

The Synod (synodality) of Rimini–Seleucia

We want to show the theological disputes that flared up after the dogmatic arrangements were made at the First Ecumenical Council of Nicaea in Asia Minor in 325¹. We will discuss the period from the end of this council to the death of Emperor Constantius II in 361. Therefore, in the first part of the paper, we deal with the religious policy of the Emperor Constantine the Great, and then we look at the theological disputes that took place under the reign of Emperor Constantius II, with special attention to the double synod convened by him in 359: for the West, in Rimini, and for the East, in Seleucia. The imperial policy, which dominated all theological discussions in the period we are studying, led to the imposition of the Arian heresy on practically the entire empire.

¹ As part of the efforts to disseminate the results of the scientific research and to foster the internationalization of academic reflection, this article is made available in English. This enables its content to be situated within a broader context of international scholarly debate and increases its accessibility to research communities beyond the Polish-speaking academic environment. The original version of this text was published in Polish: *Religia chrześcijańska i polityka cesarska pod rządami Konstantyna Wielkiego i Konstancjusza II*, in: B. Degórski, *Religia chrześcijańska i polityka cesarska pod rządami Konstantyna Wielkiego i Konstancjusza II*, “Dissertationes Paulinorum” 33/2 (2024) pp. 5–30 = *Kościół a Kościoły*, ed. A.A. Napiórkowski, A. Sejbuk, Cracoviensis cogitatio Ecclesiae 16, Wydawnictwo Naukowe UPJPII, Kraków 2025, pp. 63–92.

1. The Situation of the Church under Constantine the Great

Only a few months after the end of the Council of Nicaea (325 A.D.), it was obvious that the Arian party had not given up the fight for its own conception of Trinitarian theology. The two leading bishops of this group, Eusebius of Nicomedia and Theognis of Nicaea, announced to the emperor that they were withdrawing their support for the 325 A.D. creed formulation. Constantine the Great, unaccustomed to such treatment of the solemn decisions he had approved, considered this move of the bishops as self-exclusion from the ecclesiastical community. So, he exiled them to Gaul, and filled their sees with bishops faithful to the Nicene symbol. A letter to the community of Nicomedia expresses the emperor's indignation at the insolent attitude of its bishop Eusebius. However, it turned out that other bishops were also following in the footsteps of the rebels. Theodotus of Laodicea was one of them, he publicly declared his sympathy for Arius. The emperor's reaction in this case made it clear that he would act decisively to defend the Nicene faith².

Unfortunately, at the beginning of 328, there was an incomprehensible change in the attitude of the emperor, who began to support the representatives of the pro-Arian orientation. In the same year, Bishops Eusebius of Nicomedia and Theognis of Nicaea returned from exile and took their sees again³. Moreover, it was Eusebius, who had been severely punished by Constantine three years earlier, who now began to gain more and more confidence and favour from the emperor, until he finally took the position of his theological advisor, displacing Hosius of Cordoba, who, after the Council of Nicaea, returned to his diocese in Spain and from there supported the emperor with his advice. This fact made Eusebius an effective spokesman for the interests of the Arians. The influence of

² Cf. Philostorgius, *Historia ecclesiastica* 2, 7.

³ Cf. *ibid.*

Constance, Constantine's half-sister, who lived in Nicomedia and had long had the confidence of the high-born bishop of this imperial residence, must also be considered⁴.

Certainly, the sympathetic Bishop Eusebius of Caesarea of Palestine⁵, whose great culture, rhetorical skills and courtly manner had a great influence on the emperor, especially since Eusebius was a good diplomat and had the ability to soften contrasts, also contributed to the change of position. Most likely, the emperor's mother, St. Helena, also spoke flatteringly about him, describing her impressions from the trip to the Holy Land, where she certainly met the bishop of Caesarea.

Let us return again to Eusebius of Nicomedia, who, immediately after his return from exile, assumed the leadership of the Arian party with energy and confidence. He understood that the fight should not be waged directly against the symbol of Nicaea, as this would certainly provoke resistance and opposition from the emperor. It was more important to eliminate the Nicene leaders first. One of them was Eustatius of Antioch, who, after the end of the Council, began to play a dominant role among them. Already in Nicaea, he had opposed Arius, even in writings, and irritated him with his mockery, the same with which he now looked upon the new activity of Eusebius of Nicomedia. With subtle dexterity, therefore, it was reported to the emperor that Eustatius was a morally questionable figure who was increasingly disturbing religious peace. To increase the emperor's anger, a rumour was added that Eustatius spoke contemptuously of his mother Helena. To overthrow Eustatius, a synod

⁴ Some scholars assume that their rehabilitation took place in 327 after the second session of the Council of Nicaea, but there are serious doubts about the authenticity of the documents that would support this hypothesis. Cf., e.g., N.H. Baynes, *Constantine the Great*, London 1930, p. 22.

⁵ With regard to Eusebius of Caesarea, cf. C. Curti, *Eusebio di Cesarea*, in: *Nuovo dizionario patristico e di antichità cristiane*, (ed.) A. Di Berardino, Genova – Milano 2006, col. 1845–1853.

was convened in Antioch with the emperor's consent (331?⁶), which deposed him from office, and Constantine exiled him to Thrace⁷.

Encouraged by this success, the Arian party, in turn, directed its offensive against Athanasius, who, after the death of the bishop of Alexandria, Alexander, succeeded him as the bishop. Already at the Council of Nicaea, the energy and firmness of the then deacon Athanasius made a strong impression on the Council Fathers, who saw in him a future defender of the orthodox Nicaean theology.

The Arian enemies now, as in the case of Eustatius of Antioch, chose the path of insinuation. Athanasius was portrayed as a man thirsty for power, disregarding law and order, using all means to pursue his own interests. He was also accused of killing Bishop Arsenius, who, as a Meletian, was said to have refused to submit ruthlessly to Athanasius, as well as of flogging other Meletian bishops. Among the accusations there was even a slender one about the desecration of the chalice used during the holy liturgy⁸. Under the influence of these accusations, the emperor decided to convene a synod to deal with the case of Athanasius. This was all the easier because he had previously invited bishops to Jerusalem for the consecration of the Church of the Holy Sepulchre that he had erected. After this celebration, which took place in 335, the bishops went to the synod in nearby Tyre⁹. Of course, the synod was completely taken over by the Arian party, which allowed almost exclusively the opponents of Athanasius to participate, while the emperor's representative, Commes Flavius Dionysius, was a well-known supporter of the Arian current. The Egyptian bishops accompanying Athanasius were not admitted – they were simply not invited. In Tyre, two Pan-

⁶ The date of the synod is very controversial (326, 330, 331, 338). Cf. H. Hess, *The Canons of the Council of Serdica*, London 1958, p. 149.

⁷ Cf. Theodoretus, *Historia ecclesiastica* 1, 21, 4–22.

⁸ Athanasius talks about this in *Apologia contra Arianos*.

⁹ Cf. Eusebius Caesariensis, *Vita Constantini*, 41, 42. The Letter to the Synod Fathers is also found in Theodoretus, *Historia ecclesiastica* 1, 29.

nonian bishops also appeared on the scene for the first time: Valens of Mursa and Ursacius of Singidunum, who were to play a significant role in the later conflicts, and whom Arius had won over for his theories during his exile. Athanasius was, therefore, to defend himself against the accusations against those who, almost without exception, were his fierce opponents. Therefore, he could not count on a just verdict, and even had to fear for his own life. Therefore, he decided to secretly leave Tyre and went to Constantinople to meet Constantine in person. This accelerated the decision of the synod to remove Athanasius from office. Meanwhile, Athanasius, since he had not obtained an audience with the emperor, addressed him directly during one of the horse rides, told him about the events in Tyre and appealed to justice. However, Constantine did not make any decision at that time, limiting himself to summoning the participants of the Synod of Tyre to Constantinople. However, only four bishops appeared at the emperor's summons – the most ardent enemies of Athanasius: two Eusebius, Ursacius, and Valens¹⁰. Not only did they not explain anything objectively, but they even brought a new accusation against St. Athanasius, this time going so far as to accuse him of treason. He was accused of sabotaging imperial decrees in Egypt and preventing the export of grain necessary for the life of the capital. For such crimes, the emperor could impose the death penalty. However, he did not go so far, but exiled the Egyptian bishop to Trier¹¹. It remains unclear why Constantine did not examine this absurd accusation more thoroughly. It can be assumed that it was to his advantage, because it was a convenient excuse to remove from the East a man whom he considered an opponent of his peaceful policy.

