to this request, Theodosius expelled him. Although only Socrates writes about the emperor's supposed intention, his report is perhaps not so far from the truth.

Demophilus would most likely have remained bishop of Constantinople if he had accepted the Nicene Creed. Even though he didn't accept it and in consequence was no longer officially bishop of Constantinople, he managed, as it seems, to lead the Arian/Homoean community successfully⁹² until his death in 386.⁹³ In a situation that was disadvantageous for those who were not willing to accept the Nicene Creed, his successors were not so successful. The Arian/Homoean community of Constantinople soon divided into two parties: one led

⁸⁸ Maximin. *c. Ambr.* 39; Socr. *h.e.* 5, 10; Soz. *h.e.* 7, 12. Cf., *inter alia*, Meslin 1967, 91-94.

⁸⁹ Socr. *h.e.* 5, 10, 24; Soz. *h.e.* 7, 12, 9.

⁹⁰ Socr. *h.e.* 5, 19, 1-2; Soz. *h.e.* 7, 12, 1-2.

⁹¹ Socr. *h.e.* 5, 7, 1-5.

⁹² Socrates cites Demophilus among the principal bishops at the time when Theodosius became emperor. See Socr. *h.e.* 5, 3, 4.

⁹³ Socr. *h.e.* 5, 12, 6; Soz. *h.e.* 7, 14, 4.

by a certain Marinus, the other by Dorotheus,⁹⁴ the former bishop of Heraclea and Antioch, and one of Demophilus' closest associates.⁹⁵

6. Conclusion

This paper discusses the role of an important bishop, Demophilus of Beroe/Constantinople, as representative of the most influential group of Arian/Homoean bishops during the Arian controversy, as well as the bishop's involvement in the politico-religious strategy of Constantinople at the time, when its episcopal see was still trying to affirm itself as the most important see in the Eastern part of the Empire. These questions are highlighted mostly through analyzing the councils of Serdica (343), Antioch (344), Milan (345), Sirmium (351), Ariminum (359) and Constantinople (360), and through the reconstruction of Demophilus role in persuading Pope Liberius to sign a Sirmian Formula. Based on information on the other bishops who, with bishop Demophilus, attended the above Church meetings, it is possible to conclude that Demophilus was not only closely associated with the most influential Arian/Homoean bishops, but that the former collaborators of Eusebius of Nicomedia were among his closest associates as well. That the confidence Demophilus enjoyed in this group of bishops was justified can be deduced from the fact that Pope Liberius was detained at Beroe in the custody of Demophilus when the Pope finally condemned Alexandrian bishop Athanasius and signed a pro-Arian creed (probably the first Sirmian one). Another notable success in the career of the bishop of Beroe, however, was his translation on the see of Constantinople in 370. If the struggle against the Nicæan creed and its greatest advocate, Athanasius of Alexandria, was the primary goal of Eusebius of Nicomedia and his adherents in the theological field, the politico-religious focus of this group was to strengthen and expand the area of influence of the Constantinopolitan see. As head of the Church of Constantinople, Demophilus faithfully followed this plan as well.

⁹⁴ After Demophilus died, Marinus succeeded him as head of the Constantinopolitan Arians/Homoeans. Around 387/388, he was replaced by Dorotheus, but then there was no more unity in this community. See Mathisen 1997, 675.

⁹⁵ Socr. *h.e.* 5, 12, 7-8; 5, 23; Soz. *h.e.* 7, 14, 4; 7, 17, 9-14.

Bibliography

Primary Sources

Ammianus Marcellinus, *Res gestae*

Ammien Marcellin, Histoire, CUF Série latine, 190, 197, 231, 271, 333 and 354, ed. and transl. É. Galletier, J. Fontaine, G. Sabbah, and M.-A. Marié, with the collab. of E. Frézouls, J.-D. Berger, L. Angliviel de la Beaumelle, Paris, 1968-2018.

Athanasius Alexandrinus, *Apologia ad Constantium*

Athanase d'Alexandrie, Deux apologies : À l'empereur Constance – Pour sa fuite, SC 56 bis, ed. and transl. J.-M. Szymusiak, Paris, 2nd ed. 1987.

Athanasius Alexandrinus, *Apologia (secunda) contra Arianos*

Athanasius Werke II/1: Die Apologien 3-5 [5-7] (Berlin), 87-168, + 8: *Apologia ad Constantium / Epistula ad Joannem et Antiochum / Epistula ad Palladium / Epistula ad Dracontium / Epistula ad Afros / Tomus ad Antiochenos / Epistula ad Jovianum / Epistula Joviani ad Athanasium / Petitiones Arianorum*, ed. H.-G. Opitz, with corr. by H. C. Brennecke, U. Heil, A. von Stockhausen, Berlin/New York, 1938-1940 and 2006, ci-cii.

