
Alenka Cedilnik, Dominic Moreau
(University of Ljubljana, Slovenia/ University of Lille, France)

**EUDOXIUS OF ANTIOCH/CONSTANTINOPLE AND
THE PRO-ARIAN BISHOPS OF ILLYRICUM.
CONTRIBUTION (III) TO THE CHRISTIAN
PROSOPOGRAPHY OF THE *DIOECESIS THRACIARUM***

Abstract: This paper will focus on bishop Eudoxius of Antioch/Constantinople and his contacts with Illyrian pro-Arian bishops, first of all, Valens of Mursa and Ursacius of Singidunum. On this basis, it will seek to demonstrate the nature and purpose of their cooperation in the context of the Arian controversy and the first efforts of the Church of Constantinople to extend its influence in the politico-ecclesiastical sphere.

Keywords: Eudoxius of Antioch/Constantinople, Valens of Mursa, Ursacius of Singidunum, Eusebius of Nicomedia, Church of Constantinople, Arian controversy

Eudoxius of Antioch/Constantinople is one of the most controversial figures of the quarrel between Niceans/Homoousians and Arians/Homoeans during the 4th century. Due to his central position in a controversy that was ultimately won by the Nicene party, his biography is known mainly from the writings of his opponents. In order to elucidate several of the gray areas surrounding Eudoxius, this paper will focus on his contacts with pro-Arian bishops from Illyricum, primarily Valens of Mursa and Ursacius of Singidunum.¹ On this basis we will

¹ Following on from a paper about the figure of Ulphilas/Wulfila given in Sofia on the 10th of May 2019 (A. Cedilnik, D. Moreau, *How Ulphilas became an Arian Bishop? Contribution to the Christian Prosopography of the Dioecesis Thraciarum*, in K. Stoev, I. Topalilov, R. Milev (eds), *The Goths in the East: Sources – Archaeology – Identity* (Folia Balcanica), Sofia [forthcoming]) and a paper about the figure of Demophilus of Beroë/Constantinople given in Yambol on the 3rd of October 2019 (A. Cedilnik, D. Moreau, *Demophilus, the Last Arian Bishop of Constantinople? Contribution (II) to the Christian Prosopography of the Dioecesis Thraciarum*, in Z. Gerdzhikova and I. Topalilov (eds), *Late Antique Christianity in Southeastern Europe* (Folia Balcanica), Sofia [forthcoming]), this article is the third joint work by Alenka Cedilnik and Dominic Moreau presented as a contribution to the *Dioecesis Thraciarum, Chersonesus Taurica, Bosphorus Cimmerius et Zechia* volume of the *Prosopographie chrétienne du Bas-Empire*, which is being prepared within the framework of the DANUBIUS Project. This research programme on Christianisation of the Late An-

seek to demonstrate the nature and purpose of their cooperation in the context of the Arian/Homoean controversy, during which the Church of Constantinople began the first extension of its influence in the politico-ecclesiastical sphere. Eudoxius began his ecclesiastical career as bishop of Germanicia, but he then became bishop of Antioch in 357 and, finally, of Constantinople in 360. He first appears in the sources at the Synod of Antioch in 341. Athanasius of Alexandria reports that he received his bishop's position precisely because of his Arian orientation and the support he received from the Eusebians. Very quickly, he became one of the most prominent members of this group, along with Valens and Ursacius. In order to shed light on the background of their cooperation, particular attention will be paid to the following events: 1- Eudoxius' participation, in 341 and 343, at the synods of Antioch and Serdica; 2- his role, in 344, as a member of the delegation sent by the Synod of Antioch to the Western bishops; 3- his participation, in 351, at the Council of Sirmium; 4- his consecration, in 357, as bishop of Antioch together with the aims of the synod he organised in the following year; 5- his role, in 359, at the Council of Seleucia; 6- his consecration, in 360, as bishop of Constantinople.

Bishop of Germanicia

As can be deduced from the information given by Philostorgius,² Eudoxius' father, Caesarius, was from the city Arabissus (modern Afşin) in Lesser Armenia. Although there is nothing written about Eudoxius' early life in Photius' *Epitome* of Philostorgius, we can assume that Eudoxius grew up in a Christian family, since his father achieved martyrdom.³ This probably happened under Emperor Galerius,⁴ between 305 and 311, when the latter ruled as Augustus over Asia Minor and Illyricum, as his share of the Empire. So Eudoxius must have been born before that time or, at the latest, a few months later.

We do not know when exactly Eudoxius was consecrated bishop of Germanicia, a city in the northern Syrian region of Commagene (modern Maraş), not far from Arabissus. The only data we have about his episcopal consecration are Athanasius' encyclical letter to the bishops of Egypt and Libya, written in

tique Lower Danube is financially supported by both the French National Research Agency (ANR) and the I-SITE ULNE Foundation. It is based at the University of Lille, within the HALMA-UMR 8164 research centre, and its principal investigator is Dominic Moreau. For more information, see <https://danubius.huma-num.fr>. The authors would like to thank Ivan Bugarski, researcher at the Archaeological Institute of Belgrade, for the translation of a long version of the abstract in Serbian.

² Philost. *h.e.* 4.4.2.

³ Philost. *h.e.* 4.4.2.

⁴ Philost. *h.e.* 4.4a (= *Suda* ε 3428).

356,⁵ and his *Historia Arianorum*,⁶ written at the end of 357.⁷ In the first one, the Alexandrian prelate writes that Eudoxius became bishop on account of his impiety with the support of the Eusebians.⁸ He repeats the same information (except that he talks about Arians and not Eusebians) in the parallel passage of his *History of the Arians*, adding that the consecration took place immediately after the banishment of Bishop Eustathius of Antioch. Eustathius was unseated and exiled between 327 and 330/31.⁹ So, about this time, Eudoxius was probably ordained bishop. Unfortunately, due to the polemical nature of the passage, the information given by Athanasius should be treated with caution. As Athanasius intends to portray Eustathius as the most important defender of the orthodox religion in Antioch, we cannot be entirely certain that the changes¹⁰ cited by Athanasius actually took place immediately after Eustathius was expelled from the city. Therefore, the only reliable information about when Eudoxius was a bishop is his participation in the Synod of Antioch in 341, which he attended as the bishop of Germanicia.¹¹

⁵ D. M. Gwynn, *The Eusebians. The Polemic of Athanasius of Alexandria and the Construction of the 'Arian Controversy'*, Oxford 2007, 35–36.

⁶ Ath. Alex., *h. Ar.* 4.

⁷ D. M. Gwynn, *The Eusebians. The Polemic of Athanasius of Alexandria and the Construction of the 'Arian Controversy'*, Oxford 2007, 40–42.

⁸ Ath. Alex., *ep. Aeg. Lib.* 7.4.

⁹ Bruno Bleckmann, Doris Meyer and Jean-Marc Prieur's comment on Philost. *h.e.* 2.7, in É. Des Places, (transl.), with the collab. of B. Bleckmann, D. Meyer, J.-M. Prieur, *Philostorge, Histoire ecclésiastique* (SC, 564), Paris 2013, 208–209, n. 2 and 3; B. Bleckmann, M. Stein, (ed. & transl.), *Philostorgios, Kirchengeschichte*, vol. 2, Paderborn 2015, 126–130; R. P. C. Hanson, *The Search of the Christian Doctrine of God. The Arian Controversy, 318–381*, Edinburgh 1988, 208–210.

¹⁰ In addition to Eudoxius, the following bishops would have also been consecrated at that time: Stephanus of Antioch, his successor Leontius, George of Laodicea, Theodosius of Tripolis and Eustathius of Sebasteia. See Ath. Alex., *h. Ar.* 4.2. Most of these bishops were not ordained immediately after Eustathius' banishment. Stephanus was consecrated shortly before the Council of Serdica (R. P. C. Hanson, *The Search of the Christian Doctrine of God. The Arian Controversy, 318–381*, Edinburgh 1988, 259), George around 335 (A. L. Feder, *Studien zu Hilarius von Poitiers 2: Bischofsnamen und Bischofssitze bei Hilarius. Kritische Untersuchungen zur kirchlichen Prosopographie und Topographie des 4. Jahrhunderts*, Vienna 1911, 115), Theodosius between 326 and 328 (H.-G. Opitz, *Athanasius Werke II/1: Die Apologien 5–6* [7–8], Berlin 1940, 185, n. 9 and 16), but it is not known when Eustathius became bishop of Sebasteia (*ibid.*, 185, 9).

¹¹ Ath. Alex., *syn.* 38.2; Soz., *h.e.* 3.5.10. The leading spirits of the synod were probably (besides Eudoxius of Germanicia): Eusebius of Nicomedia (at that time already bishop of Constantinople), Acacius of Caesarea, Patrophilus of Scythopolis, Theodorus of Heraclea, Gregory of Alexandria, George of Laodicea, Narcissus of Neronias/Eirenopolis and Dianius of Caesarea in Cappadocia. Cf. also R. P. C. Hanson, *The Search of the Christian Doctrine of God. The Arian Controversy, 318–381*, Edinburgh 1988, 284.

The Synod of Rome (340/1) and Antioch (341)

If we can believe Athanasius that Eudoxius' consecration as bishop was the result of the endeavour of the Eusebians, then Eudoxius must have already worked with them before he became bishop. Nevertheless, the Synod of Antioch of 341 is the first event at which Eudoxius is known to have worked with at least some of this group of bishops. Not only was Eusebius, now of Constantinople, at the synod, but also Patrophilus of Scythopolis, Theodorus of Heraclea, Narcissus of Neronias/Eirenopolis and George of Laodicea, whom Athanasius usually refers to as Eusebians.¹² Two important pro-Arian bishops of Illyricum, Valens of Mursa and Ursacius of Singidunum, who had been close associates of Eusebius of Nicomedia since at least 335, almost certainly did not attend the synod.¹³ Still, it seems that, already at that time, the three bishops, Eudoxius, Valens and Ursacius, were actively involved together in politico-ecclesiastical plans whose prime mover was Eusebius of Nicomedia.

Even before the Synod of Antioch, whose participants presented their theological beliefs in the Second ("Dedication") Creed of Antioch, Eusebius of Nicomedia wrote a letter to Julius of Rome, explaining the justification for the condemnation of Athanasius at the Synod of Tyr. In addition to Eusebius, the signatories of the letter were Maris of Chalcedon, Theodorus of Heraclea, Diognitus/Theogni(tu)s of Nicaea, Ursacius of Singidunum and Valens of Mursa.¹⁴ As Athanasius was the loudest in pointing out the heresy of the bishops gathered around Eusebius of Nicomedia, the letter was important for the Synod of Antioch. If this letter had succeeded in proving that the bishop of Alexandria had been rightly convicted, the heresy of the prelates who had gathered in Antioch would no longer have been so unambiguous in the eyes of the West.

The justification of the allegations against Athanasius was addressed by the Synod of Rome, convened by Pope Julius at the end of 340¹⁵ or at the spring

¹² For the list of bishops who are usually referred to by Athanasius as Eusebians see D. M. Gwynn, *The Eusebians. The Polemic of Athanasius of Alexandria and the Construction of the 'Arian Controversy'*, Oxford 2007, 115.

¹³ The letter sent after the Synod of Rome by the Pope Julius I to Eusebius of Nicomedia and other bishops assembled at Antioch is an evidence that Valens and Ursacius were almost certainly not in Antioch at that time. They are not mentioned among the addressees of this letter. Otherwise, there are among them three former members of the commission sent to Mareotis by the Synod of Tyr of 335 (Maris, Macedonius and Theodorus). See Ath. Alex., *apol. sec.* 21.1 = Jul. Papa, *ep. 2, inscr.* = 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)*, Göttingen 2016, n° 431. Apart from the three bishops just mentioned and Eusebius of Nicomedia, the letter was also addressed to Dianius of Caesarea in Cappadocia, Flacillus of Antioch and Narcissus of Neronias/Eirenopolis. These bishops were the most prominent participants in the Synod of Antioch of 341. The letter, however, was not written only for them, but for all those who had previously sent from Antioch a letter to Julius. See G. L. Thompson (ed. & transl.), *The Correspondence of Pope Julius I*, Washington 2015, 27–37. Since Valens and Ursacius are not mentioned among the addressees, we can assume that they did not cooperate in writing this letter and that they were not in Antioch at that time.

¹⁴ Hil., *coll. antiar.* B.II.1.2.1.

¹⁵ P. Barceló, *Constantius II. und seine Zeit. Die Anfänge des Staatskirchentums*,

of 341.¹⁶ More than fifty bishops¹⁷ from different parts of Italy attended the synod and decided that the exiled Nicene bishops were not guilty of the offences they were accused of in the East.¹⁸ Despite being invited, the bishops from the Eastern part of the Empire did not attend the synod for purely principled reasons. They were convinced that any reconsideration of the issues already dealt with by the Eastern synods would detract from their credibility. Athanasius explained the absence of the Eastern bishops in another way. He accused his opponents of not coming to the synod because they were afraid of the truth being revealed.¹⁹

It is precisely in connection with the Synod of Rome that Valens and Ursacius are referred to again in the sources after 335. In his *Apologia secunda*, Athanasius mentions only the names of Valens and Ursacius as his opponents for the first time.²⁰ They both later confessed – as he writes – that Eusebius and his group of bishops did not respond to the invitation to the Synod of Rome because they feared that it would not have clarified how they had not acted properly in the past. Taken alone, this passage from Athanasius' writings is letting us deduce that Valens and Ursacius were at this time well acquainted with the current views of the Eastern pro-Arian group. However, a passage of a let-

Stuttgart 2004, 80.