The Arian party now had a free hand, but it wanted to crown its series of victories with the complete rehabilitation of Arius, i.e.,

¹⁰ Cf. Athanasius Alexandrinus *Apologia contra Arianos* 86; Sozomenus, *Historia ecclesiastica* 2, 281–313.

¹¹ Cf. Athanasius Alexandrinus, *Apologia contra Arianos* 9.

bringing him out of exile and restoring his priestly rights. For Arius, the situation changed for the better. Two years earlier, in 333, the emperor had promulgated an edict against him and, in a long letter to Arius and his followers, once again denounced their teaching. But later, in 334, Arius received a letter from the emperor urging him to come to the court for an exchange of views¹². On this occasion, Arius presented Constantine with a profession of faith that cleverly avoided the actual point of contention. However, the emperor, not being a theologian, but wishing to settle disputes, sent the matter back to the next synod, which was to free Arius from excommunication¹³. Such a possibility was presented to the Arian bishops at a meeting in Jerusalem. They recognised Arius' teaching as orthodox and supported his proposed profession of faith. They then revoked the excommunication imposed on Arius in Nicaea and asked the emperor to restore his presbyterate rights, which the synod would then approve by a solemn ecclesiastical act¹⁴. However, Arius died shortly before this happened¹⁵.

2. The Ecclesiastical Policy of Constantius II

After the death of Constantine the Great in 337, there was a great flourishing of the Arians. He bequeathed the eastern part of the empire to his son Constantius, who chose Arianism as his own religion and during the twenty-four years of his reign did everything in his power to promote the perpetuation of Arianism.

¹² Cf. Socrates Scholasticus, *Historia ecclesiastica* 1, 25.

¹³ Cf. Sozomenus, *Historia ecclesiastica* 2, 27, 7 et seq.

¹⁴ Cf. Sozomenus, *Historia ecclesiastica* 2, 27, 13–14; Athanasius Alexandrinus, *Apologia contra Arianos* 84; *Ibid.*, *De synodis* 21.

¹⁵ Cf. Athanasius Alexandrinus, *Epistula de morte Ariani ad episcopos Aegypti et Libyae* 19. Athanasius sees God's punishment in Arius' death. Arius probably did not die in Alexandria, but in Constantinople (cf. Sozomenus, *Historia ecclesiastica* 2, 29, 1–5).

At the beginning of Constantius' reign, St. Athanasius of Alexandria and his Catholic followers could expect the favour of the emperor. He informed Athanasius that he would take into account his father's will and that Athanasius could always count on his support. It seems that this attitude of Constantius may have been caused by the desire to find as many supporters as possible in the fight against the usurper Magnentius. Athanasius behaved very restrainedly towards the delegation of Magnentius, who also wanted to win over the Bishop of Alexandria for himself. Moreover, Athanasius called on his faithful to pray for Emperor Constantius.

Unfortunately, as the emperor gained more and more victory over the usurper, he also succumbed more and more to the opponents of St. Athanasius¹⁶. At the beginning of 352, they directly accused the bishop of Alexandria that although he allegedly supported Constantius, he nevertheless accepted the delegation of Magnentius, and therefore was disloyal to the legitimate emperor¹⁷.

Athanasius' opponents intensified their efforts after the death of Pope Julius I (April 12, 352)¹⁸, in which the bishop of Alexandria had the strongest support in the West. The new pope – Liberius

¹⁶ With regard to Emperor Constantius II and his relations with St. Athanasius, cf. G. Gigli, *L'ortodossia, l'arianesimo e la politica di Costanzo II (337–361)*, Roma 1949; R. Klein, *Constantius II und die christliche Kirche*, Darmstadt 1977; D. Kienast, *Römische Kaisertabelle: Grundzüge einer römischen Kaiserchronologie*, Darmstadt 1990, pp. 314–322; T.D. Barnes, *Athanasius and Constantius: Theology and Politics in the Constantinian Empire*, Cambridge 1993; P.O. Cuneo, *La legislazione di Costantino II, Costanzo II e Costante (337–361)*, Milan 1997; G. Ventura da Silva, *Reis, santos e feiticeiras. Constâncio II e os fundamentos místicos da basileia 337–361*, Vitoria 2003; M. Forlin Patrucco, *Costanzo II*, in: *Nuovo dizionario patristico e di antichità cristiane*, (ed.) A. Di Berardino, Genova – Milano 2006, col. 1247–1248.

¹⁷ Cf. Athanasius Alexandrinus *Historia Arianorum ad monachos* 30.

¹⁸ With regard to Pope Julius I, cf. B. Studer, *Giulio I papa*, in: *Nuovo dizionario patristico e di antichità cristiane*, (ed.) A. Di Berardino, Genova – Milano 2007, col. 2317–2318.

(352–366 AD)¹⁹ – like his predecessor, rejected the accusations against St. Athanasius and, in order to restore peace between East and West, asked Constantius, who was then in Arles, to convene a synod in Aquileia²⁰. The emperor was ready to convene a synod immediately, but he wanted it to be held in Arles, and there the bishops of Gaul were invited in 353²¹. However, it was certainly not a good sign that the bishops of Pannonia participating in the synod – Valens of Mursa (*Valens*; active in 335–359) and Ursacius of Singidunum²² (*Ursacius*; active in 335–346), acting as theological advisors to the emperor for the Latin West, strongly supported the line of the Arians. Perhaps, at their suggestion, none of the unresolved theological questions was presented to the Synod Fathers, but only a previously prepared decree containing the condemnation of St. Athanasius. The papal legates insisted to no avail that the theological disputes should be discussed first. However, the emperor, as his father had once done to the minorities in Nicaea, threatened to dismiss and exile the Western bishops if they did not sign the decision of the synod. This threat, and the skilful eloquence of Bishop Valens of Mursa, caused the bishops of Gaul, who, moreover, were poorly informed about the whole course of the controversy surrounding St. Athanasius, to sign one by one. In his honesty, only one

¹⁹ With regard to Pope Liberius, cf. B. Studer, *Liberio papa*, in: *Nuovo dizionario patristico e di antichità cristiane*, (ed.) A. Di Berardino, Genova – Milano 2007, col. 2822–2823.

²⁰ Cf. Hilarius Pictaviensis, *Fragmentum historicum* 5, 1–6. Cf. also: *Scolies ariennes sur le concile d'Aquilée*, introduction, texte latin et notes par R. Gryson, Sources Chrésiennes 267, Paris 1980 (in the appendix there are the files of the Synod of Aquileia, but from 381). M. Zelzer (ed.), in: *Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum* 82/3 (critical edition of the acts of the synod of 381).

²¹ Lieutenant Ch. Munier – G. Pilara, *Arles*, in: *Nuovo dizionario patristico e di antichità cristiane*, (ed.) A. Di Berardino, Genova – Milano 2006, col. 535–540 (especially col. 539).

²² Currently within the borders of Belgrade.

had the courage to oppose it, namely the Bishop of Trier Paulinus²³, who was exiled to Phrygia for this reason, where he soon died²⁴.

Pope Liberius could also not agree to the deposition of St. Athanasius of Alexandria and asked the emperor to convene a new great synod²⁵. Constantius willingly agreed to this request, because he already knew that no serious resistance to his will was to be expected from this episcopate, and he designated Milan as the place of the synod²⁶. In 355, many Eastern bishops and a large number of Western bishops gathered in this city²⁷. However, with this synod a great tragedy of the Church began, which also very seriously stained the emperor, who could not tolerate the slightest opposition and went to more and more severe measures against his opponents. Once again, he despotically demanded that the Synod Fathers sign a sentence condemning St. Athanasius²⁸.

When Bishop Eusebius of Vercelli²⁹ proposed that the present bishops should first put their signatures under the Nicene symbol

²³ Cf. A. Martin, *Athanasie d'Alexandrie et l'Église d'Égypte au IV^e siècle (328–373)*, Rome 1996, pp. 455, 461, 466; M. Simonetti, *Paolino di Treviri*, in: *Nuovo dizionario patristico e di antichità cristiane*, (ed.) A. Di Berardino, Genova – Milan 2008, col. 3832–3833.

²⁴ Cf. Hilarius Pictaviensis, *Fragmentum historicum* 1, 6.

²⁵ Cf. *ibid.*, 5, 3, 6.