Athanasius Alexandrinus, *Historia Arianorum ad monachos*

Athanasius Werke II/1: Die Apologien 5-6 [7-8] (Berlin), 183-230 + 8: *Apologia ad Constantium / Epistula ad Joannem et Antiochum / Epistula ad Palladium / Epistula ad Dracontium / Epistula ad Afros / Tomus ad Antiochenos / Epistula ad Jovianum / Epistula Joviani ad Athanasium / Petitiones Arianorum*, ed. H.-G. Opitz, with corr. by H. C. Brennecke, U. Heil, A. von Stockhausen, Berlin/New York, 1940 and 2006, ciii-cv.

Athanasius Alexandrinus, *Epistula de synodis Arimini et Seleucia*

Athanasius Werke II/1: Die Apologien 6-7 [8-9] (Berlin), 231-278 + 8: *Apologia ad Constantium / Epistula ad Joannem et Antiochum / Epistula ad Palladium / Epistula ad Dracontium / Epistula ad Afros / Tomus ad Antiochenos / Epistula ad Jovianum / Epistula Joviani ad Athanasium / Petitiones Arianorum*, ed.

H.-G. Opitz, with corr. by H. C. Brennecke, U. Heil, A. von Stockhausen, Berlin/New York, 1940 and 2006, cv-cviii.

Athanasius Alexandrinus, *Epistula ad episcopos Aegypti et Libyae*
Athanasius Werke I/1: Die dogmatischen Schriften 1: Epistula ad episcopos Aegypti et Libyae, ed. K. Metzler, with the collab. of D. U. Hansen, K. Savvidis, Berlin/New York, 1996.

Codex Theodosianus

Theodosiani libri XVI cum Constitutionibus Sirmondianis et Leges Novellae ad Theodosianum pertinentes I/2: Theodosiani libri XVI cum Constitutionibus Sirmondianis. Textus cum apparatus, ed. Th. Mommsen, with the collab. of P. Krüger, Berlin, 1905.

Collectio Avellana

Epistulae imperatorum pontificum aliorum inde ab a. CCCLXVII usque ad a. DLIII datae Avellana quae dicitur collectio, CSEL 35, ed. O. Günther, Vienna/Prague/Leipzig, 1895-1898, 1-773.

Chronicon Paschale

Παροχάλιον seu Chronicon Paschale, a mundo condito ad Heraclii imp. annum XX. Opus hactenus fastorum sicularum nomine laudatum, deinde chronicae temporum epitomes, ac denique Chronici Alexandrini lemmate vulgatum; post Caroli du Fresnii-Du Cangii curas ad exemplar Vaticanum recensuit Ludovicus Dindorfius (Bonnae MDCCCXXXII, 8^o). Accedunt Georgii Pisidae opera quae reperiri potuerunt omnia, PG 92, Paris, 1860, 70-1023.

Hilarius, Collectanea antiariana Parisina

S. Hilarii episcopi Pictaviensis opera IV: Tractatus mysteriorum / Collectanea antiariana Parisina (fragmenta historica) cum appendice (liber I ad Constantium) / Liber ad Constantium imperatorem (liber II ad Constantium) / Hymni / Fragmenta minora / Spuria, CSEL 65, ed. A. Feder, Vienna/Leipzig, 1916, 39-187.

Hilary of Poitiers, Conflicts of Conscience and Law in the Fourth-century Church, TTH 25, transl. L. R. Wickham, Liverpool, 1997, 15-103.

Liber pontificalis

Liber Pontificalis (pars prior), MGH Gesta pontificum Romanorum 1, ed. Th. Mommsen, Berlin, 1898.

Maximinus episcopus Gothorum, *Dissertatio contra Ambrosium*

Scripta Arriana Latina I: Collectio Veronensis / Scholia in concilium Aquileiense / Fragmenta in Lucam rescripta / Fragmenta theologica rescripta, CCSL 87, ed. R. Gryson, Turnhout, 1982, 149-171.

Philostorgius, *Historia ecclesiastica*

Philostorgios, Kirchengeschichte, 2 vols., *Kleine und fragmentarische Historiker der Spätantike* E7, ed. and transl. B. Bleckmann, M. Stein, Paderborn, 2015.

Philostorgius, Church History, Writings from the Greco-Roman World 23, transl. P. R. Amidon, Atlanta, 2007.

Socrates Scholasticus, *Historia ecclesiastica*

Sokrates, Kirchengeschichte, GCS NF 1, ed. G. C. Hansen, with the collab. of M. Širinjan, Berlin, 1995.

