

The Parting of the Ways: The East and the West at the Council of Serdica AD. 343.*

Turhan KAÇAR (**)

Özet

Bu çalışma, doğu batı kiliseleri arasındaki ilk kez miladi 343 yılında toplanan Serdika (Sofya) konsili esnasında ortaya çıkan bölünmenin nedenleri üzerine yoğunlaşmaktadır. Hıristiyan kilisenin tecrübe ettiği bu ilk bölünme, teolojik değil, politik faktörlerle izah edilecektir. Zira konsile gelen hem doğulu hem de batılı piskoposlar daha önceki konsillerde almış oldukları kararların baskısı altındaydılar. Bunun yanısıra, batı dünyasında otoritesini kabul ettirmiş olan Roma piskoposu, doğu piskoposlarını da etkisi altına almaya çalışıyordu. Konsildeki bu yüksek politikaların yanısıra, Balkan kentlerinin piskoposlarının nasıl saf belirledikleri de ele alınarak, bölgesel politik endişelere de yer verildi.

Anahtar Terimler: Serdika konsili, Roma piskoposluğu. Dördüncü yüzyıl kilise politikaları.

Abstract

The eastern and the western Christianity experienced the first schism at the council of Serdica, held in AD. 343. This schism, as observed by a fifth century church historian Socrates of Constantinople, was never healed afterwards, on the contrary it was gradually deepened. Therefore the aim of this paper is to analyze the factors behind that division. The argument here is this: the rift between the western and eastern churches was not the direct effects of any theological differences, because after Nicaea the Arian doctrine was not the issue yet, but it was due to the preceding uncompromising political setting of the council and its exploitation by the bishop of Rome. The second argument in this paper is to pursue the role and the preferences of the Balkan bishops at the council.

Key Words: The Serdican council, the Roman episcopacy, the fourth century church politics.

*An earlier version of this paper was delivered at an international conference. "The Byzantine Heritage and the Balkans". held in Plovdiv in Bulgaria in 6-9th September 2001. Here I would like to express my gratitude to the TUBA (The Turkish Academy of Sciences), which supported a part of the financial burden of my travel to that conference. I particularly acknowledge my hearty thanks to the anonymous referee(s) of this journal, who saved me from several errors.

** Assistant Prof. Dr., Balıkesir University, Department of History.

1. Introduction

The council of Serdica (mod. Sophia) has occupied a unique place both in the history of church councils and in the parting of the ways in the eastern and western Christianity. A fair-minded observant and critic, Socrates, fifth-century church historian, wrote that "from that time on the western church was severed from the eastern and the boundary between them was the mountain called Soucis that divides Illyrians from the Thracians."¹ The council was summoned by the joint authority of the emperors Constans (337-350) and Constantius II (337-361) principally to settle the orthodoxy of Athanasius, bishop of Alexandria (328-373) and of the other eastern bishops, who were deposed and exiled previously. As the council was summoned by the western and eastern *Augusti*, it was intended that it should be an ecumenical meeting, however the eastern bishops refused to attend on the ground that Athanasius and other eastern bishops, whom they themselves had deposed were being regarded by the western bishops as proper members of the council. Having met by themselves under the presidency of Hosius, bishop of Corduba (mod. Cordoba) in Spain (296-356), the western bishops confirmed the restoration of Athanasius and the other exiled eastern bishops, and the western assembly also deposed prominent leaders of the rival eastern body of bishops. This is the brief account of the council. As there are several good studies for the various aspects of the council,• a detailed account is not given here. Rather, two specific points are to be taken into consideration; the politics which led to a schism between the East and the West, and the function of the Balkan bishops at the council. That the Christian bishops fell into schism at this council is a rather very well known phenomenon, but the historical foundations of the Roman contribution to this schism, as far as I can see, has not been sufficiently studied. Therefore I will attempt to explore the preceding uncompromising political setting of the council and its exploitation by the authoritarian and interfering enterprises of the bishop of Rome. The second argument in this paper is to pursue the role of the Balkan bishops at the council. On what criteria did they choose the side to which they joined? And did they play any particular role in the schism?