²⁶ With regard to this Synod, cf. G. Corti, *Lucifero di Cagliari*, Milano 2004, pp. 63–85; A. Di Berardino, *Milan. II. Concili*, in: *Nuovo dizionario patristico e di antichità cristiane*, (ed.) A. Di Berardino, Genova – Milano 2007, col. 3277–3279.

²⁷ Cf. Sozomenus, *Historia ecclesiastica* 4, 9, 1.

²⁸ Cf. A. Di Berardino, *Milan. II. Concili*, in: *Nuovo dizionario patristico e di antichità cristiane*, (ed.) A. Di Berardino, Genova – Milan 2007, col. 3277.

²⁹ With regard to Eusebius of Vercelli, cf. E. Crovella, *S. Eusebio di Vercelli*, Vercelli 1960; M. Capellino, *Spiritualità di S. Eusebio*, Vercelli 1986; T. Bosco, *Eusebio di Vercelli nel suo tempo pagano e cristiano*, Turin 1995; M. Capellino (ed.), *S. Eusebio di Vercelli (Documenti e osservazioni storico-teologiche)*, Vercelli 1996; *Eusebio di Vercelli e il suo tempo*, (eds) E. dal Covolo, R. Uglione, G.M. Vian, Roma 1997; L. Dattrino, *Eusebio di Vercelli*, in: *Nuovo dizionario patristico e di antichità cristiane*, (ed.) A. Di Berardino, Genova – Milano 2006, col. 1861–1862.

of faith, and that the Bishop of Milan, Dionysius³⁰, should do just that, there were terrible riots³¹. In order to better control the bishops, the emperor ordered the successive sessions to be moved from the church to the imperial palace³² and, using the same threats, achieved the same result that had taken place in Arles: almost all the bishops submitted to violence. Only three of them objected: Eusebius of Vercelli, Lucifer of Cagliari³³, and Dionysius of Milan. As a punishment, they were sentenced to exile, and the Arian Auxentius, a native of Cappadocia³⁴, who could not even teach the faithful in their native Latin language, was imposed on the Catholics of Milan. After the end of the synod, the imperial envoys went to the bishops who were absent from the synod and forced their signatures. However, they encountered some resistance in Gaul, whose soul became the holy bishop Hilary of Poitiers³⁵. In the years that

³⁰ Cf. M. Simonetti, *Dionigi di Milano*, in: *Nuovo dizionario patristico e di antichità cristiane*, (ed.) A. Di Berardino, Genoa-Milan 2006, col. 1443.

³¹ Cf. Athanasius Alexandrinus, *Historia Arianorum ad monachos* 31–34.

³² Cf. Luciferus Calaritanus, *Moriendum esse for Filio Dei* 1.

³³ Cf. G. Corti, *Lucifero di Cagliari*, Milan 2004.

³⁴ Cf. M. Simonetti, *Aussenzio di Milano*, in: *Nuovo dizionario patristico e di antichità cristiane*, (ed.) A. Di Berardino, Genoa-Milano 2006, col. 662–663.

³⁵ With regard to St. Hilary and theological views, cf.: P. Smulders, *La doctrine trinitaire de s. Hilaire de Poitiers*, Roma 1944; C.F.A. Borchardt, *Hilary of Poitiers' Role in the Arian Struggle*, Den Haag 1966; E.R. Labande (ed.), *Hilaire et son temps. Actes du Colloque de Poitiers, 29 septembre – 3 octobre 1968, à l'occasion du XVIe centenaire de la mort de saint Hilaire*, Paris 1969; J. Doignon, *Hilaire de Poitiers avant l'exil*, Paris 1971; L.F. Ladaria, *El Espíritu Santo en San Hilario de Poitiers*, Madrid 1977; L. Longobardo, *Il linguaggio negativo della trascendenza di Dio in Ilario di Poitiers*, Napoli 1982; 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; M. Figura, *Das Kirchenverständnis des Hilarius von Poitiers*, Freiburg – Basel – Wien 1984; M. Durst, *Die Eschatologie des Hilarius von Poitiers: ein Beitrag zur Dogmengeschichte des vierten Jahrhunderts*, Bonn 1987; L.F. Ladaria, *La cristologia de Hilario de Poitiers*, Roma 1989; G. Vaccari, *La teologia della assunzione in Ilario di Poitiers: uno studio sui termini "adsumere" e "adsumptio"*, Roma 1994; Y.-M. Duval, *L'extirpation de l'arianisme en Italie du Nord et en Occident: Rimini (359/60) et Aquilée (381)*,

followed, he was to make a decisive contribution to preventing the Latin West from falling victim to Arianism. In the meantime, however, he was forced to participate, together with other bishops of southern Gaul, in the Synod of Béziers (356 AD)³⁶, where the condemnation of St. Athanasius was again forcibly imposed on most of the participants. However, Hilary together with Bishop Rodanios of Toulouse³⁷ opposed this. For this, they were sentenced to exile to Phrygia.

In fact, there was only one bishop in the West whose attitude could not be indifferent to the emperor and to his advisors, and that was the bishop of Rome, Pope Liberius. He, in turn, stood on the side of Athanasius and the Nicenes. Informed of the outcome of the Synod of Milan, he wrote a letter to the exiled bishops, expressing his appreciation for their righteous conduct and regretting that he could not be their companion³⁸. The rank and role of the bishop of Rome made the emperor initially want to calm things down in some way. So, he sent his official Eusebius to the pope with rich gifts. However, when the pope firmly refused to accept them, he was met with threats. When he then ordered the removal of these precious gifts deposited in St. Peter's Basilica, the prefect of the city, Leontius, received an order to bring the pope to court by force. How-

Hilaire de Poitiers (367/8) et Ambroise de Milan (397), Aldershot 1998; M. Simonetti, *Ilario di Poitiers*, in: *Nuovo dizionario patristico e di antichità cristiane*, (ed.) A. Di Bernardino, Genoa – Milan 2007, col. 2521–2528.

³⁶ After this synod, St. Hilary of Poitiers wrote one of his historical works against the bishops of Valens of Mursa and Ursacius of Singidunum: *Hilarius Pictaviensis, Liber adversus Valentem et Ursacium*. On the Synod of Béziers, cf. E. Griffe, *La Gaule chrétienne à l'époque romaine*, vol. 1, Paris 19642, pp. 224–228.

³⁷ Regarding Bishop Rodanios of Toulouse, cf. H. Crouzel, L. Odrobina, *Rodano di Tolosa*, in: *Nuovo dizionario patristico e di antichità cristiane*, (ed.) A. Di Bernardino, Genova – Milano 2008, col. 4573–4574.

³⁸ Cf. Hilarius Pictaviensis, *Fragmentum historicum* 6, 1–2.

ever, in order to avoid a general rebellion, the arrest was carried out under the cover of night³⁹.

At the court in Milan, there were serious tensions between the emperor, who was extremely irritated, who considered Athanasius an “ungodly man of unspeakable audacity”⁴⁰, and Pope Liberius, who refused to condemn the bishop of Alexandria with dignified firmness. Finally, the emperor gave the pope three days to think, after which Liberius had to choose: either sign the document and return to Rome immediately or go into exile. However, after only two days, Liberius was exiled to Thrace, where he was entrusted to the supervision of an Arian bishop. The pope also rejected the five thousand gold coins given to him by the emperor to cover his expenses. He also refused to accept the money sent to him by the empress⁴¹. For a long time, the pope’s opposition was expected, but after some time his successor was appointed. It was a certain Arch-deacon Felix⁴², who was sufficiently devoid of character to assume such an important office under these circumstances⁴³.

In this way, any voice capable of effectively opposing imperial policy was virtually silenced. However, people loyal to the emperor still remembered that in distant Spain, there was still a bishop of Hosius of Córdoba⁴⁴ (a supporter of St. Athanasius and a participant in the First Council of Nicaea in 325). Even this old man seemed dangerous to them, and when, after further letters from the Emperor Constantius, he expressed his opposition to the condemnation

³⁹ Cf. Athanasius Alexandrinus, *Historia Arianorum ad monachos* 35–37.

⁴⁰ Theodoretus, *Historia ecclesiastica* 2, 16, 1–27.

⁴¹ Cf. M. Goemans, *L'exil du pape Libère*, in: *Mélanges Chr. Mohrmann*, Utrecht 1963, pp. 184–189.

⁴² Cf. P. Marone, *Felice II antipapa*, in: *Nuovo dizionario patristico e di antichità cristiane*, (ed.) A. Di Berardino, Genova – Milan 2007, col. 1927.