¹⁶ M. Simonetti, *La crisi ariana nel IV secolo*, Rome 1975, 146; G. L. Thompson (ed. & transl.), *The Correspondence of Pope Julius I*, Washington 2015, 30. Charles Pietri (*Roma Christiana. Recherches sur l'Église de Rome, son organisation, sa politique, son idéologie de Miltiade à Sixte III (311–440)*), Rome 1976, 201) prefers to take a middle position.

¹⁷ Ath Alex., *apol. sec.* 20.3.

¹⁸ In addition to Athanasius of Alexandria and Marcellus of Ancyra, the Synod of Rome also considered convictions against other exiled bishops. The synod's support would have been given to Lucius of Adrianople (Europa/Thrace), Cyros of Beroea (Syria Prima), Euphratation of Balanea (Syria Prima), Hellanicus of Tripoli (Phoenicia), Asklepas of Gaza (Palestina Prima) and possibly even Paul of Constantinople. See H.-G. Opitz, *Athanasius Werke II/1: Die Apologien 3–5 [5–7]*, Berlin 1938–1940, 111, n. 11; T. D. Barnes, *Athanasius and Constantius. Theology and Politics in the Constantinian Empire*, Cambridge (Mass.)/London 1993, 61; A. Cedilnik, *Ilirik med Konstantinom Velikim in Teodozijem Velikim. Balkansko-podonavski prostor v poročilih Atanazija, Hilarija, Sokrata Sholastika, Sozomena, Teodoretia in Filostorgija*, Ljubljana, 2004, 80–81; A. Cedilnik, *Die Rolle von zwei illyrischen Bischöfen, Valens von Mursa und Ursacius von Singidunum, im arianischen Streit*, in M. Frass, H. Graßl, G. Nightingale (eds), *Akten des 15. Österreichischen Althistorikertages. Salzburg, 20.–22. November 2014*, Salzburg 2016, 25. The “Eastern” bishops who attended the Council of Serdica state in a letter addressed to the various bishops of East and West that Paul was present at Athanasius' deposition and also signed his condemnation (Hil., *coll. antiar.* A.IV.1.13.1). Although based on this passage we could assume that Paul attended the Synod of Tyr in 335, we cannot know for sure whether he was already bishop of Constantinople at that time. For the possibility that Paul attended the Synod of Tyr as bishop, see H. C. Brennecke, U. Theil, A. von Stockhausen, A. Wintjes, (ed. & transl.), *Athanasius Werke III/1: Dokumente zur Geschichte des arianischen Streites 4: Bis zur Synode von Alexandrien 362*, Berlin/Boston 2013, xxxviii.

¹⁹ Ath. Alex., *apol. sec.* 20.2.

²⁰ Ath. Alex., *apol. sec.* 20.2.

ter written by the so-called “Western party” of the Council of Serdica and addressed to all churches proves that, even then, as during the Synod of Tyr, they were among the most active in this group.²¹

As we see in the same letter, the “Western” bishops justified their position on Athanasius and Marcellus of Ancyra also by referring to a letter sent by Eusebius of Nicomedia and his followers – probably before the Synod of Rome met at the end of 340 or at the spring of 341²² – to Pope Julius with the purpose of explaining their opposition to Athanasius and Marcellus. With the exception of Eusebius, all the signatories were members of the commission sent to Mareotis by the Synod of Tyr in order to examine the justification of accusations against Athanasius. In the aftermath of the Synod of Rome, this group was necessarily affected by its conclusions, since the meeting justified the inadmissibility of Athanasius’ condemnation on the basis of inadequate membership and improper functioning of the commission sent to Mareotis.²³ In the section dealing with these events, surprisingly in the *Apologia secunda* Athanasius primarily focuses on the case of Valens and Ursacius, even though they were only two among other signatories. As both later (347) – after being expelled from the Church’s communion – condemned their own actions against Athanasius, we understand that the Alexandrian bishop used the two Illyrians more than other figures as evidence of his own innocence, in proving the falsehood and inconsistency of his adversaries.

Yet Athanasius’ pointing to Valens and Ursacius would perhaps not only serve to justify his accusation against the so-called “Eastern party”. Emphasising the guilt of both Illyrian bishops could also be understood because they were most probably the ones who delivered the letter informing Pope Julius that the Eastern bishops would not attend the synod he convened, as if they were doubly guilty. The possibility of this assumption is supported by quite a few data preserved in the sources.

²¹ Hil., *coll. antiar.* B.II.1.2.1.

²² This sending before the Synod of Rome was held could be inferred from the fact that the Eusebians’ letter to Julius was sent at about the same time that Athanasius’ supporters wrote to the same pope. Writing letters of support for the Alexandrian bishop would indeed seem to make more sense at a time when his innocence had not yet been officially confirmed by the Roman Synod. While one document of the *Collectanea antiariana Parisina* refers briefly to the letter of Eusebius and his followers to Julius of Rome (Hil., *coll. antiar.* B.II.1.2.1), Athanasius included in his *Apologia secunda* a long letter from Bishop Julius, representing a response of the bishop of Rome to – most likely (cf. Ath. Alex., *apol. sec.* 26–35 = Jul. Papa, *ep.* 2.8–22 = 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*), Göttingen 2016, n° 431, in which the Roman pope responds to the bishops’ accusations that he has so far sent letters only to Eusebius and his followers) – some other letter of the “Eastern” bishops. Regarding the addressees of the letter, see *supra* n. 13; and H.-G. Opitz, *Athanasius Werke* II/1: *Die Apologien* 3–5 [5–7], Berlin 1938–1940, 102, n. 11.

²³ The reasons for the synod’s decision are given in the letter sent by bishop Julius to Eusebius of Nicomedia (Constantinople) and other bishops assembled in Antioch. See Ath. Alex., *apol. sec.* 21–35 = Jul. Papa, *ep.* 2 = 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*), Göttingen 2016, n° 431.

As Athanasius' case was one of the central issues the Synod of Rome intended to address, the former members of the group sent to Mareotis surely played an important role in drafting the response to Julius' invitation. This supposition is at least partly proven by the above-mentioned letter written against Athanasius and sent to Pope Julius by as many as five former members of the group sent to Mareotis: Maris, Theodorus, Diognitus/Theogni(tu)s, Ursacius and Valens.²⁴ The content of this document is partly known, thanks to the letter written by the "Western" bishops at the Council of Serdica in 343 and addressed to all Churches.²⁵ We understand from it that the Eusebians' letter explained the position of the "Eastern party" towards Athanasius and Marcellus, while at the same time rejecting the Julius's invitation to attend the Synod of Rome.

Although we have no clear information on who brought the letter to Rome, why can we suppose that it could have been brought by Valens and Ursacius? As Julius of Rome wrote in his letter to the bishops who were gathered in Antioch in 341, letters against Athanasius were brought to him by Eusebius' agents in the past.²⁶ Since bishops Maris of Chalcedon and Theodorus of Heraclea were sent to the West only a few months later to acquaint the "Western" bishops with the Fourth Creed of Antioch, and since long journeys were likely to have been too wearisome for Eusebius of Nicomedia, the task could have been entrusted to the two bishops of Illyricum. Such an assumption is also strengthened by the fact that at least Valens of Mursa was in Aquileia in the early 340s. At that time, the election of a new Aquileian bishop resulted in bloody riots in which Bishop Viator lost his life as a result of the raging crowds.²⁷ The only source reporting the event is the letter sent by the "Western party" of the Council of Serdica to Pope Julius.²⁸ The incident is briefly presented and only two people in link with are mentioned: on the one hand, the tragically deceased Viator and, on the other hand, Valens. The authors of the letter leave no doubt that this latter instigated the rebellion and was guilty of Viator's death, as he sought to leave the episcopal see of Mursa, in order to become bishop of Aquileia. Nevertheless, the same letter omits the conclusion of the episode: *viz.* that Valens failed to achieve his purpose, since Fortunatianus was elected the new bishop of Aquileia.²⁹

²⁴ Hil., *coll. antiar.* B.II.1.2.1. The only member of the commission who is not mentioned among the authors of the letter is Macedonius of Mopsuestia.

²⁵ Hil., *coll. antiar.* B.II.1.

²⁶ Ath. Alex., *apol. sec.* 26.1 = Jul. Papa, *ep.* 2.8 = 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)*, Göttingen 2016, n° 431.

²⁷ R. Bratož, *La basilica di Aquileia nelle fonti letterarie dal IV al VII secolo*, in G. Cuscito & T. Lehmann (eds), *La basilica di Aquileia. Storia, archeologia ed arte – Der Dom von Aquileia. Geschichte, Archäologie und Kunst. Atti della XL Settimana di studi aquileiesi, 7–9 maggio 2009 (Antichità Altoadriatiche 69/1)*, Trieste 2010, 23, n. 20; R. Bratož, *Med Italijo in Ilirikom. Slovenski prostor in njegovo sosedsvo v pozni antiki*, Ljubljana 2014, 260, n. 82.

²⁸ Hil., *coll. antiar.* B.II.2.4 (12) = Jul. Papa, 4.4.

²⁹ For the event in Aquileia, cf. R. Bratož, *Cerkvenopolitični in kulturnozgodovinski odnosi med Sirmijem in Akvilejo*, *Zgodovinski časopis* 37/4 (1983), 264; R. Bratož, *Christianisierung des Nordadria- und Westbalkanraumes im 4. Jahrhundert*, in R. Bratož (ed), *Westillyricum und Nordostitalien in der spätrömischen Zeit – Zahodni Ilirik in severovzhodna Italija v poznorimski dobi*, Ljubljana 1996, 323.

As Julius makes no reference to this bloody riot organised by a notorious Eusebian in his letter that he sent to the Synod of Antioch of 341 to answer it and report on the decisions of the Roman meeting, we can assume that it took place after this latter.³⁰ Indeed, that would make sense that Valens became involved in this situation while he was on his way back from Rome, eventually together with Ursacius. Such a visit at Rome in 340/1 might also be an explanation of the particular attention to both Illyrian bishops, among all their pro-Arian colleagues, by the “Western” bishops assembled at Serdica in their letter to Pope Julius. If they really went to Rome then, they necessarily had the opportunity to speak with its bishop about their theological views and this could be an explanation to the emphasis on their irreligiosity and immaturity in the so-called “Western” bishops’ letter to Julius, while they were by no means the only ones who were deposed and banished at Serdica.

Valens and Ursacius were very active Arian militants in the years 340 and 341, when we meet Eudoxius as bishop of Germanicia for the first time. All three bishops were participating in initiatives and actions driven entirely by their mentor: Eusebius of Nicomedia. There is no evidence that both Illyrian bishops and that of Germanicia met in person during this period, but they almost certainly met at the Council of Serdica of 343.

The Council of Serdica (343) and the following synods

According to the letter of the so-called “Eastern” Council of Serdica sent to the bishops of Africa, 80 pro-Arian prelates gathered in a separate synod at that general meeting.³¹ At the end of their letter, we find a list of 73 signatories, among whom Eudoxius of Germanicia is the 19th and Valens of Mursa the 73rd, whereas Ursacius of Singidunum doesn’t appear.³² Nonetheless, there is not the slightest doubt about his participation to this meeting.³³ Although Valens

³⁰ Ath. Alex., *apol. sec.* 26 = Jul. Papa, *ep.* 2 = 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)*, Göttingen 2016, n° 431. Glen L. Thompson (*The Correspondence of Pope Julius I*, Washington 2015, 28 and 30) thinks that the letter was sent on summer 341, but he assumes that the Synod of Rome was only gathered shortly after mid-March 341. This hypothesis of a late organisation of the meeting is certainly not the one that prevails. The authors of the latest edition of Jaffé’s *Regesta pontificum Romanorum* tend rather to a sending of the letter between the end of 340 and the very beginning of 341. See 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)*, Göttingen 2016, n° 431.

³¹ Hil., *coll. antiar.* A.IV.1.16.1.

³² Hil., *coll. antiar.* A.IV.3.19 and 73.

³³ Among the bishops deposed by the “Western” Council of Serdica (Valens and Ursacius), only bishop George of Laodicea is said to have been absent from the synod. See Ath. Alex., *apol. sec.* 47.3; Hil., *coll. antiar.* B.II.1.8.2. Cf. also Ath. Alex., *H. Ar.* 17.3; Ath. Alex., *apol. sec.* 40.3; Soz. *h.e.* 3.12.3; Hil., *coll. antiar.* B.II.2.4, and B.II.3; Thdt., *h.e.* 2.38.

and Ursacius came from the Western part of the Empire, they belonged then to the so-called “Eastern” bishops party and were, thus, participating in the same events in which Eudoxius also took part.³⁴

Relying on the sources, we can assume that the role played by Valens and Ursacius was then more noticeable to contemporaries than Eudoxius’ role, since both Illyrian bishops were condemned and deposed by the “Western” bishops gathered at Serdica,³⁵ whereas the third one was not. Furthermore, the sources written by the so-called “Westerners” are identifying clearly as the leaders of the Eusebians following Eusebius of Nicomedia’s death: Theodorus of Heraclea, Narcissus of Neronias/Eirenopolis, Acacius of Caesarea, Stephanus of Antioch, Ursacius of Singidunum, Valens of Mursa, Menophantus of Ephesus and George of Laodicea.³⁶ Again, Eudoxius is not named.