2. The Preceding Setting

Before going into any further detail a serious concentration must be given on to the preceding political setting of the council, because it was on this setting that the bishop of Rome designed his political scheme. The immediate historical context of the council was the political consequences of the theological breach which the early church had experienced in the Arian crisis and at the council of Nicaea in 325.³ The theological solution on the nature of Christ reached at Nicaea (mod. Iznik) had satisfied only few

eastern bishops. Although most of them unwittingly signed the official creed, few Arians had been excommunicated and expelled from the church. In a couple of years after Nicaea the exiles returned and resumed their power. This led a harsh political conflict between the eastern bishops.⁴ The leading pro-Nicene bishops lost their sees progressively even at the reign of Constantinus the Great (306-337). The anti-Nicene bishops did not publicly denounce the Nicene creed, however they gained the control of the great bishoprics in the eastern Christianity. During these struggles bishops like Eustathius of Antiochia, Asclepius of Gazza (in Palastine), Athanasius of Alexandria (in Egypt), Marcellus of Ancyra (mod. Ankara) were successively deposed from their sees. Eustathius and Asclepius were deposed at Antiochia in 326 or 327. Athanasius was first tried at Tyrus (mod. Sur in Lebanon) in 335 and then at a court hearing by Constantine, who eventually exiled him in the following year.⁶ However, none of these depositions can be connected to their firmness to the Nicene creed, rather criminal records or extreme theological lapses were the issue.⁷ Yet, when the death of Constantinus in 337 was proclaimed, the return of the exiled bishops was also provided.⁸ Athanasius' second exile or escape came soon. At a council in Antiochia (mod. Antakya) in 338, Athanasius was once more deposed on the ground that the verdict of the council of Tyrus had not been canceled yet and an appointment was made in his place.⁹ Athanasius convoked a counter council to justify himself and produced an encyclical letter,¹⁰ however, when the appointee of the Eusebian party at Antiochia arrived at Alexandria, he took flight to Rome, where a power seeking bishop Julius (337-352), convened another council late in 340 or early in 341 and vindicated his exiled eastern colleagues, without inquiring the reason of their depositions. The first involvement of the bishop of Rome in the dispute falls to the year 338 or to early 339, when a deputation from Antiochia and a counter one from Alexandria met in Rome.¹² Having taken the opportunity Julius communicated imperatively to the eastern bishops, who were then meeting in Antiochia to consecrate the golden Church in late 341.¹³ Although the eastern bishops did not give any heed to Julius' letter, his intervention found its political effects very soon, and the western emperor Constans upholding the case wrote to the brother-emperor Constantius II, who unwillingly accepted his brother's offer after eighteen months had passed, probably because of the pressing conditions of the frontier problems with the Iranians.¹⁴ It was decided that the council was to be held at Serdica, a border city between the two halves of the empire and just within Constans' dominion. Although the participating bishops from the western churches and the body of the eastern bishops arrived at Serdica in the autumn of 343,¹⁵ they never came together under one roof and held different assemblies.¹⁶

3. The Basis Of The Roman Intervention

It was obvious that the council had been assembled by the direct intervention of the

bishop of Rome on behalf of the eastern exiled bishops. The preceding setting and afterwards of the council show that the Roman bishop was not steering a reconciliatory way between the eastern bishops, but rather he was attempting to dictate his own solution without giving any objective heed to both sides. Regarding the admittance of Athanasius of Alexandria and other bishops into communion and to the proper membership of an ecclesiastical meeting without making any little inquiry into their cases, the Western attitude before and at the council was in compromising with the see of Rome. In fact, a Roman council of fifty bishops in 341¹⁷ and the western bishops of Serdica had decided just on the basis of what they had been told, not what the truth was behind all these matters.