⁴³ Cf. Athanasius Alexandrinus, *Historia Arianorum ad monachos* 75; Theodoretus, *Historia ecclesiastica* 2, 17, 3.

⁴⁴ Cf. M. Simonetti, *Ossio*, in: *Nuovo dizionario patristico e di antichità cristiane*, (ed.) A. Di Berardino, Genoa – Milan 2007, col. 3700.

of St. Athanasius, he too was exiled to the Balkans, where he was kept under surveillance in Sirmium⁴⁵.

After the emperor had thus intimidated and subjugated the West, it was easier to engage in battle with St. Athanasius, who, in the meantime, had returned to Alexandria and at every threat cleverly referred to letters in which the emperor assured him of his sympathy and help. An attempt to take a general stand against Athanasius also failed. Finally, during a service presided over by St. Athanasius, a detachment of soldiers entered the church of “Theon” to capture the Bishop. However, as a result of the riots, which caused many deaths, Athanasius managed to escape (February 356) and then took refuge in the desert, with monks, who enthusiastically welcomed and received him⁴⁶. A year later, despite the resistance of the population, which turned against the emperor, the temples were taken away from the Catholics and handed over to the Arians, and the Christian community of Alexandria accepted a foreigner as the bishop⁴⁷.

This Arian bishop of Alexandria was George. He ruled with a real terror in Egypt, has expelled legitimate bishops and priests, and harassed in every way the faithful who remained attached to St. Athanasius. After eighteen months, however, the Alexandrians, tired of the unbearable situation, forced the bishop George imposed on them to flee⁴⁸.

Nevertheless, Athanasius could not risk returning, as the defenders of the Catholic Nicene faith were forced to lead a hidden life.

⁴⁵ Sirmium is an ancient Roman and Byzantine city located on the Sava River, an important fortress in the Roman province of Pannonia and its capital. This fortress defended the northern border of the Roman Empire. Nowadays, this city is called Sremska Mitrovica and is located in Serbia.

⁴⁶ Cf. Athanasius Alexandrinus, *Apologia de fuga* 24.

⁴⁷ Cf. Athanasius Alexandrinus, *Historia Arianorum ad monachos* 55–58; Sozomenus, *Historia ecclesiastica* 4, 9, 8–12.

⁴⁸ Cf. Athanasius Alexandrinus, *Historia Arianorum ad monachos* 73; Epiphanius Constantiensis, *Panarion* 76, 1.

In the refuge of Egyptian monks, St. Athanasius wrote his most important apologetic works. In the *Apology to the Emperor Constantius* he refuted the slander circulating about himself. In turn, the *Apology on Escape* was addressed to the whole Church and became one of the most widely read writings of Athanasius⁴⁹. Finally, the *Apology Against the Arians*⁵⁰ is of inestimable value for the history of the years 339–357 due to the numerous documents it cites. Athanasius subjected his opponents to a harsh and inexorable judgment in yet another work – in the *History of the Arians*⁵¹, which he dedicated to Egyptian monks. There, he describes the intrigues directed against the faith of the Nicenes, and calls the emperor Constantius the precursor of the Antichrist. In the West, Athanasius is seconded in this criticism by the Latin bishop of Cagliari in Sardinia, St. Lucifer, who in his works written in exile also sharply polemicises with Constantius⁵².

In all these disputes, the question of the true faith was no longer in the first place, but rather the struggle for the recognition or condemnation of the bishops: the followers of Athanasius, in their own (and our) opinion, fought for the true faith; Constantius, on the other hand, wanted to maintain peace at all costs in the Church, which depended on the empire. It is not surprising, then, that he supported those who demonstrated loyalty to him. Therefore, when the opponents of St. Athanasius succeeded in gaining political influence, their first concern was not to share their views on the faith with the faithful, but to remove the followers of Athanasius from the episcopal sees and replace them with bishops with views consistent with

⁴⁹ The Athanasian works *Apologia ad Constantium* and *Apologia de fuga* were published by J.-M. Szymusiak in: *Sources Chrétiennes* 56 bis, Paris 1958.

⁵⁰ The Athanasian edition of *Apologia contra Arianos* can be found in: J.-P. Migne (ed.), *Patrologiae cursus completus. Series Graeca*, vol. 25, Paris 1857, col. 247–410.

⁵¹ The Athanasian edition of *Historia Arianorum ad monachos* is in: J.-P. Migne (ed.), *Patrologiae cursus completus. Series Graeca*, vol. 25, Paris 1857, col. 691–796.

⁵² They were published by: W. Hartel, *Luciferi Calaritani opuscula*, *Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum*, vol. 14, Vindobonae 1886.

their own. It should not be surprising, then, that in the middle of the fourth century, there was not a single person in the ranks of the imperial supporters who was interested in the dogmatic question.

The situation changed around 356, when Aetius⁵³, a master of dialectics, after the disorderly life he had led until then, found his way to theology and was ordained a deacon by the bishop of Antioch, Leontius. Aetius addressed the important question concerning Arius, that is, the relationship between the Father and the Son, and proposed in words and writings the most radical solution to it. According to him, the Son of God does not have the same nature or substance that the Father possesses. Moreover, the Son of God is not even like the Father. Aetius expressed this by rejecting the existing theological terminology and by introducing the formula *ἀνόμοιος*. The history of dogma thus recognises this heresiarch as the founder of the “anomie” or “Aetian”, the radical wing of the Arian current.

However, in Antioch, Aetius found little support for his radical theory and, therefore, went to Alexandria, where he later met Eunomius⁵⁴ (formerly the bishop of Cyzicos), who adopted the new doctrine and propagated it. In this way, however, both heretics initiated the division of the Arians into different groups and unwittingly became the main cause of the weakening of this whole heretical movement.

⁵³ Regarding Aetius, cf. T.A. Kopecek, *A History of Neo-Arianism*, vol. 1, Cambridge MA 1979, *passim*; M. Simonetti, *Aezio di Antiochia*, in: *Nuovo dizionario patristico e di antichità cristiane*, (ed.) A. Di Berardino, Genova – Milano 2006, col. 91–92.

⁵⁴ With regard to Eunomius, cf. E. Cavalcanti, *Studi Eunomiani*, Roma 1976; R.P. Vaggione (ed.), *Eunomius, The Extant Works, Text and Translation*, Oxford 1987; F. Piloni, *Influssi Eunomiani sull'origine e lo sviluppo della teologia dei Cappadoci*, Roma 1998; R.P. Vaggione, *Eunomius of Cyzicus and the Nicene Revolution*, Oxford 2000; M. Simonetti, *Eunomio di Cizico*, in: *Nuovo dizionario patristico e di antichità cristiane*, (ed.) A. Di Berardino, Genova – Milano 2006, col. 1836–1837.

Aetius' concept was also shared by Bishop Germinius⁵⁵, who in 351, was transferred from Cyzikos to Sirmium and there, in the summer of 357, he prepared a new formula of faith in a general outline, in which the terms *substantia*, *consubstantialis*, and, of course, the Greek original of the last word – ὁμοούσιος⁵⁶, about which all theological discussion was broken, were omitted.

In support of this heretical profession of “faith”, an attempt was made to obtain the signature of the old bishop of Cordoba, Hosius, who, as we have said, was then in exile in Sirmium. Unfortunately, it worked! The hundred-year-old bishop, whose strength of spirit had been weakening for some time, had only enough clarity of mind and strength to prevent the condemnation of his long-time friend St. Athanasius⁵⁷.

The change in the theological position of Pope Liberius, which chronologically should be placed even earlier, was much more important than the visit of this old man. There are four undoubtedly authentic letters of Liberius in which, during his exile in Thrace, weakened in his resistance and pride and under pressure from the Arian bishops, he abandoned his previous line of conduct and condemned St. Athanasius. He also entered into agreements with Athanasius' opponents, and also signed a formula of faith that he had always rejected (probably identical to the formula of Sirmium of 351; it should be added here that this formula can be understood not necessarily in a heretical way, but also in accordance with the Catholic faith). Having complied with the emperor's requirements, the pope asked Constantius II for permission to return to the episcopal see in Rome. However, Pope Liberius had to pay a lot for this

⁵⁵ With regard to Germinius, cf. M. Simonetti, *Germinio di Sirmio*, in: *Nuovo dizionario patristico e di antichità cristiane*, (ed.) A. Di Berardino, Genova – Milano 2007, col. 2106–2107.

⁵⁶ Text in: Hilarius Pictaviensis, *De synodis* 11; Athanasius Alexandrinus, *De synodis* 28.