In the context that followed the failure of the Council of Serdica, which greatly weakened the political and religious position of Emperor Constantius II, especially towards his brother Constans, the roles of all the concerned bishops changed. As soon as the year after the council, Valens and Ursacius, since they were bishops in the Western part of the Empire, no longer appeared among the most active pleaders of the prevailing theological interpretations in the Eastern part. On the contrary, it is at that precise moment that Eudoxius “comes on stage” for the first time as a prominent representative of these views. Together with bishops Demophilus of Beroë, Macedonius of Mopsuestia and Martyrius, perhaps of Naupactus in Achaea,³⁷ Eudoxius was sent to the West by the Synod of Antioch of 344, in order to bring the “Western” bishops a synodical letter and the so-called Long Creed.³⁸ These documents were discussed at the Synod of Milan in 345. In an atmosphere of high political tension between Constans and Constantius, the “Long Creed” was an attempt at reconciliation in religious matters between a then weakened East and more confident West, after Serdica.

The success of this mission should have greatly benefited Valens and Ursacius. Among the bishops who were excommunicated by the pro-Nicene “Western” bishops at the Council of Serdica, they were the only ones from the Western part of the Empire and they were definitely exposed to a certain pressure. We might imagine that if the embassy had succeeded – which was not

³⁴ Eudoxius’ name is written in the list of signatories added at the end of the letter sent to Africa by the “Eastern” bishops gathered at the Council of Serdica. See Hil., *coll. antiar.* A.IV.3.19. Otherwise, the sources do not mention him in connection with the Council of Serdica.

³⁵ The “Western” bishops of the Council of Serdica excommunicated Theodorus of Heraclea, Narcissus of Neronias/Eirenopolis, Acacius of Caesarea, Stephanus of Antioch, Ursacius of Singidunum, Valens of Mursa, Menophantus of Ephesus and George of Laodicea. See Ath. Alex., *apol. sec.* 47.3; Hil., *coll. antiar.* B.II.1.8.2.

³⁶ Ath. Alex., *apol. sec.* 46.1; Hil., *coll. antiar.* B.II.1.7

³⁷ A. Cedilnik, D. Moreau, *Demophilus, the Last Arian Bishop of Constantinople? Contribution (II) to the Christian Prosopography of the Dioecesis Thraciarum*, in Z. Gerdzhikova and I. Topalilov (eds), *Late Antique Christianity in Southeastern Europe* (Folia Balcanica), Sofia (forthcoming).

³⁸ Ath., *syn.* 26.1; Hil., *coll. antiar.* A.VII.4; Socr., *h.e.* 2.19.1; Soz., *h.e.* 3.11.2. Cf. also M. Simonetti, *La crisi ariana nel IV secolo*, Rome 1975, 189–190; T. D. Barnes, *Athanasius and Constantius. Theology and Politics in the Constantinian Empire*, Cambridge (Mass.)/London 1993, 88.

the case –, both Illyrian bishops certainly wouldn't have had to anathematise Arius' teachings and confessed that they had wrongly accused Athanasius in the past, like they were forced to in 347, in order to be rehabilitated.³⁹ However, this repositioning was completely forgot as soon as the political situation changed after Constans' death in 350.

Because of the personal interests that bound Valens and Ursacius to the mission sent to Milan, we might imagine that the connection between both Illyrian bishops and the members of the delegation was strengthened during this time. Moreover, we can also assume that the bishops knew each other quite well before 344. The ambassadors were, in addition to Eudoxius: Macedonius of Mopsuestia, Demophilus of Beroë and a certain Martyrius (of Naupactus in Achaëa?). Eudoxius and Demophilus were at the Council of Serdica with Valens and Ursacius. As for Macedonius, he was a member of the commission sent to Mareotis in 335, and had, therefore, a long acquaintance with both Illyrian bishops. Only about Martyrius do we know nothing reliable,⁴⁰ except the fact that he was a member of the delegation sent to Milan. Still, we can almost be sure that all the members of the delegation to Milan were at the Synod of Antioch in 344, and we can also assume that on their way to Milan they stopped in Singidunum and/or Mursa.⁴¹

If we compare the delegation sent to Milan in 344/5 with the one that took the Fourth Creed of Antioch to Trier in 342, we find that three of their respective members also participated in the investigation of Athanasius' case in Mareotis in 335: Macedonius of Mopsuestia (who went both to Milan and Trier), Maris

³⁹ For Valens and Ursacius' letter addressed to the bishop Julius of Rome, see Jul. Papa, *ep.* 6 = Hil., *coll. antiar.* B.II.6 = Ath. Alex., *apol. sec.* 58.1–4 = Soz. *h.e.* 3.23.2–5; Ath. Alex., *h. Ar.* 26.3; Thdt., *h.e.* 2.16.11. Valens and Ursacius' letter addressed to the bishop Athanasius of Alexandria: Hil., *coll. antiar.* B.II.8 = Ath. Alex., *apol. sec.* 58.5 = Soz. *h.e.* 3.24.1–2; Ath. Alex., *h. Ar.* 26.4. Cf. also A. Cedilnik, *Ilirik med Konstantinom Velikim in Teodozijem Velikim. Balkansko-podonavski prostor v poročilih Atanazija, Hilarija, Sokrata Sholastika, Sozomena, Teodoreta in Filostorgija*, Ljubljana, 2004, 153–165.

⁴⁰ The letter written by Dianius, Flacillus, Narcissus, Eusebius, Maris, Macedonius, Theodorus and their friends was brought to Julius of Rome by Macarius the Presbyter and Martyrius and Hesychius the Deacons. See Ath. Alex., *apol. sec.* 22.3, 24.3, 26.1 = Jul. Papa, *ep.* 2.2, 4 and 8 = 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)*, Göttingen 2016, n° 431. Perhaps this Martyrius could be identified with the namesake ambassador sent to Milan in 344.

⁴¹ Timothy D. Barnes (*Athanasius and Constantius. Theology and Politics in the Constantinian Empire*, Cambridge (Mass.)/London 1993, 88) supposes that the delegation of four bishops was accompanied by the *comes* Thalassius, who met with Emperor Constans at Poetovio. The meeting is reported by Athanasius (*apol. Const.* 3). If the bishops travelled accompanied by Thalassius, then there is no doubt that they travelled by land. On the contrary, if the *comes* did not accompany them, there is no longer any certainty about the means of transport. As the Synod of Milan, to which they went, probably met before Easter, the bishops travelled, however, at a time unfavourable for sailing. On the date of the synod, see A. Cedilnik, *Ilirik med Konstantinom Velikim in Teodozijem Velikim. Balkansko-podonavski prostor v poročilih Atanazija, Hilarija, Sokrata Sholastika, Sozomena, Teodoreta in Filostorgija*, Ljubljana, 2004, 143–144. If the bishops travelled by land, Singidunum and Mursa were on their way, and it seems very probable that the bishops stopped in at least one of those two cities.

of Chalcedon and Theodorus of Heraclea (who both went to Trier). If Valens and Ursacius have really been the ones to bring to Julius of Rome the letter written by Eusebius of Nicomedia with five⁴² members of the commission⁴³ sent to Mareotis, Diognitus/Theogni(tu)s of Nicaea would then have been the only member of this commission not to participate in any of the other delegations that followed (Rome,⁴⁴ Trier⁴⁵ and Milan⁴⁶). However, this Diognitus/Theogni(tu)s was already dead in 343,⁴⁷ so he could not take part in the embassy to Milan in 344/5. Regarding Theodorus and Maris, who were still alive at that time, it seems impossible that the first one participate in the embassy to Milan, as he was – like Valens and Ursacius – excommunicated by the “Western Council” of Serdica, while Maris’ fate is uncertain on this date (he should have been excommunicated also in Serdica, but we have no proof). In this situation, perhaps we could imagine that Eudoxius’, Demophilus’ and Martyrius’ “coming on stage” arises from the need to replace members of the commission sent to Mareotis, who, with the notable exception of Macedonius, could not participate in the embassy sent to the West by the Synod of Antioch in 344.

The Council of Sirmium (351)

At the time when the usurper Magnentius was still threatening Constantius’ authority in the West, this latter invited the bishops to Sirmium in 351, in order to re-examine the value of the doctrine spread by Photinus, the then-bishop of this city. According to the list recorded by Hilarius of Poitiers,⁴⁸ 22 bishops

⁴² Valens of Mursa, Ursacius of Singidunum, Maris of Chalcedon, Theodorus of Heraclea and Diognitus/Theogni(tu)s of Nicaea.

⁴³ The members of the commission sent to Mareotis in 335 are: Valens of Mursa, Ursacius of Singidunum, Maris of Chalcedon, Theodorus of Heraclea, Diognitus/Theogni(tu)s of Nicaea and Macedonius of Mopsuestia. See Ath. Alex., *apol. sec.* 13.2, 28.1, 72.4, 75.1, 76.2; Socr., *h.e.* 1.31.3; Soz., *h.e.* 2.25.19.

⁴⁴ Supposedly Valens of Mursa and Ursacius of Singidunum.

⁴⁵ The members of the delegation who brought the Fourth Creed of Antioch (341) to Trier at the beginning of 342 were: Narcissus of Neronias/Eirenopolis, Maris of Chalcedon, Theodorus of Heraclea and Mark of Arethusa. See Ath. Alex., *syn.* 25.1; Socr., *h.e.* 2.18.1–2, 2.41.19; Soz., *h.e.* 3.10.4

⁴⁶ The members of the delegation who brought the so-called Long Creed to Milan in 345 were: Eudoxius of Germanicia, Macedonius of Mopsuestia, Demophilus of Beroë and Martyrius. See Ath. Alex., *syn.* 26.1; Hil., *coll. antiar.* A.VII.4; Socr., *h.e.* 2.19.1, 2.41.20; Soz., *h.e.* 3.11.2.

⁴⁷ M. Simonetti, *La crisi ariana nel IV secolo*, Rome 1975, 172, n. 26; R. P. C. Hanson, *The Search of the Christian Doctrine of God. The Arian Controversy, 318–381*, Edinburgh 1988, 296.

⁴⁸ Hil., *coll. antiar.* B.VII.9 (7). Hilarius’ list is probably the only reliable information about the participants in the Council of Sirmium of 351, although the Gallic bishop mistakenly links this list to the council that assembled in Sirmium in 357. See H. C. Brennecke, *Hilarius von Poitiers und die Bischofsopposition gegen Konstantius II. Untersuchungen zur dritten Phase des arianischen Streites (337–361)*, Berlin/New York 1984, 95; W. A. Löhr, *Die Entstehung der homöischen und homöusianischen Kirchenparteien. Studien zur Synodalgeschichte des 4. Jahrhunderts*, Witterschlick/Bonn 1986, 181. If this list actually refers

gathered at the council.⁴⁹ At least three of the four members of the embassy sent to Milan in 344 (Demophilus, Macedonius and Eudoxius)⁵⁰ participated in that meeting. That could prove that participants in this embassy strengthened ties with both Valens and Ursacius. Indeed, the close interconnection between the

to the Council of Sirmium of 351, it is, however, certainly flawed, as it does not name Photinus' successor, Germinius, who attended the council. See H. C. Brennecke, *Hilarius von Poitiers und die Bischofsopposition gegen Konstantius II. Untersuchungen zur dritten Phase des arianischen Streites (337–361)*, Berlin/New York 1984, 95–96. It should be noted that the traditional numbering of the Councils of Sirmium (1- 347/8, 2- 351, 3- 357 and 4-358-359) is not used here, because there are too many uncertainties concerning it. See T. D. Barnes, *Athanasius and Constantius. Theology and Politics in the Constantinian Empire*, Cambridge (Mass.)/London 1993, 231–232.

⁴⁹ Although an accurate and reliable list of participants in the council has not been preserved, we can assume that the bishops from the Western part of the Empire did not participate in the council; see H. C. Brennecke, *Hilarius von Poitiers und die Bischofsopposition gegen Konstantius II. Untersuchungen zur dritten Phase des arianischen Streites (337–361)*, Berlin/New York 1984, 95; W. A. Löhr, *Die Entstehung der homöischen und homöusianischen Kirchenparteien. Studien zur Synodalgeschichte des 4. Jahrhunderts*, Witterschlick/Bonn 1986, 37. The same can be supposed of most of the bishops in Illyricum. Although the removal of Photinus was not entirely contrary to the interests of the Western bishops – since we know that Photinus was condemned by them more than 5 years before at the Synod of Milan of 345 and, again, two years later by another synod probably in the same city – we can imagine that the bishops of Illyricum, who almost unanimously supported Athanasius of Alexandria as well as the other exiled pro-Nicene bishops at the Council of Serdica, didn't want to collaborate with the pro-Arian bishops assembled in Sirmium in 351 (so when a part of Illyricum was already under Constantius' full authority). Regarding Photinus' condemnation in 345 and 347 see M. Simonetti, *La crisi ariana nel IV secolo*, Rome 1975, 202; H. C. Brennecke, *Hilarius von Poitiers und die Bischofsopposition gegen Konstantius II. Untersuchungen zur dritten Phase des arianischen Streites (337–361)*, Berlin/New York 1984, 57 and 62; W. A. Löhr, *Die Entstehung der homöischen und homöusianischen Kirchenparteien. Studien zur Synodalgeschichte des 4. Jahrhunderts*, Witterschlick/Bonn 1986, 37.