Although the sixth canon of Nicaea restricted the Roman bishop's sphere of influence only to the western provinces of the empire,¹⁸ why Julius of Rome got involved into an eastern ecclesiastical matter? A brief answer to the problem must be that the attitude of Julius of Rome was purely political, as he was not playing the role of an intermediary but a judge. When Julius took the side of Athanasius, he did not know the matter in detail except the Athanasian version of the story. What political concern the bishop of Rome was following is quite simple. It was not of course sweet memories of the past alliance between the two great sees,¹⁹ rather the bishop of Rome was trying to impose his sway on the eastern provinces of the Roman empire, by this way he would secure and enjoy a world-wide ecclesiastical authority. A further significant question must be asked here; what past perspectives had become determinative in the imperative attitude of the bishop Julius? Because the claim of authority must have been based on either alleged or genuine historical foundations on behalf of the claimant.

Julius of Rome had written to the eastern bishops, who were then at the council of Antiochia in 341 that "why nothing was written to us concerning the church of Alexandrians in particular? Are you ignorant that the custom has been for word to be written first to us, and then for a just sentence to be passed from this place"²⁰ Obviously there was no such custom that the eastern bishops must have given information to the bishop of Rome on each case they decided, on the contrary, there were attempts by the Roman bishops to exercise a universal authority even from the first century onwards.

The letter of Clemens of Rome to the church of Corinthians at the very end of the first century must have been the first sign of the Roman involvement of the other churches internal matters.²¹ Probably the power behind this attempt was not only that the Roman church was an apostolic foundation as it was referred to Petrus,²² but the city of Rome was also the secular administrative center of the empire. The uninvited Roman intervention continued in the second and third centuries. When the Easter controversies began with the direct and domineering initiatives of a Roman bishop Victor at the end of the second century, he had even threatened to excommunicate the bishops of Asia

Minor if they would not have obeyed him.²³ in the third century, while the rebaptism issue was hotly being disputed, Stephanus of Rome, was not only snubbed and threatened the Anatolian bishops but he also rejected Cyprianus of Carthago (in mod. Tunisia).²⁴ There were other instances that the bishops of Rome did not miss the opportunity to impose authority. In the latter half of the third century, when some Libyan bishops complained of Dionysius of Alexandria, the namesake Dionysius of Rome took the complaints and urged the Alexandrian bishop.²⁵ However, two historical instances give a certain priority to the bishop of Rome; one is the case of Paulus of Samosata, about him the emperor Aurelianus (270-75) gave the authority to the bishops who were in communion with the bishop of Rome.²⁶ The other instance was the action of Constantinus during the Donatist schism, which Constantinus referred to the bishop of Rome to decide.²⁷ In fact, it was not surprising at all that although Constantinus referred the Donatist case to the bishop of Rome and three other bishops from Gaul, the Roman bishop shrewdly included another fifteen Italian colleagues to secure to get a result that he desired.²⁸ These are the background on which Julius of Rome was talking. Yet, the bishops of Rome would not conclusively secure a universal authority by these efforts. Therefore, the behavior of Julius in that case must be categorized as purely a further political endeavor to widen the authoritative sphere of the Roman Church.

The bishop of Rome did not attend the council of Serdica in person, but he had sent three of clergy as observants to there, as he did at the council of Nicaea.²⁹ It is really interesting to observe that the bishops of Rome had not been present at any council in the fourth century outside Rome. Obviously they did not want to put their position controversial at the councils, at which bishops often acted like political party groups and excommunication was always a possibility, which is implied by the letter of Hosius to Julius.³⁰ In fact, for the bishop of Rome there was no need to be present in person at Serdica because he would have acquired through his representatives as the proceedings of the council showed. At the end of the council the western bishops passed a canon that simply gave the arbitration of the appealing episcopal cases to the Roman bishop, who by this way was to impose a unique authority in the Church.³¹ The canon did not geographically restrict the authority of the arbitration only to the western provinces, but to the whole church. It seems that a considerable differing point of view between the eastern and the western churches was developing on the matter of authority. Previously an eastern council of Antiochia about 330 had decided that the arbitration of the controversial trials must be referred to a council of neighboring bishops,³² however the council of Serdica directly gave the authority of arbitration to the bishop of Rome.³³ Consequently the canon must be interpreted as the justification of the involvement on the part of the Roman bishop, before and during the course of the council. Another indication that the Roman bishop enjoyed a unique authority among the attendants of the

council must be pointed out. There was a specific letter, written to Julius by Hosius and Protegenes, to defend a creed accepted at the council and to report the proceedings. It is interesting to notice here that while the eastern body of bishops wrote an encyclical letter addressed to the churches, the western bishops had composed both an encyclical letter and a special letter to Rome, which begins with a full of biblical encomium to salute the authority of Rome often referring the Pauline letters.³⁴