⁵⁷ Cf. Sozomenus, *Historia ecclesiastica* 4, 12, 6; Hilarius Pictaviensis, *De synodis* 11, 63, 87.

conciliation, which was more an expression of human weakness than of theological views. When he returned to Rome in 358 with the imperial consent, he had to share the office and dignity of bishop of Rome with his “successor” Felix II, who, in the meantime, took his place. Although the Romans were in favour of his return from exile, and Felix was forced to leave the city, Liberius’ authority outside Rome was so weakened that he played no role in further theological discussions⁵⁸.

However, the radical wing of the Anomeans, propagating the formula of Sirmium in 357, did not meet with the favour it had hoped for. Not only in Gaul, where Bishop Phebadius of Agen wrote the treatise *Contra Arianos*⁵⁹, and in North Africa⁶⁰, but also in the Arian circles of the East, there was strong resistance to the struggle of the Anomeans against the divinity of the Son. A new moderate stream came to the fore, which was closer to the supporters of Nicaea than to the supporters of Eunomius. Its leader was Basil of Ancyra⁶¹, who was well versed in theology. In 358, he invited many bishops to his city for Easter, and then published on their behalf a document of great importance for the further development of theological discussion. On the one hand, this document decisively rejected the theses of the Anomeans, and on the other hand, proposed the word *ὁμοιούσιος* as a new term. Thus, the Son was recognised as similar to the Father in substance, which undoubtedly meant a considerable approximation to the position of the followers of Nicaea. Moreover, Emperor Constantius II, who had hitherto favoured the Anomeans, was convinced of the correctness of this new formula, which was

⁵⁸ Cf. Sozomenus, *Historia ecclesiastica* 4, 15, 4–6; Theodoretus, *Historia ecclesiastica* 2, 17.

⁵⁹ In: PL 20, 13–30. Cf. A. Durengues, *Le livre de Phoebade contre les Arien*, Agen 1927.

⁶⁰ Cf. Hilarius Pictaviensis, *Adversus Constantium* 26.

⁶¹ With regard to Basil of Ancyra, cf. M. Simonetti, *Basilio di Ancira*, in: *Nuovo dizionario patristico e di antichità cristiane*, (ed.) A. Di Berardino, Genova – Milano 2006, col. 723–724.

confirmed in 358 at the Synod of Sirmium and adopted by Pope Liberius⁶². Both St. Athanasius and St. Hilary of Poitiers were kind to this new terminology, the orthodox interpretation of which seemed possible and which was to be discussed in a friendly and cordial atmosphere⁶³. Bishop Basil of Ancyra also took advantage of the imperial favour to take a sharp stand against the Anomeans, whose leading bishops in turn had to experience the bitterness of exile⁶⁴. Basil of Ancyra then sought to have his theology as official as possible, which would take place at the great ecumenical council that was to be held in Nicaea⁶⁵.

3. The Double Synod of Rimini and Seleucia (in 359)

While Bishop Basil of Ancyra was busy preparing for this council, a group of other bishops succeeded in suggesting to Emperor Constantius the idea of convening, instead of a general council, a double synod to be held at the same time: in the West for the Latin episcopate and in the East for the bishops of the eastern provinces. It is obvious that the emperor liked this project. The Eastern Synod could certainly count, despite the splits, on an “Arian” majority, and the Western bishops, as recent events have shown, will eventually succumb to power.

Seleucia in the province of Isauria in Asia Minor was chosen as the site of the Eastern Synod, and the Western bishops were assigned a place in Rimini⁶⁶.

With this double synod, the last act of the drama of the deplorable religious policy of Emperor Constantius II began. At first, in

⁶² Cf. Sozomenus, *Historia ecclesiastica* 4: 14–15.

⁶³ Cf. Athanasius Alexandrinus, *De synodis* 41; Hilarius Pictaviensis, *De synodis* 81.

⁶⁴ Cf. Philostorgius, *Historia ecclesiastica* 4, 8–9.

⁶⁵ Cf. Sozomenus, *Historia ecclesiastica* 4, 16, 1–4, 14–19; Hieronymus Stridonensis, *Chronicon* ad annum 358.

⁶⁶ Cf. Hilarius Pictaviensis, *Fragmentum historicum* 2, 9–15, 3, 16.

May 359, a preparatory commission was convened in Sirmium. Its task was to develop a formula that was to be presented to both synods as a doctrinal basis (a kind of *instrumentum laboris*)⁶⁷. The Greek concept of this fundamental document, in the development of which Bishops Valens of Mursa and Ursacius of Singidunum collaborated using their powers of manipulation and cunning, must have come as no small surprise to Basil of Ancyra. The term that stood out in it was not the term *ὁμοιούσιος* proposed by him, but the phrase *ὅμοιος τῷ πατρὶ*, which expressed only the idea that the Son of God is similar to the Father. The proponents of this new concept apparently convinced the emperor that this kind of vague and ambiguous formulation, which excluded the question of substance, could secure him the agreement of many Synod Fathers with the most diverse views. The preparatory commission also established the procedure for this double synod: that at the end of the session, the participants in each of the synods were to send a delegation to the emperor to inform him of the results of the discussions and to give final form to the agreed conclusions.

3.1. The Synod of Rimini

In the summer of 359, more than four hundred bishops of the West from all the provinces of this part of the empire arrived in Rimini⁶⁸. Only Rome was not represented. Apparently, the emperor did not send any invitation to the papal see, perhaps because there were two bishops there – Liberius and Felix II. It was also a sign that Pope Liberius' submission to Constantius' demands did not increase the imperial respect for him.

At the beginning of the Synod of Rimini, the overwhelming majority were supporters of orthodox Nicene theology, which influenced the course of events. The Arian group constituted only about

⁶⁷ Cf. *ibid.*, 4, 17, 3. Greek text in: Athanasius Alexandrinus, *De synodis* 8; Socrates Scholasticus, *Historia ecclesiastica* 2, 37.

⁶⁸ Cf. C.A. Balducci, *Aspetti religiosi e politici del concilio di Rimini*, Rimini 1960.

twenty percent of all the participants in the synod, and was headed by bishops: Valens and Ursacius of Pannonia, Auxentius of Milan and Saturninus of Arles⁶⁹. It is not surprising, then, that the majority of the bishops in Rimini did not adopt the new formula of Sirmium. Moreover, the leaders of the minority Arian stream were excommunicated and their fidelity to the decisions of the First Council of Nicaea (325 AD) was re-professed. A delegation was also appointed to present the conclusions to Emperor Constantius II. However, since the Arian opposition did not accept this declaration of the synod, two delegations set out from Rimini to the East to meet the emperor in Constantinople. Unfortunately, while the Arian group was immediately received by the emperor, the majority (Catholic) delegation was ordered to wait in Adrianople and then in Nicaea in Thrace⁷⁰. The leader of this orthodox group was the famous Restitute of Carthage⁷¹, who, however, was not up to the task. Soon, representatives of the Arian minority infiltrated the group of Latin bishops and made their Catholic colleagues explain the formula from Sirmium for so long that finally these “orthodox” signed the document. Moreover, they even went so far as to solemnly reaffirm their alliance with the Arian bishops excommunicated in Rimini. This happened in October 359⁷².

⁶⁹ With regard to Saturninus of Arles, cf. E. Griffe, *La Gaule chrétienne*, pp. 224–226, 243–246, 262–264; 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, *passim*; V. Saxer, S. Samulowitz, *Saturnino di Arles*, in: *Nuovo dizionario patristico e di antichità cristiane*, (ed.) A. Di Berardino, Genoa – Milan 2008, col. 4768–4769.

⁷⁰ Cf. Athanasius Alexandrinus, *Historia Arianorum* 16; 44; Athanasius Alexandrinus, *Apologia contra Arianos* 48.

⁷¹ With regard to the Restitute of Carthage, cf. A. Di Berardino, *Restituto (o Restuto)*, in: *Nuovo dizionario patristico e di antichità cristiane*, (ed.) A. Di Berardino, Genova – Milano 2008, col. 4499–4500.

⁷² Cf. Athanasius Alexandrinus, *De synodis* 8; Socrates Scholasticus, *Historia ecclesiastica* 2, 37.