⁵⁰ Hilarius recorded the names of the following participants in the Council of Sirmium of 351: Narcissus of Neronias/Eirenopolis, Theodorus of Heraclea in Europe, Basilius of Ancyra in Galatia, Eudoxius of Germanicia in Syria Prima, Demophilus of Beroë in Thrace, Cecripius of Nicomedia in Bithynia, Silvanus of Tarsus in Cilicia, Ursacius of Singidunum in Moesia Superior, Valens of Mursa in Pannonia Superior, Euagrius, perhaps bishop of Mytilene on Lesbos (see A. L. Feder, *Studien zu Hilarius von Poitiers 2: Bischofsnamen und Bischofssitze bei Hilarius. Kritische Untersuchungen zur kirchlichen Prosopographie und Topographie des 4. Jahrhunderts*, Vienna 1911, 102), Hireneus, perhaps Eirenaios of Tripolis in Phoenicia (ibid., 102), a certain Exuperantius, Terentianus, Bassus (who could be the same bishop who attended the Council in Serdica and who is believed to be from the island of Carpathos; see ibid., 102), Gaudentius (who is neither a bishop from Naissus nor from Ariminum; see ibid., 102), Macedonius of Mopsuestia in Cilicia, Marcus of Arethusa in Syria Prima, Acacius of Caesarea in Palestine, Julius (probably not bishop of Thebae in Achaia; see ibid., 103), Surinus, Simplicius and Junior. We have supplemented the list of bishops with the names of episcopal sees after A. L. Feder, *Studien zu Hilarius von Poitiers 2: Bischofsnamen und Bischofssitze bei Hilarius. Kritische Untersuchungen zur kirchlichen Prosopographie und Topographie des 4. Jahrhunderts*, Vienna 1911, 101–103. Most of the bishops on the list – insofar as they can be identified – supported the theological conclusions of the synods of Antioch (341 and 344) and of the “Eastern” party of the Council of Serdica (343). See H. C. Brennecke, *Hilarius von Poitiers und die Bischofsopposition gegen Konstantius II. Untersuchungen zur dritten Phase des arianischen Streites (337–361)*, Berlin/New York 1984, 95.

most active pro-Arian bishops of the moment is also indicated by the fact that most of the members of the delegation sent to Trier in 342, attended the Council of Sirmium of 351.⁵¹ Relying on the composition of both embassies of the 340s that introduced the theological thinking of the East in the West, it seems clear that their members were closely connected with the group sent to Marcotis. Thus, there can be no doubt about the connection between Eudoxius, Valens and Ursacius during the Council of Sirmium, and even before it.

While trying to determinate the role which the former associates of Eusebius of Nicomedia could have played at the Council of Sirmium, it seems worth noting that Germinius, who was appointed by the council as the new bishop of Sirmium to replace Photinus,⁵² came from Cyzicus.⁵³ This city was already closely connected with Constantinople during this period, although it was not in the province of Europe, but in that of Hellespontus.⁵⁴ Therefore, it could be assumed that behind the decision to make Germinius the new bishop of Sirmium, we have to suspect the religious authorities of Constantinople or the group of bishops (the so-called Eusebians, who had been making systematic efforts since Eusebius' time) working to strengthen the power of the Constantinopolitan episcopal see on both sides of the Propontis.⁵⁵

The role of Eudoxius, Valens and Ursacius at the council is not precisely known: apart from their presence at the meeting, the sources tell us nothing. Notwithstanding, in the period after the Council of Sirmium of 351 and during the whole reign of Constantius in the West, we find all three of them among the most influential representatives of the "Arian" Church.

⁵¹ The Council of Sirmium of 351 was attended by three of the four members of the embassy sent to Trier (Narcissus of Neronias/Eirenopolis, Theodorus of Heraclea, Mark of Arethusa, but not by Maris of Chalcedon), and by three of the four members of the embassy sent to Milan (Eudoxius of Germanicia, Macedonius of Mopsuestia and Demophilus of Beroë, but not by Martyrius (of Naupactus in Achaea ?)).

⁵² Photinus, a pupil of Marcellus of Ancyra, was consecrated bishop of Sirmium sometime between 343 and 345, since no Sirmian bishop is mentioned in the lists of Serdica, while Photinus is mentioned in this position for the first time at the Synod of Milan in 345, when he was condemned by the "Western" bishops.

⁵³ Ath. Alex., *h. Ar.* 74.5.

⁵⁴ Eleusius was consecrated bishop of Cyzicus by Macedonius of Constantinople (bishop in 342–343, 344–346 and 349–360). See Socr., *h.e.* 2.38.3–4; Soz., *h.e.* 4.20.1–2. For the dates of Macedonius' episcopate in Constantinople, see 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 2017, 176–180. As for Eunomius of Cyzicus, he was consecrated by Eudoxius of Constantinople (360–370). See Philost., *h.e.* 5.3; Soz., *h.e.* 4.25.6, 6.8.7. Moreover, the consecration of a new bishop of Cyzicus was the first act of Demophilus after he was elected on the see of Constantinople in 370. See Philost., *h.e.* 9.13.

⁵⁵ D. Moreau, *La partitio imperii et la géographie des Balkans: entre géopolitique et géo-ecclésiologie*, in Costellazioni geo-ecclésiologiche da Costantino a Giustiniano: dalle chiese 'principali' alle chiese patriarcali. XLIII Incontro di studiosi dell'Antichità cristiana (Rome, 7–9 May 2015), Rome 2017, 268–271; D. Moreau, *The establishment, affirmation and expansion of the Patriarchate of Constantinople up to Justinian: a political or "heretical" issue?*, in D. I. Mureşan, D. Moreau (eds), *An Ecumene of Changes. Jurisdictional Spaces and Frontiers of the Patriarchate of Constantinople (4th–20th C.)*, London (forthcoming).

The Imperial Efforts for Unification

After the Council of Sirmium of 351, we meet Valens of Mursa and Ursacius of Singidunum again in 353 and 355, at the synods of Arles⁵⁶ and of Milan.⁵⁷ Once Constantius became the sole ruler of the Empire, he was given a chance to establish uniformity of doctrine throughout it. To achieve this purpose, the Emperor first wanted to get rid of Athanasius of Alexandria, and, to do so, bishops assembled in Arles and then Milan were given the task to condemn him unanimously. As can be deduced from the sources, Valens⁵⁸ and Ursacius⁵⁹ were among the most zealous executors of Constantius' will. However, they were, apparently, not the only representatives of Illyricum at the Synod of

⁵⁶ Sulp. Sev., *chron.* 2.39. On Valens' and Ursacius' participation in the Synod of Arles, see M. Simonetti, *La crisi ariana nel IV secolo*, Rome 1975, 217; H. C. Brennecke, *Hilarius von Poitiers und die Bischofsopposition gegen Konstantius II. Untersuchungen zur dritten Phase des arianischen Streites (337–361)*, Berlin/New York 1984, 137; R. P. C. Hanson, *The Search of the Christian Doctrine of God. The Arian Controversy, 318–381*, Edinburgh 1988, 331–332.

⁵⁷ For more details on the role of the Illyrian bishops at the Synod of Milan and in the events directly connected with it, see A. Cedilnik, *Ilirik med Konstantinom Velikim in Teodozijem Velikim. Balkansko-podonavski prostor v poročilih Atanazija, Hilarija, Sokrata Sholastika, Sozomena, Teodoret in Filostorgija*, Ljubljana, 2004, 218–225. On the synod, cf. also M. Simonetti, *La crisi ariana nel IV secolo*, Rome 1975, 218–220; H. C. Brennecke, *Hilarius von Poitiers und die Bischofsopposition gegen Konstantius II. Untersuchungen zur dritten Phase des arianischen Streites (337–361)*, Berlin/New York 1984, 164–184; T. D. Barnes, *Athanasius and Constantius. Theology and Politics in the Constantinian Empire*, Cambridge (Mass.)/London 1993, 117–118.

⁵⁸ As reported by Hilarius of Poitiers, it was allegedly Valens' fault that the pro-Nicene bishops at the synod could not prevent the condemnation of Athanasius. See Hil., *coll. antiar.*, *app.* 2.3. The bishop of Mursa is supposed to have prevented the signing of the Creed adopted in Nicaea, by which Athanasius' adherents at the synod wanted to divert the participants' attention, in order to present the issue of the condemnation of Athanasius as purely religious. See Ath. Alex., *h. Ar.*, 76, 4–5. Among the authors of that time, Hilarius is the only one who reports the event. Therefore, the passage raises doubts whether the incident described actually took place. Specifically, it is not known for sure whether the Nicene Creed in its original form from 325 was known in the West at the time of the Synod in Milan. See H. C. Brennecke, *Hilarius von Poitiers und die Bischofsopposition gegen Konstantius II. Untersuchungen zur dritten Phase des arianischen Streites (337–361)*, Berlin/New York 1984, 175–182. Cf. also T. D. Barnes, *Athanasius and Constantius. Theology and Politics in the Constantinian Empire*, Cambridge (Mass.)/London 1993, 117–118, who, on his side, allows the possibility that the Nicene Creed was known in the West at that time.

⁵⁹ The sources do not only highlight the role of Valens, but also of Ursacius. According to Athanasius (*h. Ar.* 41.1–2), it was the fault of both Illyrian bishops that the deputies of the Roman bishop Liberius, the priest Eutropius (in fact, Pancratius; see H.-G. Opitz, *Athanasius Werke II/1: Die Apologien 5–6 [7–8]*, Berlin 1940, 205, n. 32) and the deacon Hilarius, were extremely inappropriately treated in Milan, because they did not support Athanasius' condemnation. While the priest Pancratius(-Eutropius) was immediately expelled, Hilarius was first stripped, whipped and ridiculed, and then sent into exile. The description of the event is reminiscent of stories about the suffering of martyrs and is, therefore, not entirely reliable. Despite several questions raised by the description of the event, it is certainly worth noting that ancient authors often report physical punishment on church representatives.

Milan. In addition to them, the list of thirty signatories⁶⁰ under Athanasius' condemnation also includes two more bishops from this part of the Empire: Germinius of Sirmium⁶¹ and Gaius, whose episcopal see is not exactly known (probably Savaria in Pannonia Prima).⁶²

Whereas Athanasius and Hilarius ascribe to both Illyrian bishops, Valens and Ursacius, a very important role in the synod, we have no evidence that Eudoxius attended it. Nevertheless, there is no doubt that the bishop of Germanicia was also involved in the implementation of the Emperor's plan in the West, as Sozomen reports that Eudoxius was present when the Constantius tried to persuade Liberius of Rome to condemn Athanasius.⁶³ Since the Pope did not give up under Constantius' pressure, he was at the Emperor's command exiled to Beroë in Thrace, where the task of breaking Liberius's resistance was entrusted to Demophilus. We know that Liberius was arrested and sent to the imperial court in Milan, but we do not know when exactly it happened: in 355 or 356?⁶⁴ It is theoretically possible that Eudoxius was in Milan in 355 and it seems possible that he even attended the synod.⁶⁵ However, his involve-

⁶⁰ The list, coming from a now-lost manuscript of Vercelli, is known only from Cesare Baronio's transcription in his third volume of the updated edition of the *Annales Ecclesiastici* published in Mainz in 1601 (col. 355). See H. C. Brennecke, *Hilarius von Poitiers und die Bischofsopposition gegen Konstantius II. Untersuchungen zur dritten Phase des arianischen Streites (337–361)*, Berlin/New York 1984, 165–166, n. 74; H. C. Brennecke, U. Theil, A. von Stockhausen, A. Wintjes, (ed. & transl.), *Athanasius Werke III/1: Dokumente zur Geschichte des arianischen Streites 4: Bis zur Synode von Alexandrien 362*, Berlin/Boston 2013, 371–373.

⁶¹ The letter sent by the Synod of Milan to Eusebius of Vercelli is supposed to have been taken to the bishop by Germinius of Sirmium, together with a certain Eustomius. See M. Meslin, *Les ariens d'Occident 335–430*, Paris 1967, 67; H. C. Brennecke, *Hilarius von Poitiers und die Bischofsopposition gegen Konstantius II. Untersuchungen zur dritten Phase des arianischen Streites (337–361)*, Berlin/New York 1984, 173; H. C. Brennecke, U. Theil, A. von Stockhausen, A. Wintjes, (ed. & transl.), *Athanasius Werke III/1: Dokumente zur Geschichte des arianischen Streites 4: Bis zur Synode von Alexandrien 362*, Berlin/Boston 2013, 369–371.