4. The Balkan Participants

A considerable majority of the western bishops at the council were recruited from the Balkan provinces which under Constans' share of the empire, with the exception of few other bishops, though whose sees were in the administrative part of the eastern empire.³⁵ The reverse was also true. Some bishops, whose sees were in the eastern part of the empire, were among the western bishops. Therefore the political distribution of the Balkan bishops cannot simply be made according to the secular administrative status of their provinces. A Thracian bishop, Bassus of Diocletianapolis was among the body of the western bishops while the other two bishops from the same eastern province were with the easterners. It seems that Bassus did not want to be subservient to the bishops of Philippopolis (mod. Plovdiv in Bulgaria) and Beroe (Stara Zagora in Bulgaria) and he therefore chose to be with the western bishops, because the city of Diocletianapolis was a new foundation of the emperor Diocletianus in Thrace,³⁶ hence its bishop was only third among the others. Therefore, as he may well have wanted more prominence, he had chosen the western bishops. In fact this is only an interpretation from the point of regional political concerns. On the other hand, the bishop Bassus was unpopular among the eastern bishops, as a matter of fact, the synodal letter of the eastern bishops clearly betray the disreputation of Bassus among the Easterners, because he had been deported from Syria in the past because of his criminal record.³⁷ At a council, in which the multitude of the votes matters, bishops were ready to act obliquely and to disregard the infamy of their colleagues as long as they would vote on behalf of their party. A certain bishop from Achaia, Dionysius of Elis (an ancient city in southern Greece), had also been excommunicated before by some Balkan bishops,³⁸ but he was now among his judges with the western group of bishops. The existence of these two figures was not of course that because they thought the case of the exiled bishops or the ongoing other ecclesiastical problems were important but, simply their political interests were required to be among them.

Apparently, the preservation of the political positions sometimes preceded the theological views of some bishops. The participation of Gaudentius of Naissus (Nia in Yugoslavia) and Protegenes of Serdica into the western bishops may be indicated as the

example of this at the council of Serdica. The encyclical letter of the eastern bishops records that Protegenes and Gaudentius' predecessor Cyriacus were among the eastern bishops when they excommunicated Marcellus of Ancyra at a council in Constantinopolis in 336. More, the eastern encyclical letter accuses of Protegenes for being inconsistent because the bishop of Serdica had written against Marcellus in the past but now they were at the same side.³⁹ What had changed in Marcellus, even Athanasius preferred to keep silent about him?⁴⁰ Only a political explanation may be offered for the attitude of Protegenes. At the time of the council of Constantinopolis in 336, Constantinus was the sole ruler of the empire and therefore there was no administrative division, but now, the city of Serdica was just within the territory of the western emperor, consequently to be outside the group who was favoured by the western emperor would be a suspect or a discontent figure within the frontier and there was also a threat of excommunication for him in case he would not be with the western party. The great sees of the eastern Christianity were in a very farther distance to Serdica than Rome. Therefore the aged Protegenes would not have wanted to experience ecclesiastical conflicts in his old age. And he was also the host bishop too. But as a host he would not have to be with the western bishops because at the council of Nicaea the host bishop Theognis was not in the same opinion with the majority.⁴¹ However, the leadership of the western party may have attracted him because a high profile figure of the early Church, Hosius of Corduba, was heading the western group. The same was also true for Gaudentius of Naissus. Although his predecessor, Cyriacus had been one of the judges of Marcellus of Ancyra, Gaudentius leaving the tradition of his bishop opted for a political attitude and joined the western bishops.⁴² On the other hand, the see of Hadrianopolis (mod. Edirne) belonged to the eastern part of the empire, its bishop Lucius was among the western bishops. Athanasius reports that Lucius and his predecessor Eutropius were deposed by the machinations of Eusebius of Nicomedia (later of Constantinopolis), who was regarded as the leader of the eastern bishops by Athanasius and his supporters.⁴³ Therefore, the presence of Lucius among the western bishops was a necessity after all.