Socrates, Sozomenus: Church histories, NPNF2 2, transl. A. C. Zenos, Oxford/New York, 1890, 1-178.

Sozomenus, *Historia ecclesiastica*

Socrates, Sozomenus: Church histories, NPNF2 2, transl. C. D. Hartranft, Oxford/New York, 1890, 236-427.

Sozomenos, Historia ecclesiastica – Kirchengeschichte, Fontes christiani 73, ed. and transl. G. C. Hansen, Turnhout, 2004.

Theodoretus, *Historia ecclesiastica*

Theodoret, Kirchengeschichte, GCS NF 5, ed. L. Parmentier, with corr. by G. C. Hansen, Berlin/New York, 3rd ed. 1998.

Other Cited Works

Brennecke et al. 2007 = H. C. Brennecke, U. Heil, A. von Stockhausen, A. Wintjes (ed. and transl.), *Athanasius Werke III/1: Dokumente zur Geschichte des arianischen Streites 3: Bis zur Ekthesis makrostichos*, Berlin/New York, Walter de Gruyter.

- Brennecke et al. 2014 = H. C. Brennecke, U. Heil, A. von Stockhausen, A. Wintjes (ed. and transl.), *Athanasius Werke III/1: Dokumente zur Geschichte des arianischen Streites 4: Bis zur Synode von Alexandrien 362*, Berlin/Boston, Walter de Gruyter.
- Delmaire et al. 2009 = R. Delmaire, J. Rougé (transl.), with the collab. of O. Huck, F. Rochard, L. Guichard, *Les lois religieuses des empereurs romains de Constantin à Théodose II (312-438) 2: Code Théodosien I-XV, Code Justinien, Constitutions sirmon-diennes*, SC 531, Paris, Cerf.
- Thompson 2015 = G. L. Thompson (transl.), *The Correspondence of Pope Julius I, The Library of Early Christianity 3*, Washington, Catholic University of America Press.

Secondary Sources

- Barnes 1992 = T. D. Barnes, *The Capitulation of Liberius and Hilary of Poitiers*, *Phoenix* 46/3, 256-265.
- Barnes 1993 = T. D. Barnes, *Athanasius and Constantius. Theology and Politics in the Constantinian Empire*, Cambridge [Mass.]/London, Harvard University Press.
- Barnes 2017 = T. D. Barnes, *Emperors and Bishops of Constantinople (324-431)*, in G. E. Demacopoulos, A. Papanikolaou (eds), *Christianity, Democracy, and the Shadow of Constantine, Orthodox Christianity and Contemporary Thought*, New York, Fordham University Press, 175-201.
- Brennecke 1984 = H. C. Brennecke, *Hilarius von Poitiers und die Bischofsopposition gegen Konstantius II. Untersuchungen zur dritten Phase des arianischen Streites (337-361)*, *Patristische Texte und Studien* 26, Berlin/New York, Walter de Gruyter.
- Brennecke 1988 = H. C. Brennecke, *Studien zur Geschichte der Homöer. Der Osten bis zum Ende der homöischen Reichskirche*, *Beiträge zur historischen Theologie* 73, Tübingen, Mohr.
- Cedilnik 2004 = A. Cedilnik, *Ilirik med Konstantinom Velikim in Teodozijem Velikim. Balkansko-podonavski prostor v poročilih Atanzija, Hilarija, Sokrata Sholastika, Sozomena, Teodoretina in Filostorgija*, *Thesaurus memoriae* 3, Ljubljana, Zgodovinski inštitut Milka Kosa ZRC SAZU.
- Cedilnik 2022 = A. Cedilnik, *Georgij iz Kapadokije – Makedonijev človek na mestu aleksandrijskega škofa?*, in A. Cedilnik, M. Lovenjak (eds), *Na obzorju novega. Območje severnega Jadrana*

ter vzhodnoalpski in balkansko-podonavski prostor v obdobju pozne antike in zgodnjega srednjega veka. Posvečeno Rajku Bratožu ob njegovi sedemdesetletnici, Ljubljana, Založba Univerze v Ljubljani, 91-113.