⁶² R. Bratož, *Die kirchliche Organisation in Westillyricum (vom späten 4. Jh. bis um 600) – Ausgewählte Fragen*, in O. Heinrich-Tamáška (ed.), *Keszthely-Fenekpuszta im Kontext spätantiker Kontinuitätsforschung zwischen Noricum und Moesia*, Budapest/Leipzig/Keszthely/Rhaden 2011, 240 and 248.

⁶³ Soz., *h.e.* 4.11.3.

⁶⁴ A. Chastagnol, *Les fastes de la préfecture de Rome au Bas-Empire*, Paris 1962, 147–149; Ch. Pietri, *Roma Christiana. Recherches sur l'Eglise de Rome, son organisation, sa politique, son idéologie de Miltiade à Sixte III (311–440)*, Rome 1976, 246–247; A. H. M. Jones, J. R. Martindale, J. Morris, *The Prosopography of the Later Roman Empire 1: 260–395*, Cambridge 1971, 503 (Flavius Leontius 22); T. D. Barnes, *The Capitulation of Liberius and Hilary of Poitiers*, *Phoenix* 46/3 (1992), 257–260; 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 sirmondiennes* (SC 531), Paris 2009, 166–167; A. Cedilnik, D. Moreau, *Demophilus, the Last Arian Bishop of Constantinople? Contribution (II) to the Christian Prosopography of the Dioecesis Thraciarum*, in Z. Gerdzhikova and I. Topalilov (eds), *Late Antique Christianity in Southeastern Europe (Folia Balcanica)*, Sofia (forthcoming).

⁶⁵ Socrates and Sozomen report that bishops from the East and from the West gathered at the Synod of Milan. According to them, there were only a few bishops from the East

ment in Constantius' efforts to obtain Liberius' signature for the condemnation of Athanasius clearly proves that the actions of the pro-Arian bishops mentioned here were unequivocally directed towards the same goal.⁶⁶ Valens' and Ursacius' main role in this imperial project was clearly to get as many bishops as possible to subscribe against Athanasius, even after the end of the synod.⁶⁷ All these Eusebian bishops, Eudoxius, Valens, Ursacius, and others, undoubtedly cooperated, if not during the synod, after it.

Bishop of Antioch

According to Socrates, Eudoxius was in Rome when the news reached him that Leontius, bishop of Antioch, had died.⁶⁸ Under the pretext that his own Church urgently needed him, he obtained the Emperor's permission to leave Rome and return to Germanicia immediately.⁶⁹ He took advantage of the situation to install himself as bishop of Antioch.⁷⁰ Sozomen's report is similar, but slightly less detailed.⁷¹ Both ecclesiastical historians agree that Eudoxius became the head of the Church of Antioch with strong supports from the imperial court.⁷² However, Sozomen is adding that Constantius may have directly supported him in his episcopal translation.⁷³

and more than three hundred from the West. See Socr., *h.e.* 2.36.1; Soz., *h.e.* 4.9.1. However, the list of participants in the synod gives only the names of thirty bishops. See *supra* n. 60. If the information provided by both Church historians is accurate, then the list of signatories to Athanasius' condemnation is very deficient.

⁶⁶ Ossius of Cordova's letter to Constantius proves that Valens and Ursacius acted as influential imperial advisers in the period after the Synod of Milan. The Spanish bishop warns the Emperor not to believe Ursacius, Valens and their fellows. See Ath. Alex., *h. Ar.* 44.1 and 5–6.

⁶⁷ After the synods of Arles (353) and Milan (355), Constantius sent his representatives throughout the Western part of the Empire, in order to obtain, with the help of officials, consent to the condemnation of Athanasius from the bishops who had not participated in these meetings. Athanasius writes that the Emperor's commissioners were accompanied by the clergy from the sees of Mursa and Singidunum to inspire these officials with zeal and to control them. See Ath. Alex., *h. Ar.* 31.2–4.

⁶⁸ Socr., *h.e.* 2.37.7–11.

⁶⁹ Constantius was in Rome from the 28th of April to the 29th of May 357. See D. Kienast, W. Eck, M. Heil, *Römische Kaisertabelle. Grundzüge einer römischen Kaiserchronologie*, Darmstadt 2017, 301.

⁷⁰ Theodoret of Cyrus (*h.e.* 2.25, 2.26.1) writes similarly, stating that the Emperor, when informed of Eudoxius' conduct, even demanded that the bishop be expelled from the city.

⁷¹ Soz., *h.e.* 4.12.3–4.

⁷² According to Socrates (*h.e.* 2.37.9), Eudoxius' supporters were some of the officers of Constantius' bedchamber, and, according to Sozomen (*h.e.* 4.12.4), eunuchs belonging to the palace, who, like Eudoxius, favoured the doctrine of Aëtius. That he was appointed bishop of Antioch by the Anomoeans can also be deduced from Photius' *Epitome* of Philostorgius (Philost. *h.e.* 4.4.1).

⁷³ Soz., *h.e.* 4.12.4; cf. also 4.14.1. When writing about Eudoxius' installation as bishop of Antioch, Sozomen emphasises that there was no sanction from George of Laodicea, Mark of Arethusa nor other bishops, Syrian or not, who had the right to ordain. See Soz., *h.e.* 4.12.4. On the circumstances in which Eudoxius was appointed bishop, cf. also M. Simonetti,

While the sources are not giving us clear information on the Emperor's role in Eudoxius' appointment as bishop of Antioch, we can be sure that this was made, as Philostorgius writes, with the support of those who shared his views. Philostorgius and Sozomen define the theological beliefs of Eudoxius' supporters as Anomoean.⁷⁴ This could also be deduced from Socrates' report. At the beginning of the passage, in which he speaks of the ordination, he says that Eudoxius' predecessor, Bishop Leontius, had ordained Aëtius as deacon,⁷⁵ and he concludes the same passage with the information that Eudoxius' first desire as head of the Church of Antioch was to restore him in his position.⁷⁶ However, the newly-appointed prelate did not succeed in this intention, because – as Socrates⁷⁷ goes on – Aëtius' opponents won over Eudoxius' efforts. Therefore, we can assume that the Anomoeans⁷⁸ alone were not strong enough to make Eudoxius' appointment. The only reasonable assumption is that there was also an intervention outside this religious party.⁷⁹

Whether he received such “external” help or not to achieve its ambitions, Eudoxius continued to work closely with his pro-Arian Illyrian colleagues. In 357 (maybe in the summer),⁸⁰ a new council met in Sirmium. In accordance with Constantius' wishes, the participants in the council were to compose a creed which was to be the theological basis for an upcoming ecumenical council. This Council of Sirmium was certainly attended by Valens of Mursa, Ursacius of Singidunum and Germinius of Sirmium, but it is not known whether other bishops were also present.⁸¹ We can, therefore, imagine that the Illyrian bishops, and especially Valens and Ursacius, were the main authors of the formula

La crisi ariana nel IV secolo, Rome 1975, 237; T. D. Barnes, *Athanasius and Constantius. Theology and Politics in the Constantinian Empire*, Cambridge (Mass.)/London 1993, 139.

⁷⁴ Philost., *h.e.* 4.4; Soz., *h.e.* 4.12.4. Cf. also B. Bleckmann, M. Stein, (ed. & transl.), *Philostorgios, Kirchengeschichte*, vol. 2, Paderborn 2015, 283–284. In the *Suda* it is written that Aëtius was Eudoxius' teacher. See Philost., *h.e.* 5.2a and 8.18a (= *Suda* α 4450).

⁷⁵ Richard P.C. Hanson (*The Search of the Christian Doctrine of God. The Arian Controversy, 318–381*, Edinburgh 1988, 599) thinks that Aëtius could hardly be ordained deacon earlier than 346.

⁷⁶ Socr., *h.e.* 2.37.7–11. In the letter sent in 358 to the bishops gathered in Ancyra, George of Laodicea states that disciples of Aëtius were promoted by Eudoxius to high clerical positions. See Soz., *h.e.* 4.13.2. The information provided by Philostorgius is similar, as he reports that Eudoxius intended to elevate Eunomius to the diaconate, but the latter did not accept the office. See Philost., *h.e.* 4.5.

⁷⁷ Socr., *h.e.* 2.37.11.

⁷⁸ In researching Eudoxius' collaboration with the Anomoeans, the fact – pointed out in Th. A. Kopecek, *A History of Neo-Arianism*, Cambridge 1979, 171 – that the Anomoean difference-in-essence formula was based on the ungenerated/generated distinction of the Long Creed is not unimportant. It was Eudoxius who was a member of the delegation of four bishops who in 345 presented this creed in the West.

⁷⁹ Thomas A. Kopecek (*A History of Neo-Arianism*, Cambridge 1979, 150–151) also assumes – albeit based on different arguments – that Eudoxius did not enjoy the support of the Anomoeans when he was appointed bishop of Antioch.

⁸⁰ M. Simonetti, *La crisi ariana nel IV secolo*, Rome 1975, 229.

⁸¹ Ath. Alex., *h. Ar.* 45.4–5; Ath. Alex., *syn.* 28.2; Socr., *h.e.* 2.30.31; Soz., *h.e.* 4.12.6. The presence of Ossius of Cordova and Potamius of Olisipo/Lisbon is not reliable.

adopted in Sirmium in 357. This so-called “Second Creed of Sirmium” forbade not only the Nicene term ὁμοούσιος, but also the term ὁμοιούσιος, whose first record has been preserved precisely in this creed.⁸²

The decisions of the council were welcomed and approved only a few months later by the bishops,⁸³ who, at the invitation of the new bishop of Antioch, Eudoxius, met at the Synod of Antioch of the beginning of 358. According to Sozomen, the synod sent a letter to Valens, Ursacius and Germinius, in which the participants of the synod thanked them for teaching bishops in the West the true faith.⁸⁴ At the time of the meeting in Antioch, there is no doubt about Eudoxius’ cooperation with the Anomoeans.⁸⁵ In addition, the conclusions of the Synod of Antioch of 358 appear to confirm that the three bishops Eudoxius, Valens and Ursacius, not only cooperated, but also followed then the same or, at least, similar theological beliefs. This supposition could be further confirmed if we assume, as is probable, that in 357 Eudoxius was not present at the Council of Sirmium⁸⁶ and could thus not participate directly in formulating the positions adopted there.⁸⁷

⁸² R. P. C. Hanson, *The Search of the Christian Doctrine of God. The Arian Controversy, 318–381*, Edinburgh 1988, 349.

⁸³ At the Synod of Antioch in 358, there were also Acacius of Caesarea and Uranios of Tyr. See Soz., *h.e.* 4.12.5. Cf. also M. Simonetti, *La crisi ariana nel IV secolo*, Rome 1975, 237; R. P. C. Hanson, *The Search of the Christian Doctrine of God. The Arian Controversy, 318–381*, Edinburgh 1988, 348, n. 2.

⁸⁴ Soz., *h.e.* 4.12.7.

⁸⁵ Sozomen writes that Eudoxius, after becoming bishop of Antioch, quite openly showed his support for Aëtius’ doctrine. See Soz., *h.e.* 4.12.5, 4.13.2–3. Cf. also Socr., *h.e.* 2.37.9–11; Thdt., *h.e.* 2.25.2.

⁸⁶ Eudoxius being not mentioned among the participants in the council, some sources let us think that he was then busy arranging everything necessary for his appointment as bishop of Antioch. See M. Simonetti, *La crisi ariana nel IV secolo*, Rome 1975, 229. Indeed, Socrates (*h.e.* 2.37.7–8) writes that Constantius and Eudoxius were in Rome when this latter was informed that Leontius had died. If Socrates’ information is true, then Eudoxius began his preparations to take over the episcopal see of Antioch already in the spring of 357, since it is usually said that the Emperor would have been in the city in May. See T. D. Barnes, *Athanasius and Constantius. Theology and Politics in the Constantinian Empire*, Cambridge (Mass.)/London 1993, 139. Nevertheless, the exact date of Leontius’ death is not a subject that is completely unanimous, because some of Athanasius’ writings would suggest that Leontius was still alive between the middle of 357 and the beginning of 358. See R. P. C. Hanson, *The Search of the Christian Doctrine of God. The Arian Controversy, 318–381*, Edinburgh 1988, 420. Both the years 357 and 358 are therefore possible. See R. P. C. Hanson, *The Search of the Christian Doctrine of God. The Arian Controversy, 318–381*, Edinburgh 1988, 348; É. Des Places, (transl.), with the collab. of B. Bleckmann, D. Meyer, J.-M. Prieur, *Philostorge, Histoire ecclésiastique* (SC, 564), Paris 2013, 320, n. 1; B. Bleckmann, M. Stein, (ed. & transl.), *Philostorgios, Kirchengeschichte*, vol. 2, Paderborn 2015, 283.