The positions of the Balkan bishops should not only be taken into consideration as a part of a political game, but their area of representation should be examined. For instance at the council, Dacia Ripensis, from the loop of the lower Danube was represented by two bishops, Calvus of Castramartus (the site is unknown) and Vitalis of Aquae (Negotin in Yugoslavia) at the council. This shows that Christianity was already a significant phenomenon in the region, because if a place had a bishop it had also a staff of lesser clergy and a considerable number of a Christian community. A final observation on the bishops of the Balkan provinces of the empire should be that these bishops did not particularly pursue a previously determined theology.

5. Epilogue

in conclusion, the council of Serdica would have been the first true ecumenical meeting of the western and eastern churches, if the bishops of both sides had managed to come under one roof, because the Nicene council was effectively an eastern assembly, in which only few specimen western representatives had attended. Yet the Serdican council became the first ecumenical fiasco in the early Church, because, as it is seen, the rift between the western and eastern churches was not the direct effects of any theological differences, rather the politicization of the ecclesiastical disputes by the bishop of Rome had on a large scale prevented a world-wide union. In fact, after the council of Nicaea the Arian doctrine was not the issue yet, and the Nicene creed had not become a mythological text. Another point has to be made here that the Roman endeavours to dictate its authority on the ecclesiastical matters is not only a fourth-century phenomenon but it is traceable from the first century onwards. As the Roman bishops accustomed to take every opportunity to expand their sphere of influence, the bishop of Rome once again exploited the political setting of the council. So the schism came. After all, the Serdican council must be regarded as the first very important step in the great schism between the eastern and western churches just because of the political concerns. Apparently this judgement is not given to deny the role of the linguistic and cultural differences in this schism, but it did not fail into the object of our discussion. The political attitudes of the Balkan bishops did not contribute on a large scale to this division, as they pursued only local concerns, which did not have any global impact on either side. However, as a conclusion, the wide representation of the Balkan churches at the council arises further topic to discuss, for instance their geographical distribution indicates the boundaries of the Christian mission in the early fourth century.

6. The List of the Ancient and Modern Sources

6.i. Ancient Sources⁴⁴

Athanasius, *Select Works and Letters*, in *NPNF* 2nd series, vol.4 (English Translation and notes by Archibald Robertson) (reprinted in Edinburgh 1991).

St. Clement, [Clemens], *Epistle To The Corinthians*, in *ANF* vol. 1, (English translation A. Roberts & J. Donaldson) (reprinted in Edinburgh 1996).

Cyprian [Cyprianus], *The Letters*, in *ACW* (4 vols.) No. 43-7, (Translated and annotated by G.W. Clarke New York 1984).

Eusebius, *HE*. Eusebius, *The Ecclesiastical History* in 2 vols. in Loeb Classical Library, vol. 1 with an English translation by Kirsopp Lake (1926), London & New York, vol.2 by J.E.L. Oulton (London & Cambridge 1952).