- Cedilnik-Moreau 2021 = A. Cedilnik, D. Moreau, *Eudoxius of Antioch/Constantinople and the Pro-Arian Bishops of Illyricum. Contribution (III) to the Christian Prosopography of the Dioecesis Thraciarum*, in M. Rakocija (ed.), *Нун и Византија. Деветнаести међународни научни скуп, Нун, 3-5. јун 2020 - Niš and Byzantium. Nineteen International Symposium, Niš, 3-5 June 2020, Сборник радова – The Collection of Scientific Works 19, Niš, NKC, 447-476.*
- Cedilnik - Moreau 2024 = A. Cedilnik, D. Moreau, *How Ulfilas became an Arian Bishop? Contribution (I) to the Christian Prosopography of the Dioecesis Thraciarum, C&C 19/1, 95-112.*
- Chastagnol 1962 = A. Chastagnol, *Les fastes de la préfecture de Rome au Bas-Empire, Études prosopographiques 2*, Paris, Nouvelles Éditions Latines.
- Demandt 2007 = A. Demandt, *Die Spätantike. Römische Geschichte von Diocletian bis Justinian 284-565 n. Chr., Handbuch der Altertumswissenschaft 3/6*, 2nd ed., Munich, C. H. Beck.
- Feder 1910 = A. L. Feder, *Studien zu Hilarius von Poitiers 1: Die Sogenannten "Fragmenta historica" und der sogenannte "Liber I ad Constantium imperatorem" nach ihrer Überlieferung, inhaltlichen Bedeutung und Entstehung, Sitzungsberichte der Kais. Akademie der Wissenschaften in Wien. Philosophisch-historische Klasse 162/4*, Vienna, in Kommission bei Alfred Hölder.
- Feder 1911 = A. L. Feder, *Studien zu Hilarius von Poitiers 2: Bischofsnamen und Bischofssitze bei Hilarius. Kritische Untersuchungen zur kirchlichen Prosopographie und Topographie des 4. Jahrhunderts, Sitzungsberichte der Kais. Akademie der Wissenschaften in Wien. Philosophisch-historische Klasse 166/5*, Vienna, in Kommission bei Alfred Hölder.
- Gwynn 2007 = D. M. Gwynn, *The Eusebians. The Polemic of Athanasius of Alexandria and the Construction of the 'Arian Controversy'*, *Oxford Theological Monographs*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.

- Hanson 1988 = R. P. C. Hanson, *The Search of the Christian Doctrine of God. The Arian Controversy, 318-381*, Edinburgh, T. & T. Clark.
- Herbers 2016 = K. Herbers (dir), *Regesta pontificum Romanorum ab condita ad annum post Christum natum MCXCVIII edidit Philippus Jaffé 1: (A S. Petro usque ad a. DCIV)*, 3rd ed., Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Jones-Martindale-Morris 1971 = A. H. M. Jones, J. R. Martindale, J. Morris, *The Prosopography of the Later Roman Empire 1: 260-395*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Löhr 1986 = W. A. Löhr, *Die Entstehung der homöischen und homöusianischen Kirchenparteien. Studien zur Synodalgeschichte des 4. Jahrhunderts, Bonner Beiträge zur Kirchen- und Theologiegeschichte 2 / Beiträge zur Religionsgeschichte 1*, Witterschlick/Bonn, Verlag Wehle.
- Manders 2019 = E. Manders, *Macedonius, Constantius and the Changing Dynamics of Power*, in C. A. Cvetković, P. Gemeinhardt (eds), *Episcopal Networks in Late Antiquity. Connection and Communication across Boundaries, Arbeiten zur Kirchengeschichte 137*, Berlin/Boston, Walter de Gruyter.
- Mathisen 1997 = R. W. Mathisen, *Barbarian Bishops and the Churches "in Barbaricis Gentibus" during Late Antiquity, Speculum 72/3, 664-697*.
- Meslin 1967 = M. Meslin, *Les ariens d'Occident 335-430, Patristica Sorbonensia 8*, Paris, Éditions du Seuil.
- Pietri 1976 = Ch. Pietri, *Roma Christiana. Recherches sur l'Eglise de Rome, son organisation, sa politique, son idéologie de Miltiade à Sixte III (311-440), Bibliothèque des Écoles Françaises d'Athènes et de Rome 224*, Rome, École Française de Rome.
- Simonetti 1975 = M. Simonetti, *La crisi ariana nel IV secolo, Studia Ephemeridis Augustinianum 11*, Rome, Institutum Patristicum "Augustinianum".
- Stevenson 2014 = W. Stevenson, *Exiling Bishops: The Policy of Constantius II, DOP 68, 7-27*.
- Wipszycka 2015 = E. Wipszycka, *The Alexandrian Church. People and Institutions, The Journal of Juristic Papyrology: Supplement 25*, Warsaw, Journal of Juristic Papyrology.

Universitatea „Alexandru Ioan Cuza” din Iași
Facultatea de Istorie • Centrul de Studii Clasice și Creștine

Bd. Carol I, Nr. 11, 700506, Iași, România
Tel.: 040/0232/201634, Fax: 040/0232/201156



ISSN: 1842-3043
e-ISSN: 2393-2961

EDITURA UNIVERSITĂȚII „ALEXANDRU IOAN CUZA” DIN IAȘI