⁸⁷ We can only guess whether the conclusions of the Council of Sirmium of 357 were influenced by other adherents of Aëtius’ doctrine. Apart from Eudoxius, among the participants in the Synod of Antioch of 358, Acacius of Caesarea was certainly an acquaintance of Valens and Ursacius, as all of them took part in the councils of Serdica of 343 and of Sirmium of 351; Ath. Alex., *h. Ar.* 17.3; Ath. Alex., *apol. sec.* 36.6, 40.3, 46.1, 47.3; Hil., *coll. antiar.* B.II.1.7.3, 1.8.2; Soz., *h.e.* 3.12.3; see Hil., *coll. antiar.* B.VII.9 for the participants in the Council of Sirmium. Since the Illyrian bishops were not, like Eudoxius, condemned for

Unlike Eudoxius and the Anomoeans⁸⁸ gathered around him, most of the “Eastern” bishops did not want to accept the Second Creed of Sirmium. This resulted in the convening of a new council in Sirmium in 358, at which the Homoiousians (condemned by the Council of Sirmium of 357) gathered around Basilus of Ancyra, following a synod also in 358 in that city, had the decisive say.⁸⁹ While Eudoxius’ Illyrian colleagues attended the council, the bishop of Antioch lost Constantius’ favour and was at his command convicted, for his support of the Anomoeans.⁹⁰ In these new circumstances, in which Basilus of Ancyra won for some time the Emperor’s benevolence, Valens and Ursacius lost, for their part, the politico-religious influence they had had until then, but without being openly denounced. This trust Basilus and his followers gained with Constantius did not last long. As soon as spring 359, Basilus’ opponents⁹¹ managed to weaken significantly his influence at the imperial court. Bishops who Constantius had previously expelled were then allowed to return from exile. As we can suppose, Eudoxius was among these bishops.⁹²

Athanasius reports that not only Ursacius, Valens, Germinius and Eudoxius, but also Acacius of Caesarea and Patrophilus of Scythopolis managed to convince the Emperor along other influential figures of the need to re-launch the debates.⁹³ Thus, the Council of Sirmium, which seems not to have

collaborating with the Anomoeans, their contacts with them, if any existed, were, however, certainly not as close as those of Eudoxius; Philost., *h.e.* 4.8.

⁸⁸ Soz., *h.e.* 4.13–14.

⁸⁹ According to Sozomen, but some historians are not considering his report as reliable, the main participants at the opening of the Council of Sirmium were Ursacius, Valens and Germinius, together with, from the Eastern part, Basilus of Ancyra, Eustathius of Sebasteia, Eleusius of Cyzicus, and from the Western part, Liberius of Rome and four African bishops whose episcopal see cannot be identified: Athanasius, Alexander, Severianus and Crescens. Soz., *h.e.* 4.15.1–4; Ch. Pietri, *Roma Christiana. Recherches sur l’Eglise de Rome, son organisation, sa politique, son idéologie de Miltiade à Sixte III (311–440)*, Rome 1976, 258–259 (who thinks that Liberius was at the opening, but that he conducted negotiations on his own, directly with the Emperor, and left for Rome without really participating to the synod); H. C. Brennecke, *Hilarius von Poitiers und die Bischofsopposition gegen Konstantius II. Untersuchungen zur dritten Phase des arianischen Streites (337–361)*, Berlin/New York 1984, 288–292 (who thinks that Sozomen’s report is simply not reliable and that Liberius never attended this council). In any case, there is a consensus that the Pope did not sign the Third Sirmium Formula. On the African bishops, see A. Mandouze, *Prosopographie chrétienne du Bas-Empire 1 : Prosopographie de l’Afrique chrétienne (303–533)*, Paris 1982, 51, 98–99, 222 and 1068.

⁹⁰ Soz., *h.e.* 4.13.6, 4.14.1; Thdt., *h.e.* 2.26.1. Philostorgius (*h.e.* 4.8.2) reports that the Emperor ordered Eudoxius to leave Antioch and return to his homeland. On the privilege of such a condemnation, see B. Bleckmann, M. Stein, (ed. & transl.), *Philostorgios, Kirchengeschichte*, vol. 2, Paderborn 2015, 288. Considering the “soft sentence” enjoyed by Eudoxius, one might assume that Constantius did not fully believe the accusations made against the bishop by Basilus of Ancyra and Eustathius of Sebasteia (Philost., *h.e.* 4.1), according to which Eudoxius allegedly participated – together with Aëtius – in Gallus’ revolt.

⁹¹ Philostorgius (*h.e.* 4.10.1) is giving the names of Patrophilus of Scythopolis and Narcissus of Neronias/Eirenopolis.

⁹² Philost., *h.e.* 4.10.1.

⁹³ Ath. Alex., *syn.* 1.3–4.

been completely closed yet, met again on the 22th of May 359 (unless there was a new summons by the Emperor to Sirmium, which does not seem likely). In addition to Valens, Ursacius and Germinius, Marcus of Arethusa, Basilius of Ancyra, George of Alexandria, Pancratius of Pelusium and Hypatian of Heraclea attended this most important session.⁹⁴ The creed adopted then defined the relationship between the Father and the Son with the term ὁμοιος κατὰ πάντα, and served as a basis for achieving consensus on theological issues at the councils of Ariminum/Rimini and Seleucia.

The sources are not mentioning Eudoxius as a participant in this council. However, he was not only among those who had to act in the shadows for a reversal of the situation in Sirmium, but was also among those who actively participated in the preparations for the planned ecumenical councils in Ariminum and Seleucia.⁹⁵ Like Valens and Ursacius, he attended one of these “ecumenical” councils. While both Illyrians, together with their fellow countrymen Germinius and Gaius (of Savaria in Pannonia Prima ?), attended the Council of Ariminum, Eudoxius attended the Council of Seleucia. Since the promoters⁹⁶ of the so-called “Fourth Creed of Sirmium” were in a large minority in both Ariminum and Seleucia, they were initially deposed by the Niceans/Homoousians in Ariminum⁹⁷ and by the Homoiousians in Seleucia.⁹⁸ Despite the resistance of both parties, the bishops assembled in Ariminum and Seleucia finally adopted the Homoean Creed. Thus, it became binding on the whole Church, and the bishops who from the very beginning had worked most vigorously for its confirmation became for some time the most influential prelates in the Empire.

In this situation, the Homoeans gathered around Acacius of Caesarea convened a new synod in Constantinople, in January 360, in order to consecrate Eudoxius as the new bishop of the imperial capital.⁹⁹ He replaced then Macedonius, who was deposed by the same meeting, on the basis of criminal acts he had committed in the past. This latter had once enjoyed a strong support

⁹⁴ Epiph., *haer.* 73.22.5–7 and 26.1; Hil., *coll. antiar.* B.VI.3.1. Cf. also M. Simonetti, *La crisi ariana nel IV secolo*, Rome 1975, 246, n.79; R. P. C. Hanson, *The Search of the Christian Doctrine of God. The Arian Controversy, 318–381*, Edinburgh 1988, 363.

⁹⁵ Soz., *h.e.* 4.16.21.

⁹⁶ The most important bishops of this group in Seleucia were: Acacius of Caesarea, George of Alexandria, Uranius of Tyr, Patrophilus of Scythopolis and Eudoxius of Antioch; Socr., *h.e.* 2.39.16; Soz., *h.e.* 4.22.7.

⁹⁷ Among the bishops deposed by the Council of Ariminum, there was: Valens of Mursa, Ursacius of Singidunum, Germinius of Sirmium and Gaius. See Hil., *coll. antiar.* A.IX.3; Ath. Alex., *syn.* 9.3, 11.1; Socr., *h.e.* 2.37.51; Soz., *h.e.* 4.17.9 and 11. Cf. also H.-G. Opitz, *Athanasius Werke II/1: Die Apologien 6–7* [8–9], Berlin 1940, 236–237, n. 32.

⁹⁸ Among the bishops deposed at the Council in Seleucia, there was: Acacius of Caesarea, George of Alexandria, Uranius of Tyr, Patrophilus of Scythopolis and Eudoxius of Antioch. See Ath. Alex., *syn.* 12.5; Socr., *h.e.* 2.40.43; Soz., *h.e.* 4.22.25.

⁹⁹ Philost., *h.e.* 4.12.2, 5.1.1, 5.1.5; Socr., *h.e.* 2.43.7, 2.44.3; Soz., *h.e.* 3.5.10, 4.25.6, 4.26.1; Chron. Pasch. s.a 360.

and confidence within the Eusebians,¹⁰⁰ but it was impossible for the newly created Homoean party to keep it in his position anymore, as he refused to accept their doctrine.¹⁰¹

Bishop of Constantinople

Eudoxius was bishop of Constantinople from 360 to 370. For this period, there is almost no evidence to suggest that he continued to maintain contact with the Illyrian bishops. After Constantius' death, the circumstances in which the bishops operated changed greatly. While Eudoxius, after Emperor Valens came to power, enjoyed all his support and had a strong influence over him,¹⁰² Valens of Mursa and Ursacius of Singidunum forever lost the role they had played at the imperial court in Constantius' time.

The sources¹⁰³ report only one event in which both bishops cooperated with each other during this period. After the fall of the usurper Procopius in 366, the Anomoean Eunomius was accused of supporting him.¹⁰⁴ Therefore, he was sentenced to exile in Mauretania. In this situation, Eunomius asked bishop Eudoxius for help. We can imagine that he did so because Eudoxius, as bishop of Constantinople, had a huge influence on the Emperor, and at the same time he had been very favourably disposed to the Anomoeans in the past. However, Eudoxius was not willing to help. Instead, it was Valens of Mursa who exerted his influence in favour of Eunomius. In fact, this latter stopped in Mursa when he was on his way into exile. The Illyrian bishop, together with Domninus of Marcianopolis, where Emperor Valens and Eudoxius were staying during the ruler's First Gothic War (367–369),¹⁰⁵ interceded on behalf of Eunomius with the Emperor. Because of their intervention, Eunomius was allowed to return from exile.

We are almost certain that Eunomius asked Valens of Mursa for help,¹⁰⁶ but the reason why is less clear. Is it because the Illyrian prelate was (or at least

¹⁰⁰ Socr., *h.e.* 2.12.2–3; Soz., *h.e.* 3.7.3–4.

¹⁰¹ Socr., *h.e.* 2.38; 2.42.1–3; Soz., *h.e.* 4.20.1–4, 4.24.3–4; Philost., *h.e.* 4.9, 5.1.1. Cf. also B. Bleckmann, M. Stein, (ed. & transl.), *Philostorgios, Kirchengeschichte*, vol. 2, Paderborn 2015, 291 and 309.

¹⁰² Philost., *h.e.* 9.3.1. Cf. also Th. A. Kopecek, *A History of Neo-Arianism*, Cambridge 1979, 422.

¹⁰³ Philost., *h.e.* 9.7–8.

¹⁰⁴ On Eunomius' collaboration with the usurper Procopius and the related consequences, see Th. A. Kopecek, *A History of Neo-Arianism*, Cambridge 1979, 425–430.

¹⁰⁵ On Valens' First Gothic War, see, among other references, N. Lenski, *Failure of the Empire. Valens and the Roman State in the Fourth Century A.D.*, Berkeley/London 2002, 116–152.

¹⁰⁶ On the possibility that Eunomius would have sought the bishop of Mursa to intervene in his favour with the Emperor, relying on the fact that both, bishop Valens and the Emperor, came from Pannonia, see N. Lenski, *Failure of the Empire. Valens and the Roman State in the Fourth Century A.D.*, Berkeley/London 2002, 245; B. Bleckmann, M. Stein, (ed. & transl.), *Philostorgios, Kirchengeschichte*, vol. 2, Paderborn 2015, 470.

had been in the past) in good terms with Eudoxius? This could be an explanation of his suddenly regained influence with the imperial court. Whatever was the reason, it really seems to illustrate the relations between all these bishops.

While studying the cooperation between bishops Eudoxius, Valens and Ursacius, we understand that the event is important not only because it proves that the Illyrian bishops had contacts with Eudoxius after 360, but its significance also lies in the fact that it may shed light on the attitude of the three bishops towards the Anomoeans. The sources provide no reliable evidence to suggest that adherents of Aëtius' doctrine participated in writing the Second Creed of Sirmium.¹⁰⁷ However, for Valens and Ursacius a possibility of contact with Anomoeans could be shown up later.¹⁰⁸ We can assume that, in the circle of

¹⁰⁷ Although the Anomoeans gathered around Eudoxius enthusiastically welcomed the Second Creed of Sirmium, the formula itself cannot be simply defined as Anomoean. While Manlio Simonetti (*La crisi ariana nel IV secolo*, Rome 1975, 233) draws attention to the openness of the creed to radical Anomoean understanding, Hanns Christof Brennecke (*Hilarius von Poitiers und die Bischofsopposition gegen Konstantius II. Untersuchungen zur dritten Phase des arianischen Streites (337–361)*, Berlin/New York 1984, 318) and Richard P.C. Hanson (*The Search of the Christian Doctrine of God. The Arian Controversy, 318–381*, Edinburgh 1988, 346) emphasise that it definitively cannot be understood as Anomoean.