- Hilary [Hilarius], *Select Works*, in *NPNF* 2nd series vol. 9 (reprinted 1995) Massachusetts.
- Hilary [Hilarius], *Against Valens and Ursacius, and Letter to the emperor Constantius*. (= Wickham, L.R. 1997. *Hilary of Poitiers, Conflict of Conscience and law in the Fourth-Century Church*, Liverpool.).
- Ignatius, *Letters*, in *ANF* vol.1 (reprinted in Edinburgh 1993).
- Optalus. *Against the Donatists*, (Translated and edited by M. Edwards), (Liverpool University Press, Translated Texts For Historians: Liverpool 1997).
- Socrates. HE. *The Ecclesiastical History of Socrates Scholasticus*. in *NPNF* 2nd series, vol.2 (reprinted in Edinburgh 1989).
- Sozomenus, HE. *The Ecclesiastical History of Sozomen*, in *NPNF* 2nd series, vol.2 reprinted in Edinburgh 1989).
- Sokrates, *Kirchengeschichte* Hrsg. von G. Christen Hansen, mit Beiträgen von Manjairinjan, (in *Die Griechischen Christlichen Schriftsteller*), (Akademie-Verlag Berlin 1995).
- Sozomenus, *Kirchengeschichte*, Hrsg. John Bidez, a new ed. by Gunther C. Hansen, (in *Die Griechischen Christlichen Schriftsteller*) (Akademie-Verlag: Berlin 1960).
- Theodoret, HE. *The Ecclesiastical History*, in *NPNF* 2nd- series vol.3 (Edinburgh. 1996).
- Theodoret, *Kirchengeschichte*, hrsg. von Leon Parmentier & F. Scheidweiler, in *Die Griechischen Christlichen Schriftsteller*, (Akademie-Verlag: Berlin 1954).
- 6.ii. Modern Literature**
- Barnard, L. 1980. "The Council of Serdica: Some problems re-assessed" *Annuaire Historiae Conciliorum* 12: 1-25.
- Barnard, LAV. 1983. *The Council of Serdica 343 AD*. Sofia,
- Barnes.T.D. 1978. "Emperors and Bishops, AD. 324-44: Some Problems" *American Journal of Ancient History* 3: 53-75.
- Barnes. T.D. 1981. *Eusebius and Constantine*. Cambridge, Mass.
- Barnes. T.D. 1989, "The Career of Athanasius" *Studia Patristica* 21: 390-401.
- Barnes, T.D. 1993. *Athanasius and Constantius*. Cambridge, Mass.
- Baur. W. 1996. *Heresy and Orthodoxy in the Earliest Christianity*. Mifflintown.
- Bethune-Baker, J.F. 1950. *An Introduction to the Early History of Christian Doctrine to the Time of the Council of Chalcedon*, 8th ed. New York:.
- Caspar. E. 1927. "Die Römische Synode von 313" *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte* 46: 333-46.

- Chadwick, H. 1948. "The Fate of Eustathius of Antiochia" *Journal of Theological Studies* 49: 27-35.
- Drake, H. 1986. "Athanasius' First Exile" *Greek Roman and Byzantine Studies* 27: 193-204.
- Elliott, **T.G.** 1988. "The Date of the Council of Serdica" *The Ancient History Bulletin* 11.3: 65-72.
- Elliott, **T.G.** 1992. "Constantinus and 'the Arian Reaction after Nicaea'" *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 43/2: 169-194.
- Fischer, J.A. 1976. "Die Synoden im Osterfeststreit des 2. Jahrhunderts" *Annuario Historiae Conciliorum* 8: 16-39.
- Frend, W.H.C. 1952. *The Donatist Church. A Movement of Protest in Roman North Africa*. Oxford
- Frend, W.H.C. 1984. *The Rise of Christianity*. Philadelphia.
- Gessel, W. 1975. "Das primatiale Bewusstsein Julius' I. im Lichte der Interaktionen zwischen der Cathedra Petri und den zeitgenössischen Synoden" in *Konzil und Papst. Historische Beiträge zur Frage der Höchsten Gewalt in der Kirche*, pp. 63-74, Festgabe für Herman Tückle, ed. G. Schwaiger. Münih, Paderborn.
- Gwatkin, H.M. 1900. *Studies of Arianism*. Londra.
- Hall, S.G. 1989. "The Creed of Serdica" *Studia Patristica* 19: 173-84
- Hanson, **R.P.C.** 1984. "The Fate of Eustathius of Antiochia" *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte* 95: 171-79.
- Hanson, R.P.C. 1988. *The Search for the Christian Doctrine of the God, The Arian Controversy 318-381*. Edinburgh.
- Hefele, C.J. & Leclercq, H. 1907. *Histoire des conciles*, Paris.
- Hess, H. 1958. *The canons of the Council of Sardica AD 343, A Landmark in the early Development of Canon Law*. Oxford.
- Hunt, D. 1998. "The Successors of Constantine" in *The Cambridge Ancient History* vol. 13: 1-43, ed. A. Cameron and P. Garnsey, Cambridge.
- Jones, A.H.M. 1964=1986. *The Later Roman Empire*. 2 vols. Baltimore.
- Jones, A.H.M. 1971. *The Cities of the Eastern Roman Provinces*. Oxford.
- Jonkers, E.J. S 954. *Acta Et Symbola Conciliorum Quae Saeculo Quarto Habita Sunt*, Textus Minores vol. 19. Leiden.
- Kelly, J.N.D. 1972. *Early Christian Creeds*. Harlow.
- Kelly, J.N.D. 1977. *Early Christian Doctrines*. Londra.