Meanwhile, in Rimini, four hundred bishops had been waiting for three months for the emperor's decision and the possibility of returning to their dioceses. The city offered little entertainment, and the imperial official in charge of external order made it more and more clear to them that they would not be able to leave the city without signing the second formula of Sirmium. For this reason, the Catholic bishops, although they constituted the majority, were unstopably broken in their views, until finally they were even ready to thank the emperor in writing for his concern for the preservation of the uncorrupted faith! The last group of about fifteen bishops, who still had doubts about signing them, were assured that they would still be able to make some clarifications after signing. These additions were of no interest to the emperor, who already had in his hands an extensive document – the profession of faith (*professio* “*Sirmiana*”) signed by all the bishops of the West (except, of course, the exiles). It goes without saying that this confession was contrary to the formula of the First Council of Nicaea (325 A.D.).

3.2. The Synod of Seleucia

At the end of September 359, when the conflict in Rimini was coming to an end, the bishops of the East met for the first time in Seleucia⁷³. All of the one hundred and fifty present were Arians divided into three streams. The most important was the Homoyouzian faction⁷⁴, represented by Basil of Ancyra, Macedonius of Constantinople⁷⁵,

⁷³ Cf. Socrates Scholasticus, *Historia ecclesiastica* 2, 39–40; Sozomenus, *Historia ecclesiastica* 4, 22.

⁷⁴ Cf. J. Gummerus, *Die homöusianische Partei bis zum Tode des Konstantius*, Leipzig 1900; M. Simonetti, *Omeousiani*, in: *Nuovo dizionario patristico e di antichità cristiane*, (ed.) A. Di Berardino, Genova – Milano 2007, col. 3605–3607.

⁷⁵ With regard to Macedonius and his supporters (macedonian), cf. F. Loofs, *Die Christologie der Macedonianer*, Leipzig 1916, pp. 64–76; M. Simonetti, *Macedonio*

Silvanus of Tarsus⁷⁶, among others. In the second place, there was the homoiosian stream⁷⁷, led by Acacius of Caesarea of Palestine⁷⁸, after whom his followers were also called Acacians⁷⁹. The weakest was the radical anomean stream⁸⁰ represented by George of Alexandria⁸¹ and Eudoxius of Antioch⁸².

The bishops, divided into three fighting factions, did not come to an agreement. Most of them were in favour of reaffirming the formula of faith established by the so-called “synod of the consecration of the church”, which took place in Antioch in 341. Meanwhile,

(macedoniani), in: *Nuovo dizionario patristico e di antichità cristiane*, (ed.) A. Di Berardino, Genova – Milano 2007, col. 2961–2962.

⁷⁶ Regarding Silvanus of Tarsus, cf. R.P.C. Hanson, *The Search for the Christian Doctrine of God: the Arian Controversy*, 318–381, Edinburgh 1988, pp. 763–764; Simonetti, M., *Silvano di Tarso*, in: *Nuovo dizionario patristico e di antichità cristiane*, (ed.) A. Di Berardino, Genova – Milano 2008, col. 4937–4938.

⁷⁷ Lt. H.Chr. Brennecke, *Studien zur Geschichte der Homöer. Der Osten bis zum Ende der homöischen Reichskirche*, Tübingen 1899; M. Simonetti, *Omei*, in: *Nuovo dizionario patristico e di antichità cristiane*, (ed.) A. Di Berardino, Genova – Milano 2007, col. 3599–3600.

⁷⁸ Regarding Acacius, cf. J.M. Leroux, *Acace évêque de Césarée de Palestine (341–365)*, *Studia Patristica* 8 (= Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur 93), Berlin 1966; M. Simonetti, *Acacio di Cesarea*, in: *Nuovo dizionario patristico e di antichità cristiane*, (ed.) A. Di Berardino, Genova-Milano 2006, col. 36–37.

⁷⁹ With regard to acacias, cf. Socrates Scholasticus, *Historia ecclesiastica* 2, 39–40; Sozomenus, *Historia ecclesiastica* 4, 22–23. Cf. also M. Simonetti, *Acaciani*, in: *Nuovo dizionario patristico e di antichità cristiane*, (ed.) A. Di Berardino, Genova – Milano 2006, col. 35.

⁸⁰ With regard to the anomei, cf. M. Simonetti, *Anomei (anomeismo)*, in: *Nuovo dizionario patristico e di antichità cristiane*, (ed.) A. Di Berardino, Genova – Milano 2006, col. 322–323.

⁸¹ With regard to the Arian George, cf. M. Simonetti, *Giorgio il Cappadoce*, in: *Nuovo dizionario patristico e di antichità cristiane*, (ed.) A. Di Berardino, Genova – Milano 2007, col. 2170.

⁸² With regard to Eudoxius, cf. M. Simonetti, *Eudossio*, in: *Nuovo dizionario patristico e di antichità cristiane*, (ed.) A. Di Berardino, Genova – Milano 2006, col. 1823–1824.

the Acacians, at the session of their group, adhered to the last formula from Sirmium, but added to it the condemnation of the term *ἀνόμοιος*⁸³. Since the Homoyouzians, who constituted the majority, remained adamant in their attitude, the Acacians left the synod and immediately began negotiations with the emperor. The Homoyouzians also sent their trusted men to Constantine.

In the dispute over imperial support, the Acacians finally won, because their theology was in line with what had already been signed in Rimini. After a long and fierce opposition, the Homoyouzians relented when the emperor revealed that on January 1, 360, on the occasion of the beginning of his tenth consulate, he intended to announce to the inhabitants of the empire that religious peace had been restored⁸⁴. In this way, the profession of faith of the First Ecumenical Council of Nicaea (325 A.D.) was completely abandoned. With the adoption of homoian theology, the Arian orientation clearly prevailed.

However, Emperor Constantius II wanted his victory to be solemnly confirmed by a joint synod. He met in Constantinople in January 360⁸⁵. Apart from the Eastern bishops, only a few bishops from Thrace were on it. The Synod in this composition finally approved this formula of faith, the signing of which was forced in Rimini; it was to be valid forever. To ensure that this formula was accepted by all, bishops with dissenting views were tried, although it was not explicitly called a condemnation for a different, “heterodox” doctrine, but a punishment for alleged abuse of power in the exercise of office. In this way, all the bishops who led the Homoyouzians lost their sees, and the Emperor Constantius made this sentence even

⁸³ Cf. Athanasius Alexandrinus, *De synodis* 29; Socrates Scholasticus, *Historia ecclesiastica* 2, 39–40.

⁸⁴ Cf. Theodoretus, *Historia ecclesiastica* 2, 8, 37–52; Athanasius Alexandrinus, *Tomos ad Antiochenos* 5.

⁸⁵ Cf. Athanasius Alexandrinus, *Apologia contra Arianos* 44–51; Theodoretus, *Historia ecclesiastica* 3, 8, 1–36; Hilarius Pictaviensis, *Fragmentum historicum* 2, 1–8.

more severe, condemning to exile those who did not meet the requirements of the decree issued by him.

Like in the West, efforts were made to induce the submission of those Eastern bishops who did not participate in any of these synods. However, the hiding bishop of Alexandria, St. Athanasius, has not yet been found by the imperial police, who could only establish that he had sent a letter to all the bishops of Egypt and Libya in which he called on them to be faithful to the Nicene Creed and to refuse to sign the heretical confession⁸⁶. Owing to this, the whole Egypt remained holding the true faith. In other provinces of the East, too, there were individual bishops here and there who preferred exile rather than renouncing their Catholic faith⁸⁷. On the other hand, Acacius (probably not wanting to exacerbate the conflicts) filled the episcopal sees in which there were no ordinaries mostly with people who were not interested in the “ecclesiastical politics” in the past. However, all the important ecclesiastical centres, such as Alexandria, Antioch, Constantinople, Caesarea in Palestine, Sirmium in the Balkans, and Milan, still had Arian bishops, and it seemed that Arianism had forever become the only possible profession of the Christian faith.

* * *

To sum up, let us quote the words of St. Jerome, who observed the described events, and judged them harshly: “the world, groaning in pain, saw with astonishment that it had become Arian”⁸⁸. Fortunately, we know the course of history, leading to the triumph

⁸⁶ Critical text: C.H. Turner (pub.), *Ecclesiae occidentalis monumenta iuris antiquissima*, vol. 1, Oxford 1939, pp. 480–482.

⁸⁷ Cf. canons 3, 4, 7.

⁸⁸ Hieronymus Stridonensis, *Adversus Luciferianos* 29: “[...] ingemuit totus orbis et Arianum se esse miratus est”. Cf. B. Degórski, *Il giudizio di san Girolamo sull'imperatore Costantino il Grande secondo la continuazione della «Cronaca» di Eusebio di Cesarea*, in: I. Bodrožić, Š. Bilokapić (pub.), *Sanctus Hieronymus Dalmatiae vir il-*

of the true Nicene faith after only about twenty years, which, after the Arian turmoil, was confirmed and resealed at the First Council of Constantinople in 381⁸⁹. This confession of the legitimate Christian faith in the Triune God is common to all Christians to this day.