¹⁰⁸ Opinions on whether Valens and Ursacius supported the doctrine of the Anomoeans are divided. Hanns Christof Brennecke (*Studien zur Geschichte der Homöer. Der Osten bis zum Ende der homöischen Reichskirche*, Tübingen 1988, 11 and 16–23) takes the view that Valens, Ursacius and Germinius can in no way be classified as adherents of the Anomoean doctrine. As Eudoxius also supported the Homoean Creed at the Council of Seleucia and later in Constantinople, while still collaborating with Eunomius – although probably not anymore with Aëtius – after 360, we could suppose that the acceptance of the Homoean doctrine did not preclude cooperation with the Anomoeans. Furthermore, Patrophilus of Scythopolis and Narcissus of Neronias/Eirenopolis, who interceded with the Emperor against the persecution of Aëtius and his followers initiated by Basilus of Ancyra, were usually defined by Athanasius of Alexandria as members of the same group as Valens and Ursacius, the so-called Eusebians. As for George of Alexandria, who supported Aëtius, was also a signatory of the Fourth Creed of Sirmium in 359. On George's support of Aëtius, see Th. A. Kopecek, *A History of Neo-Arianism*, Cambridge 1979, 137–145; H. C. Brennecke, *Studien zur Geschichte der Homöer. Der Osten bis zum Ende der homöischen Reichskirche*, Tübingen 1988, 13. In addition to the arguments based on the mutual cooperation of individuals, the possibility that Valens and Ursacius could have been in favour of the Anomoean doctrine might also be confirmed by the content of the Fourth Creed of Sirmium. It is interesting to note that Basilus of Ancyra, in the explanation he added to his signature of the Fourth Creed of Sirmium, explicitly emphasised on the fact that he did not understand the expression ὁμοιος κατὰ πάντα merely in the meaning of ὁμοιος κατὰ τὴν βούλησιν (Aëtius' explanation of the relationship between the Father and the Son). See H. C. Brennecke, *Studien zur Geschichte der Homöer. Der Osten bis zum Ende der homöischen Reichskirche*, Tübingen 1988, 21–22, for a completely opposite opinion. Similar to Hanns Christof Brennecke, Thomas A. Kopecek (*A History of Neo-Arianism*, Cambridge 1979, 151, 175 and 183–184) also sees the Fourth Creed of Sirmium as an attempt (by Homoiousians) to reject Aëtius' doctrine, although he thinks that Valens and Ursacius undoubtedly supported the Anomoeans. See Th. A. Kopecek, *A History of Neo-Arianism*, Cambridge 1979, 133–198. The following fact suggests that the content of the Fourth Creed of Sirmium could really be interpreted in this way: in 366, Germinius' insistence on explaining that the Father and the Son were ὁμοιος κατὰ πάντα, prompted Valens, Ursacius and their circle of like-minded bishops to write a letter urging their Sirmian colleague to renounce this belief and accept, as they did, the term ὁμοιος. While the expression

bishops to which Valens and Ursacius belonged, there was an intense discussion about the correctness of Aëtius' doctrine in 358 and 359. Eudoxius¹⁰⁹ certainly worked closely with his Illyrian colleagues during these years. Therefore, it is not impossible that they also cooperated with each other about Anomoeanism.¹¹⁰ For the period before the Council of Sirmium of 358–359, Philostorgius¹¹¹ leads us to suppose that not only Eudoxius but also Valens and Ursacius could have been well disposed to Aëtius' teachings.¹¹²

Sozomen's report¹¹³ on the situation at the council in 359 leaves no doubt about the benevolence of Valens and his supporters towards the Anomoeans. He writes that Valens and his group of bishops were against both the ὁμοούσιος as well as the ὁμοιούσιος, and preferred Aëtius' doctrine. Of course, the Fourth Creed of Sirmium cannot be defined as Anomoean and Sozomen could have presented such an opinion on the fact that George of Alexandria attended the council. In any case, the same ecclesiastical historian's writing seems to confirm the assumption according to which the discussion about Aëtius' ideas was topical in the circle to which Eudoxius, Valens and Ursacius belonged at this time.¹¹⁴

In the group of the so-called Eusebians¹¹⁵ and their collaborators, these three bishops were not the only ones with such an opinion. Philostorgius reports

ὁμοιος κατὰ πάντα was certainly unacceptable to Anomoeans, the explanation that the Son is ὁμοιος to the Father did not completely rule out the Anomoean understanding. See Th. A. Kopecek, *A History of Neo-Arianism*, Cambridge 1979, 170.

¹⁰⁹ Thanks to Patrophilus (of Scythopolis) and Narcissus' (of Neronias/Eirenopolis) intervention with Constantius, Eudoxius returned from exile (Philost. *h.e.* 4.10.1). Then he, together with Ursacius, Valens, Germinius, Acacius of Caesarea and Patrophilus of Scythopolis, persuaded the Emperor to organise the final session for the Council of Sirmium (Ath. Alex., *syn.* 1.3–4).

¹¹⁰ That Aëtius' teaching could have been one of the more pressing issues at that time can also be inferred from the possibility that he most probably published his work *Syntagma-tion* in 359. For the date see R. P. C. Hanson, *The Search of the Christian Doctrine of God. The Arian Controversy, 318–381*, Edinburgh 1988, 350.

¹¹¹ Philost. *h.e.* 4.9–10.1. This passage suggests that Macedonius of Constantinople first favoured the Anomoeans and only later became a supporter of the Homoiousians. We can also understand from it that Patrophilus of Scythopolis and Narcissus of Neronias/Eirenopolis intervened in favour of the condemned with the Emperor before Nicomedia was hit by the earthquake on the 28th of August 358.

¹¹² Thomas A. Kopecek (*A History of Neo-Arianism*, Cambridge 1979, 181) thinks that George of Alexandria cultivated an alliance with Valens, Ursacius, Eudoxius, Aëtius and Eunimius at the Council of Sirmium in 359.

¹¹³ Soz., *h.e.* 4.16.20–21.

¹¹⁴ Apart from Valens and Ursacius, the synod was also attended by Germinius of Sirmium, Marcus of Arethusa, George of Alexandria, Basilus of Ancyra, Hypatian of Heraclea and Pancratius of Pelusium.

¹¹⁵ Athanasius usually defines the following bishops as Eusebians: Eusebius of Nicomedia, Asterius "the Sophist", Diognitus/Theogni(tu)s of Nicaea, Athanasius of Anazarbus, Maris of Chalcedon, Patrophilus of Scythopolis, Theodorus of Heraclea, Narcissus of Neronias/Eirenopolis, Ursacius of Singidunum, Valens of Mursa and George of Laodicea. See D. M. Gwynn, *The Eusebians. The Polemic of Athanasius of Alexandria and the Construction of the 'Arian Controversy'*, Oxford 2007, 115. Among these, Maris of Chalcedon, Patrophilus

that Macedonius of Constantinople had been favourable to Eunomius and his group, before Basilius of Ancyra and his followers persuaded him over to their view.¹¹⁶ This information is very interesting, as we know that Valens, Ursacius and their close colleagues had supported Macedonius in the past and, thus, enabled him to become and remain bishop of Constantinople.¹¹⁷ If Philostorgius' information is correct, it could further confirm the supposition that the group of bishops to which Valens and Ursacius belonged, and not just the bishops gathered around Eudoxius in Antioch, would have an ear for Aëtius' ideas.

However, Macedonius is not the only bishop, among those who had cooperated with both Illyrians in the past, to support these ideas (in his case, at least for some time in the period before the Synod of Constantinople in 360). According to the information given again by Philostorgius¹¹⁸, Maris of Chalcedon,¹¹⁹ Eudoxius of Antioch¹²⁰ and Acacius of Caesarea were also Aëtius' supporters when delegations from the Council of Seleucia and from the Council of Ariminum met in Constantinople in 359. It may not be unimportant that the same ecclesiastical historian¹²¹ accuses Acacius of showing ostensibly his accordance with Aëtius' views, while not attributing to Maris and Eudoxius such a behaviour. This means that Philostorgius did not doubt that both of them were adherents of Aëtius' doctrine, while he was sure that Acacius was not.

If Aëtius and his pupil Eunomius were really in Constantinople in 359,¹²² then Valens and Ursacius should have met them in person. At this time, both Illyrian bishops held the view that the Son was similar to the Father and it seems they didn't change their opinion until the end of their lives. Relying on Philostorgius,¹²³ defending the same Homoean position at the Council of Seleucia did not, however, prevent Acacius, Eudoxius and Maris from speaking in favour of Aëtius and Eunomius at Constantinople in 359. Furthermore, only Aëtius was condemned at the Synod of Constantinople of 360. Not only was Eunomius not condemned, but he was also ordained bishop of Cyzicus,¹²⁴

of Scythopolis, Narcissus of Neronias/Eirenopolis, Ursacius of Singidunum, Valens of Mursa and George of Laodicea were still alive in the second half of the 350s.

¹¹⁶ Philost. *h.e.* 4.9.

¹¹⁷ Socr., *h.e.* 2.12.2–5; Soz., *h.e.* 3.7.4.

¹¹⁸ Philost., *h.e.* 4.12.

¹¹⁹ We know that Maris collaborated with Valens and Ursacius at least from 335 onwards, when they were all sent to Mareotis by the Synod of Tyr.

¹²⁰ Philostorgius (*h.e.* 4.11) also reports quite unequivocally that Eudoxius worked together with Aëtius in the same group, during the preparations for the Council of Ariminum and Seleucia in 359.

¹²¹ Philost., *h.e.* 4.12.

¹²² Philostorgius and Sozomen write that Aëtius was present in Constantinople in 359, during the final negotiations between both delegations of the Councils of Ariminum and Seleucia. See Philost. *h.e.* 4.12.2; Soz., *h.e.* 4.23.3–4.

¹²³ Philost., *h.e.* 4.12.2–3.

¹²⁴ Richard P.C. Hanson (*The Search of the Christian Doctrine of God. The Arian Controversy, 318–381*, Edinburgh 1988, 612) assumes that Eunomius' appointment as bishop of Cyzicus was possible only because he did not take part in any debate at Constantinople in 359 and 360.

both by Eudoxius and Maris.¹²⁵ The bishop of Constantinople, who continued to keep in touch with Eunomius after the synod of 360, seems finally stopped supporting him only a couple of years later because, Aëtius and Eunomius – since he did not manage to have his mentor rehabilitated – began to establish an alternate Anomoean Church organisation, with its own bishops.¹²⁶

As for the Illyrian bishops, they were not directly involved in this dispute. Eunomius could have thus counted on the support of Valens of Mursa, because of – as could be deduced from Eunomius' decision to appeal to him – the understanding¹²⁷ he had shown towards him and his Anomoean views in the past.

¹²⁵ Philostorgius (*h.e.* 5.3) reports that Eunomius accepted his ordination as a bishop of Cyzicus on the condition that Eudoxius and Maris achieve that Aëtius be recalled from exile and his deposition be cancelled. Cf. also Philost., *h.e.* 6.1; 7.5. As for Socrates (*h.e.* 4.7, 5.24.1) and Sozomen (*h.e.* 6.8.7), they report that only Eudoxius appointed Eunomius bishop of Cyzicus.

¹²⁶ Philost., *h.e.* 6.3, 7.6, 8.2, 9.4; Socr., *h.e.* 4.13.1–2, 5.24.1; Soz., *h.e.* 6.26.5–7; Thdt., *h.e.* 2.29. Cf. also B. Bleckmann, M. Stein, (ed. & transl.), *Philostorgios, Kirchengeschichte*, vol. 2, Paderborn 2015, 418; Th. A. Kopecek, *A History of Neo-Arianism*, Cambridge 1979, 392–422.

¹²⁷ Among the bishops whom Athanasius usually defines as Eusebians, the following were probably still alive between 358 and 360: Athanasius of Anazarbus, Maris of Chalcedon, Patrophilus of Scythopolis, Narcissus of Neronias/Eirenopolis (may have been dead in 359; H. C. Brennecke, *Studien zur Geschichte der Homöer. Der Osten bis zum Ende der homöischen Reichskirche*, Tübingen 1988, 197), Ursacius of Singidunum, Valens of Mursa, and George of Laodicea. As mentioned above, there is a possibility that Maris, Patrophilus and Narcissus could have been favourably disposed towards Aëtius and his followers. If we take into account that Athanasius of Anazarbus was Aëtius' teacher (Philost., *h.e.* 3.15.5), then George of Laodicea is the only one in this group for whom there is no doubt that he had been against Aëtius throughout that period. See Socr., *h.e.* 2.39.17; Soz., *h.e.* 4.13.1–3. Sozomen (*h.e.* 4.12.3–7) reports that Eudoxius became bishop of Antioch against the interests of the bishop of Laodicea and Mark of Arethusa. Moreover, it was the same George who, in 358, wrote a letter to Basilus of Ancyra and to the bishops this latter invited to his city (Macedonius of Constantinople, Cecropius of Nicomedia and Eugenius of Nicaea), warning them about Aëtius' doctrines which were – as he wrote – likely to dominate over Antioch. See Soz., *h.e.* 4.13.1–3. Although, the head of the Church of Laodicea was not present at the Synod of Ancyra in 358, he signed the statement issued by this meeting afterwards. After this event, the details about his faith are not entirely clear. Nevertheless, there is long-standing historiographical view about George's following actions, according to which he later deserted Basilus' party and joined the Homoeans, in order to avoid his own deposition in 360. See R. P. C. Hanson, *The Search of the Christian Doctrine of God. The Arian Controversy, 318–381*, Edinburgh 1988, 350, 614; Th. A. Kopecek, *A History of Neo-Arianism*, Cambridge 1979, 406. Cf. also M. DelCogliano, *The Death of George of Laodicea*, *Journal of Theological Studies* 60/1 (2009), 181–190 (which proposes that George was not condemned at the Synod of Constantinople, because he had died shortly after the Council of Seleucia in 359). On Athanasius of Anazarbus, see R. P. C. Hanson, *The Search of the Christian Doctrine of God. The Arian Controversy, 318–381*, Edinburgh 1988, 41–43; H. C. Brennecke, *Studien zur Geschichte der Homöer. Der Osten bis zum Ende der homöischen Reichskirche*, Tübingen 1988, 196–197.