- Klein, R. 1977. *Constantius II und die Christliche Kirche*. Darmstadt.
- Lienhard, J.T. 1993. "Did Athanasius Reject Marcellus" in *Arianism After Arius, Essays on the Development of the Fourth Century Trinitarian Conflicts*, pp. 65-80, eds. M.R. Barnes & D.H. Williams Edinburgh.
- Luibheid, C. 1982. *The Council of Nicaea*. Galway.
- Percival, H. 1899. *The Seven Ecumenical Councils of the Undivided Church, Their Canons and Dogmatic Decrees*. Edinburgh.
- Schwartz, E. 1910. "Die Konzilien des 4. und 5. Jahrhunderts" *Historische Zeitschrift* 104: 1-37.
- Schwartz, E. 1931. "Der griechische Text der Kanones von Serdika" *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft*, 30: 1-35.
- Wickham, L.R. 1997. *Hilary of Poitiers, Conflict of Conscience and law in the Fourth-Century Church*, Liverpool.
- Wiles, M. 1996. *Archetypal Heresy. Arianism through the Centuries*. Oxford.
- Williams, R. 1987. *Arius: Tradition and Heresy*. Londra.

1. Socrates, *HE*, 2. 22.

2. The fullest account of the council can be studied from the following works; Barnard 1983; The council separately published two creeds and more than twenty canons. For the canons see Schwartz 1931; Jonkers 1954, 61-73, for the English translation of the canons see Percival 1899; Hess 1958; For the creed published at the council see Hanson 1988, 300ff; Kelly 1972, 274-83; Hall 1989, 173-84.

3. There are numerous studies on the Arian controversy and the council of Nicaea in the western literature. I will cite a few of them here.

Gwatkin 1900; Barnes 1981; Luibheid 1982; Williams 1987; Hanson 1988, 152-178; Wiles 1996.

4. Barnes 1981, 224-245; Elliott 1992, 169-194.

5. The dating of the deposition of Eustathius is controversial; Chadwick 1948, 27-35 dates it as 326 or 327; Hanson 1984, 171-79, dates as 331; Barnes 1978, 59 ff. gives the date of 327.

6. Socrates, *HE*, 2.35. Sozomenus, *HE*, 2.28; Barnes 1981, 239 ff; Drake 1986, 193-204. Athanasius is a difficult personality for church historians, because, while the 19th century scholarship salutes him as a hero the 20th century church historians see him completely in negative terms. Barnes 1989, 390-401; Hanson 1988, 239-262, p.239-241 particularly important.

7. Eustathius and Marcellus were deposed because of their doctrinal lapse to Sabellianism; Athanasius was tried at Tyrus (Sur) and condemned because of his misbehavior against Meletians.

8. The imperial letter was composed by the senior Augustus Constantinus II, for the text of the letter see Athanasius, *Defence Against the Arians*, 87; Socrates, *HE*, 2.3; Sozomenus, *HE*, 3.2; Theodoret, *HE*, 2.2.

⁹Athanasius, *History of the Arians* 10; Sozomenus, *HE*, 3.5; Barnes 1993, 47 ff.