Bibliography

Sources

Athanasius Alexandrinus, *Apologia ad Constantium*, in: J.-M. Szymusiak (pub.), *Sources Chrétiennes* 56 bis, Paris 1958.

Athanasius Alexandrinus, *Apologia contra Arianos*, in: J.-P. Migne (pub.), *Patrologiae cursus completus. Series Graeca*, vol. 25, Parisiis 1857, col. 247–410.

Athanasius Alexandrinus, *Apologia de fuga*, in: J.-M. Szymusiak (pub.), *Sources Chrétiennes* 56 bis, Paris 1958.

Athanasius Alexandrinus, *De synodis*, in: J.-P. Migne (pub.), *Patrologiae cursus completus. Series Graeca*, vol. 26, Parisiis 1857, col. 681–794.

Athanasius Alexandrinus, *Historia Arianorum ad monachos*, in: J.-P. Migne (pub.), *Patrologiae cursus completus. Series Graeca*, vol. 25, Parisiis 1857, col. 691–796.

Athanasius Alexandrinus, *Tomos ad Antiochenos*, in: A. Segneri (pub.), *Atanasio, Lettera agli antiocheni*, Biblioteca Patristica 46, Bologna 2010.

Ecclesiae occidentalis monumenta iuris antiquissima, in: C.H. Turner (pub.), *Ecclesiae Occidentalis Monumenta Juris Antiquissima*, Oxford 1939.

lustris. Zbornik radova s međunarodnog znanstvenog skupa održanog u Splitu 24. i 25. rujna 2020, Split 2023, pp. 311–323.

⁸⁹ Cf. B. Degórski, *Sformułowanie wiary w Trójjedynego Boga w latach 360–380. Formuła dogmatyczna μία οὐσία – τρεῖς ὑποστάσεις*, “*Vox Patrum*” 21 (2001) no. 40–41, pp. 227–235; B. Degórski, *Il primo Concilio di Costantinopoli (381). Uno schizzo storico e teologico*, “*Vox Patrum*” 36 (2016) no. 65, pp. 155–170.

- Epiphanius Constantiensis, *Panarion*, in: G. Pini (pub.), Epifanio di Salamina, *Panarion. Testo greco a fronte*, vol. 1–3, Brescia 210–2017.
- Hieronymus Stridonensis, *Adversus Luciferianos*, in: J.-P. Migne (pub.), *Patrologiae cursus completus. Series Latina*, vol. 23, Parisiis 1883, col. 155–182.
- Hieronymus Stridonensis, *Chronicon*, in: B. Degórski (pub.), *Hieronymi historica et hagiographica*, Hieronymi opera, vol. 15, Roma 2014, pp. 236–307.
- Hilarius Pictaviensis, *Adversus Constantium*, in: J.-P. Migne (pub.), *Patrologiae cursus completus. Series Latina*, vol. 10, Parisiis 1845, col. 577–606.
- Hilarius Pictaviensis, *De synodis*, in: J.-P. Migne (pub.), *Patrologiae cursus completus. Series Latina*, vol. 10, Parisiis 1845, col. 471–546.
- Hilarius Pictaviensis, *Fragmentum historicum*, in: J.-P. Migne (pub.), *Patrologiae cursus completus. Series Latina*, vol. 10, Parisiis 1845, col. 553–572.
- Hilarius Pictaviensis, *Liber adversus Valentem et Ursacium*, in: A. Fered (ed.), *S. Hilarii Pictaviensis opera*, pars IV, *Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum*, vol. 65, Vindobonae – Lipsiae 1916, pp. 189–193.
- Luciferus Calaritanus, *Moriendum esse pro Filio Dei*, in: G. Hartel (pub.), *Luciferi Calaritani opuscula*, *Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum*, vol. 14, Vindobonae 1886, pp. 284–318.
- Philostorgius, *Historia ecclesiastica*, in: B. Bleckmann – M. Stein (pub.), *Philostorgios Kirchengeschichte*, vol. 1–2, Paderborn 2015.
- Scolies ariennes sur le concile d'Aquilée*, introduction, texte latin et notes par R. Gryson, *Sources Chrétiennes* 267, Paris 1980.
- Socrates Scholasticus, *Historia ecclesiastica*, in: J.-P. Migne (ed.), *Patrologiae cursus completus. Series Graeca*, vol. 67, Parisiis 1864, col. 29–872.
- Sozomenus, *Historia ecclesiastica*, in: J.-P. Migne (ed.), *Patrologiae cursus completus. Series Graeca*, vol. 67, Parisiis 1864, col. 874–1630.
- Theodoretus, *Historia ecclesiastica*, in: J.-P. Migne (ed.), *Patrologiae cursus completus. Series Graeca*, vol. 82, Parisiis 1884, col. 881–1280.

Studies

- Balducci C.A., *Aspetti religiosi e politici del concilio di Rimini*, Rimini 1960.
- Barnes T.D., *Athanasius and Constantius: Theology and Politics in the Constantinian Empire*, Cambridge 1993.
- N.H. Baynes, *Constantine the Great*, London 1930.
- Borchardt C.F.A., *Hilary of Poitiers' Role in the Arian Struggle*, Den Haag 1966.
- Bosco T., *Eusebio di Vercelli nel suo tempo pagano e cristiano*, Torino 1995.
- Brennecke H.C., *Hilarius von Poitiers und die Bischofsopposition gegen Konstantius II.: Untersuchungen zur dritten Phase des Arianischen Streites (337–361)*, Berlin – New York 1984.
- Brennecke H.C., *Hilarius von Poitiers und die Bischofsopposition gegen Konstantius II. Untersuchungen zur dritten Phase des arianischen Streites (337–361)*, Berlin – New York 1984.
- Brennecke H.Chr., *Studien zur Geschichte der Homöer. Der Osten bis zum Ende der homöischen Reichskirche*, Tübingen 1899.
- Capellino M. (ed.), *S. Eusebio di Vercelli (Documenti e osservazioni storico-teologiche)*, Vercelli 1996.
- Capellino M., *Spiritualità di S. Eusebio*, Vercelli 1986.
- Cavalcanti E., *Studi Eunomiani*, Roma 1976.
- Corti G., *Lucifero di Cagliari*, Milano 2004.
- Crouzel H., Odrobina L., *Rodanio di Tolosa*, in: *Nuovo dizionario patristico e di antichità cristiane*, (ed.) A. Di Berardino, Genova – Milano 2008, col. 4573–4574.
- Crovella E., *S. Eusebio di Vercelli*, Vercelli 1960.
- Cuneo P.O., *La legislazione di Costantino II, Costanzo II e Costante (337–361)*, Milano 1997.
- Curti C., *Eusebio di Cesarea*, in: *Nuovo dizionario patristico e di antichità cristiane*, (ed.) A. Di Berardino, Genova – Milano 2006, col. 1845–1853.
- Dattrino L., *Eusebio di Vercelli*, in: *Nuovo dizionario patristico e di antichità cristiane*, (ed.) A. Di Berardino, Genova – Milano 2006, col. 1861–1862.