Conclusion

It can be deduced from Athanasius' writing that the beginnings of Eudoxius' career are based on his collaboration with the so-called Eusebians. Despite assumptions¹²⁸ that this party is a construct by the bishop of Alexandria, which served, overall, his desire to reduce the credibility of his opponents, a review of the contacts among the prelates that he places in this group shows a different picture. Thus, the contacts between Eudoxius and the pro-Arian Illyrian bishops dealt with in this paper clearly show that Eudoxius had close ties with Valens of Mursa and Ursacius of Singidunum, who were, at that time, not only the most important pro-Arian bishops of Illyricum, but also prominent members of the group of the Eusebians. By 341, when Eudoxius is first mentioned in the sources as a bishop, it seems that the three bishops had already participated in some actions in the background of which stood Eusebius of Nicomedia. The activities of the then bishop of Constantinople and his followers had then three basic purposes: 1- to justify the condemnation of Athanasius in the East (letter sent by Eusebius and the members of the Mareotis commission to Bishop Julius of Rome), 2- to compose a creed which would present its authors' views in a way that would be acceptable not only in the East but in the West as well (the final result being the Fourth Creed of Antioch), and 3- to extend the influence of Constantinople in the politico-ecclesiastical sphere through the decisive role of its bishop (which ultimately led to the creation of the Patriarchate).

Eusebius of Nicomedia died in 341, but his ideas seem to have continued to live on in the efforts of his former associates. Relying on the analysis of the cooperation between Eudoxius, Valens and Ursacius, we can claim that after Eusebius' death they still followed Eusebius' guidelines. However, their efforts to exclude Athanasius of Alexandria and to compose a creed that would be valid throughout the Empire are not the only activities that would give them a special place among the "Eastern" bishops of that time. What is really special, and therefore also most important, in determining the legitimacy of "Eusebians" label for Eudoxius, Valens and Ursacius is the fact that they cooperated very closely with each other in their efforts to achieve the stated goals at least until 360. So, by the time they had mostly achieved what they wanted – with the support of Emperor Constantius: 1- Athanasius was condemned and deposed, 2- the Homoean creed was compulsory throughout the Empire, and 3- Eudoxius had become bishop of Constantinople. These are achievements that are certainly not accidental and could not be achieved by an individual without the strong support of co-workers: the Eusebians.

The endeavour of the three bishops had not yet been fully completed when, after Constantius' death, their cooperation was hampered by a different political situation. As head of the Church of Constantinople, Eudoxius proved to be a worthy successor to Eusebius. Thrace, Asia and Pontus were already parts of the area of authority of the Arian Church of the imperial capital from the time of this latter.¹²⁹ Eudoxius continued his mentor's work, by being the

¹²⁸ D. M. Gwynn, *The Eusebians. The Polemic of Athanasius of Alexandria and the Construction of the 'Arian Controversy'*, Oxford 2007, vii.

¹²⁹ D. Moreau, *La partitio imperii et la géographie des Balkans: entre géopolitique et*

first bishop of Constantinople to try to extend its influence to the “true East”, by directly interfering in the episcopal elections in Antioch, through the ordination of Meletius.¹³⁰ If there remained then only twenty-one years of Homean supremacy over the ecclesiastical organisation in the Eastern part of the Empire, the politico-religious consequence of the action of Eudoxus and his colleagues was lasting, because the see of Constantinople was from now on placed in front of Alexandria and Antioch, a situation which the Niceans/Homoousians decided not to abrogate, but to officialise in 381.

géo-ecclésiologie, in Costellazioni geo-ecclésiiali da Costantino a Giustiniano: dalle chiese ‘principali’ alle chiese patriarcali. XLIII Incontro di studiosi dell’Antichità cristiana (Rome, 7–9 May 2015), Rome 2017, 268–271; A. Cedilnik, D. Moreau, *How Ulfilas became an Arian Bishop? Contribution to the Christian Prosopography of the Dioecesis Thraciarum*, in K. Stoev, I. Topalilov, R. Milev (eds), *The Goths in the East: Sources – Archaeology – Identity* (Folia Balcanica), Sofia (forthcoming); D. Moreau, *The establishment, affirmation and expansion of the Patriarchate of Constantinople up to Justinian: a political or “heretical” issue?*, in D. I. Mureşan, D. Moreau (eds), *An Ecumene of Changes. Jurisdictional Spaces and Frontiers of the Patriarchate of Constantinople (4th–20th C.)*, London (forthcoming).

¹³⁰ A. Cedilnik, D. Moreau, *Demophilus, the Last Arian Bishop of Constantinople? Contribution (II) to the Christian Prosopography of the Dioecesis Thraciarum*, in Z. Gerdzhikova and I. Topalilov (eds), *Late Antique Christianity in Southeastern Europe* (Folia Balcanica), Sofia (forthcoming).

Аленка Цедилник, Доминик Моро
(Универзитет у Љубљани, Словенија/ Универзитет у Лилу, Француска)
ЕВДОКИЈЕ АНТИОХИЈСКИ/ЦАРИГРАДСКИ И ПРОАРИЈАНСКИ ЕПИСКОПИ
ИЛИРИКА. ПРИЛОГ (III) ХРИШЋАНСКОЈ ПРОСОПОГРАФИЈИ ТРАЧКЕ
ДИЈЕЦЕЗЕ

Чланак је посвећен делатности епископа Евдокија и његовим контактима са проаријанским прелатима из Илирика, пре свега са Валенсом из Мурсе и Урсакијем из Сингидунума. Пажња је усмерена на природу и узроке њихове сарадње у светлу аријанске контроверзе, као и на напоре Цариграда да прошири свој политички и еклесијални утицај. Евдокије је одрастао у хришћанској породици. Најкасније 341. године, уз подршку полуаријанаца јевсевијеваца, постао је епископ Германикије у северној сиријској области Комагени. Године 357. био је изабран за епископа Антиохије, а 360. за епископа Цариграда. Као епископ Германикије и Антиохије блиско је сарађивао са проаријанским епископима Илирика, нарочито са Валенсом и Урсакијем. На основу сачуваних података о саборима у Риму и Антиохији, који су одржани 340. и 341. године, чини се да су та тројица епископа била укључена у политичке и еклесијалне планове иза којих је стајао Јевсевије Никомидијски. Евдокије се, као епископ Германикије, први пут спомиње у писаним изворима управо 341. године. Након тога, Евдокије, Валенс и Урсакије су по свој прилици учествовали на сабору у Сердици 343. године. Чини се да је Валенсова и Урсакијева улога у тим догађајима оставила дубљи утисак на савременике него Евдокијева. Међутим, у годинама које су следиле, епископи из западног дела Царства Валенс и Урсакије нису имали већег удела у теолошким распрама на хришћанском Истоку: управо тада на главну позорницу ступа Евдокије. Године 344, учествовао је у делегацији која је одлуке Антиохијског сабора бранила пред епископима Запада у Милану. Може се претпоставити да су, због постојећих односа и личних интереса, том приликом биле учвршћене везе између чланова посланства и двојице епископа из Илирика. О томе би могло да сведочи и Евдокијево учешће на сабору у Сирмијуму 351. године, а нарочито то што је, тада већ у својству епископа Антиохије, 358. године сазвао нови сабор који је усвојио одлуке још једног сирмујумског синода, одржаног 357. године. Такође, Евдокије је био један од најистакнутијих епископа хомојаца на сабору у Селеукији 359. године, баш као што су Валенс и Урсакије били мађу најгласовитијим следбеницима Акација Цезарејског на сабору у Ариминију. Као утицајан хомојац, Евдокије је био изабран за цариградског епископа 360. године, и ту функцију је обављао до своје смрти 370. године. Из тог раздобља извори бележе само један догађај у којем су сарађивали наши епископи. Наиме, када је аномејац Евномије био оптужен да је у прошлости пружао подршку узурпатору Прокопију и осуђен на изгнанство у Мауританији, утицајни Валенс из Мурсе се заложно за њега на царском двору. Иако не можемо бити сигурни, успеху његове интервенције код цара Валенса могло је да допринесе и то што је владар био раније, ако не и тада, у добрим односима са Евдокијем. Несумњива сарадња тројице епископа наговештава постојање ширег плана, у којем су учествовали јевсевијевци који су чак и након смрти свог првака, Јевсевија Никомидијског, настојали да прате његове замисли и ојачају утицај Цариградске епископије. У нашим разматрањима посветили смо се следећим темама: настојањима тројице епископа да издејствују осуду александријског епископа Атанасија и преузму одлучујућу улогу у развоју и ширењу теолошких доктрина; Валенсовом покушају да постане епископ Аквилеје; Евдокијевом именовану за епископа Антиохије и, након тога, Цариграда; његовој улози у постављању Мелетија за наследника на месту антиохијског епископа; контактима које су Евдокије, Валенс и Урсакије могли да одржавају са аномејцима. Иако се показало да није могуће доћи до коначних одговора, предочене могућности остају вредне пажње.

Превоо Иван Бугарски

Primary Sources

Athanasius Alexandrinus, *Apologia ad Constantium*
 Szymusiak, J.-M. (ed. & transl.), *Athanase d'Alexandrie, Deux apologies : À l'empereur Constance – Pour sa fuite*, 2nd ed. (SC 56 bis), Paris 1987.

Athanasius Alexandrinus, *Apologia (secunda) contra Arianos*
 Opitz, H.-G. (ed.), with corr. by H.C. Brennecke, U. Theil & A. von Stockhausen, *Athanasius Werke II/1: Die Apologien 3–5 [5–7]*, Berlin 1938–1940, 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*, Berlin/New York 2006, ci–cii.

Athanasius Alexandrinus, *Historia Arianorum ad monachos*
 Opitz, H.-G. (ed.), with corr. by H.C. Brennecke, U. Theil & A. von Stockhausen, *Athanasius Werke II/1: Die Apologien 5–6 [7–8]*, Berlin 1940, 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*, Berlin/New York 2006, ciii–cv.

Athanasius Alexandrinus, *Epistula de synodis Arimini et Seleucia*
 Opitz, H.-G. (ed.), with corr. by H.C. Brennecke, U. Theil & A. von Stockhausen, *Athanasius Werke II/1: Die Apologien 6–7 [8–9]*, Berlin 1940, 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*, Berlin/New York 2006, cv–cviii.

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

Chronicon Paschale

Dindorf, L. (ed.), *Πασχάλιον seu Chronicon Paschale, a mundo condito ad Heraclii imp. annum XX. Opus hactenus fastorum siculorum nomine laudatum, deinde chronicae temporum epitomes, ac denique Chronici Alexandrini lemme 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.

Epiphanius of Salamis

Holl, K. & Dummer, J. (ed.), *Epiphanius 3. Panarion haer. 65–80* (GCS 37), Berlin 1985.

Hilarius, *Collectanea antiariana Parisina*

Feder, A. (ed.), *S. Hilarii episcopi Pictaviensis opera IV: Tractatus misteriorum / 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), Vienna/Leipzig 1916, 39–187.

Julius I (Pope), *Epistulae*

Thompson, G. L. (ed. & transl.), *The Correspondence of Pope Julius I* (Library of Early Christianity 3), Washington 2015.

- Philostorgius, *Historia ecclesiastica*
Bleckmann, B. & Stein, M. (ed. & transl.), *Philostorgios, Kirchengeschichte*, 2 vols. (Kleine und fragmentarische Historiker der Spätantike E7), Paderborn 2015.
- Des Places, É. (transl.), with the collab. of B. Bleckmann, D. Meyer & J.-M. Prieur, *Philostorge, Histoire ecclésiastique*. (SC, 564), Paris 2013.
- Socrates Scholasticus, *Historia ecclesiastica*
Hansen, G. C. (ed.), with the collab. of M. Širinjan, *Sokrates, Kirchengeschichte*. (GCS NF 1), Berlin 1995.
- Sozomenus, *Historia ecclesiastica*
Hansen, G. C. (ed. & transl.), *Sozomenos, Historia ecclesiastica – Kirchengeschichte*. (Fontes christiani 73), Turnhout 2004.
- Theodoretus of Cyrus, *Historia ecclesiastica*
Parmentier L. (ed.), with corr. by G. C. Hansen, *Theodoret, Kirchengeschichte*, 3rd ed. (GCS NF 5), Berlin/New York 1998.