- Degórski B., *Sformułowanie wiary w Trójjedynego Boga w latach 360–380. Formuła dogmatyczna $\mu\acute{\alpha}$ οὐσία – τρεῖς ὑποστάσεις*, “Vox Patrum” 21 (2001) fasc. 40–41, pp. 227–235.
- Degórski B., *Il primo Concilio di Costantinopoli (381). Uno schizzo storico e teologico*, “Vox Patrum” 36 (2016) fasc. 65, pp. 155–170.
- Degórski B., *Il giudizio di san Girolamo sull'imperatore Costantino il Grande secondo la continuazione della «Cronaca» di Eusebio di Cesarea*, in: I. Bodrožić, Š. Bilokapić (ed.), *Sanctus Hieronymus Dalmatiae vir illustris. Zbornik radova s međunarodnog znanstvenog skupa održanog u Splitu 24. i 25. rujna 2020*, Split 2023, pp. 311–323.
- Di Berardino A., *Milano. II. Concili*, in: *Nuovo dizionario patristico e di antichità cristiane*, (ed.) A. Di Berardino, Genova – Milano 2007, col. 3277–3279.
- Di Berardino A., *Restituto (o Restuto)*, in: *Nuovo dizionario patristico e di antichità cristiane*, (ed.) A. Di Berardino, Genova – Milano 2008, col. 4499–4500.
- Doignon J., *Hilaire de Poitiers avant l'exil*, Paris 1971.
- Durengues A., *Le livre de Phoebade contre les Arien*, Agen 1927.
- Durst M., *Die Eschatologie des Hilarius von Poitiers: ein Beitrag zur Dogmengeschichte des vierten Jahrhunderts*, Bonn 1987.
- Duval Y.-M., *L'extirpation de l'arianisme en Italie du Nord et en Occident: Rimini (359/60) et Aquilée (381), Hilaire de Poitiers (367/8) et Ambroise de Milan (397)*, Aldershot 1998.
- Eusebio di Vercelli e il suo tempo*, (eds.) E. dal Covolo, R. Ugliione, G.M. Vian, Roma 1997.
- Figura M., *Das Kirchenverständnis des Hilarius von Poitiers*, Freiburg – Basel – Wien 1984.
- Forlin Patrucco M., *Costanzo II*, in: *Nuovo dizionario patristico e di antichità cristiane*, (ed.) A. Di Berardino, Genova – Milano 2006, col. 1247–1248.
- Gigli G., *L'ortodossia, l'arianesimo e la politica di Costanzo II (337–361)*, Roma 1949.
- Goemans M., *L'exil du pape Libère*, in: *Mélanges Chr. Mohrmann*, Utrecht 1963, s. 184–189.
- Griffe E., *La Gaule chrétienne à l'époque romaine*, vol. 1, Paris 1964².

- Gummerus J., *Die homöusianische Partei bis zum Tode des Konstantius*, Leipzig 1900.
- Hanson R.P.C., *The Search for the Christian Doctrine of God: the Arian Controversy*, 318–381, Edinburgh 1988.
- Hess H., *The Canons of the Council of Serdica*, London 1958.
- Kienast D., *Römische Kaisertabelle: Grundzüge einer römischen Kaiserchronologie*, Darmstadt 1990.
- Klein R., *Constantius II und die christliche Kirche*, Darmstadt 1977.
- Kopecek T.A., *A History of Neo-Arianism*, vol. 1, Cambridge MA 1979.
- Labande E.R. (ed.), *Hilaire et son temps. Actes du Colloque de Poitiers, 29 septembre – 3 octobre 1968, à l'occasion du XVI^e centenaire de la mort de saint Hilaire*, Paris 1969.
- Ladaria L.F., *El Espíritu Santo en San Hilario de Poitiers*, Madrid 1977.
- Ladaria L.F., *La cristología de Hilario de Poitiers*, Roma 1989.
- Leroux J.M., *Acace évêque de Césarée de Palestine (341–365)*, *Studia Patristica* 8 (= Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur 93), Berlin 1966.
- Longobardo L., *Il linguaggio negativo della trascendenza di Dio in Ilario di Poitiers*, Napoli 1982.
- Loofs F., *Die Christologie der Macedonianer*, Leipzig 1916.
- Marone P., *Felice II antipapa*, in: *Nuovo dizionario patristico e di antichità cristiane*, (ed.) A. Di Berardino, Genova – Milano 2007, col. 1927.
- Martin A., *Athanase d'Alexandrie et l'Église d'Égypte au IV^e siècle (328–373)*, Rome 1996.
- Munier Ch. – Pilara G., *Arles*, in: *Nuovo dizionario patristico e di antichità cristiane*, (ed.) A. Di Berardino, Genova – Milano 2006, col. 535–540.
- Pilloni F., *Influssi Eunomiani sull'origine e lo sviluppo della teologia dei Cappadoci*, Roma 1998.
- Saxer V. – Samulowitz S., *Saturnino di Arles*, in: *Nuovo dizionario patristico e di antichità cristiane*, (ed.) A. Di Berardino, Genova – Milano 2008, col. 4768–4769.
- Simonetti M., *Acaciani*, in: *Nuovo dizionario patristico e di antichità cristiane*, (ed.) A. Di Berardino, Genova – Milano 2006, col. 35.
- Simonetti M., *Acacio di Cesarea*, in: *Nuovo dizionario patristico e di antichità cristiane*, (ed.) A. Di Berardino, Genova – Milano 2006, col. 36–37.

- Simonetti M., *Aezio di Antiochia*, in: *Nuovo dizionario patristico e di antichità cristiane*, (ed.) A. Di Berardino, Genova – Milano 2006, col. 91–92.
- Simonetti M., *Anomei (anomeismo)*, in: *Nuovo dizionario patristico e di antichità cristiane*, (ed.) A. Di Berardino, Genova – Milano 2006, col. 322–323.
- Simonetti M., *Aussenzio di Milano*, in: *Nuovo dizionario patristico e di antichità cristiane*, (ed.) A. Di Berardino, Genova – Milano 2006, col. 662–663.
- Simonetti M., *Basilio di Ancira*, in: *Nuovo dizionario patristico e di antichità cristiane*, (ed.) A. Di Berardino, Genova – Milano 2006, col. 723–724.
- Simonetti M., *Dionigi di Milano*, in: *Nuovo dizionario patristico e di antichità cristiane*, (ed.) A. Di Berardino, Genova – Milano 2006, col. 1443.
- Simonetti M., *Eudossio*, in: *Nuovo dizionario patristico e di antichità cristiane*, (ed.) A. Di Berardino, Genova – Milano 2006, col. 1823–1824.
- Simonetti M., *Eunomio di Cizico*, in: *Nuovo dizionario patristico e di antichità cristiane*, (ed.) A. Di Berardino, Genova – Milano 2006, col. 1836–1837.
- Simonetti M., *Germinio di Sirmio*, in: *Nuovo dizionario patristico e di antichità cristiane*, (ed.) A. Di Berardino, Genova – Milano 2007, col. 2106–2107.
- Simonetti M., *Giorgio il Cappadoce*, in: *Nuovo dizionario patristico e di antichità cristiane*, (ed.) A. Di Berardino, Genova – Milano 2007, col. 2170.
- Simonetti M., *Ilario di Poitiers*, in: *Nuovo dizionario patristico e di antichità cristiane*, (ed.) A. Di Berardino, Genova – Milano 2007, col. 2521–2528.
- Simonetti M., *Macedonio (macedoniani)*, in: *Nuovo dizionario patristico e di antichità cristiane*, (ed.) A. Di Berardino, Genova – Milano 2007, col. 2961–2962.
- Simonetti M., *Omei*, in: *Nuovo dizionario patristico e di antichità cristiane*, (ed.) A. Di Berardino, Genova – Milano 2007, col. 3599–3600.
- Simonetti M., *Omeousiani*, in: *Nuovo dizionario patristico e di antichità cristiane*, (ed.) A. Di Berardino, Genova – Milano 2007, col. 3605–3607.

- Simonetti M., *Ossio*, in: *Nuovo dizionario patristico e di antichità cristiane*, (ed.) A. Di Berardino, Genova – Milano 2007, col. 3700.
- Simonetti M., *Paolino di Treviri*, in: *Nuovo dizionario patristico e di antichità cristiane*, (ed.) A. Di Berardino, Genova – Milano 2008, col. 3832–3833.
- Simonetti M., *Silvano di Tarso*, in: *Nuovo dizionario patristico e di antichità cristiane*, (ed.) A. Di Berardino, Genova – Milano 2008, col. 4937–4938.
- Smulders P., *La doctrine trinitaire de s. Hilaire de Poitiers*, Roma 1944.
- Studer B., *Giulio I papa*, in: *Nuovo dizionario patristico e di antichità cristiane*, (ed.) A. Di Berardino, Genova – Milano 2007, col. 2317–2318.
- Studer B., *Liberio papa*, in: *Nuovo dizionario patristico e di antichità cristiane*, (ed.) A. Di Berardino, Genova – Milano 2007, col. 2822–2823.
- Vaccari G., *La teologia della assunzione in Ilario di Poitiers: uno studio sui termini “adsumere” e “adsumptio”*, Roma 1994.
- Vaggione R.P. (ed.), *Eunomius. The extant works, Text and translation*, Oxford 1987.
- Vaggione R.P., *Eunomius of Cyzicus and the Nicene revolution*, Oxford 2000.
- Ventura da Silva G., *Reis, santos e feiticeiras. Constância II e os fundamentos místicos da basileia 337–361*, Vitoria 2003.