10. The letter is in effect addressed to Julius of Rome, Athanasius, *Defence* 3-19.

11. Athanasius, *Defence*, 1,20; For the political conflicts of the year 339-41 see Klein 1977, 29-46.
12. Athanasius, *Defence*, 22; Hanson 1988. 267 ff.
13. Athanasius, *Defence* 21-35, The eastern bishops are usually labeled as the Eusebian party, because of Eusebius of Nikomedia and later of Constantinopolis, this is in my view a result of Athanasian view point, because it looks like the misconduct of Athanasius is deflected and as if it was only the Eusebian intrigue.
14. For the external problems of the eastern *Augustus* at the time see Jones 1964=1986, 112-15; Hunt 1998.
15. The date of the council has long been controversial since the 19th century. Socrates and Sozomenus place it to the consulship of Rufinus and Eusebius in the eleventh year after the death of Constantinus i.e. 347 Socrates. *HE*. 2.20; Sozomenus, *HE*, 3.20 However, modern scholarship defense two theories regarding the matter that the council was either held in 342 or 343, See most recent studies for the controversy of dating, Schwartz 1910,30;1978,67-69; Barnard 1983,46-55; Elliot 1988,65-72.
16. For the process of the negotiations and different assemblies see Barnard 1983, 63 ff. and 71 ff; Hanson 1988, 294.
17. Hefele defends the Roman action for behalf of Athanasius on the grounds that the Roman synod of 341 must have borne as much weight as the synods which had deposed them. Hefele-Leclercq 1907.1,2.750-51
18. Jonkers 1954,41 -42 "Let the Ancient customs hold good which are in Egypt and Libya and Pentapolis, according to which the bishop of Alexandria has authority over all these places. For this is also customary to the bishop of Rome..."
19. There was a close alliance between, Rome and Alexandria during the Novatian crisis and the Outbreak of the controversy of Paul of Samosata in the third century. Novatian was a Roman presbyter, who was disappointed in an election and formed a rigorist party just after the Decian persecution. Paul of Samosata, a heretical bishop of Antiochia (261-68), was excommunicated by the Syrian bishops. In both cases the bishops of Rome and Alexandria cooperated.
20. The letter of Julius in Athanasius, *Defence*, 35.
21. The text of the letter is in ANF, vol. 1, pp. 5-21; W. Bauer comments on the political concerns of the bishop of Rome. Bauer 1996. 125-29.
22. Bauer 1996. 11 MS
23. Eusebius. *HE*, 5.23-25; for the councils of this period particularly see Fischer 1976. 16-39
24. For the letter of Firmilianus of Caesarea (in Cappadocia) see Cyprian [Cyprianus] *Letter* 75.6-8. Cyprianus own communication with Stephanus on rebaptism may be followed from his 73 and 74th letters.
25. For the communication between the two Dionysii see Bethune-Baker 1950, chapter 8 is particularly important on this matter; Kelly 1977. 134-35; Frend 1984.383-84.
26. Eusebius, *HE*. 7.30.19.
27. The imperial letter is in Eusebius. *HE*, 10.5,18
28. Optatus, *Against the Donatists*. 1.23. 24: for Constantinus' letter to Miltiades of Rome see Eusebius, *HE*. 10.5.18; Frend 1952. 148 ff; Caspar 1927, 333-46.
29. The Roman bishop had been represented by two of his clergy at Nicaea, Vito and Vicentius, Socrates. *HE*, 1.13; Sozomenus, *HE* 1.17. At Serdica there were three members of the Roman church representing the bishop Archidamus. Philoxenus and Leo, Hilary, *Against Valens and Ursacius*. 1.4.2 (=Wickham 1997); Athanasius, *Letter* 46 [to the Mareotis from Serdica]; Athanasius, *Defence*, 50.

³⁰Hilary, *Against Valens and Ursacius*, 1.4.1.

³¹ See an important study for the enterprises of Julius to establish his authority, Gessel 1975, 63-74, esp. p.66 ff.

32.The date of the council of Antiochia is controversial because it is

conventionally assumed to be held in

341, however recent scholarship dates it earlier. See Hess 1958, appendix.

See canon 14.

33.Canon 3 of Serdica (Latin) "If judgment have gone against a bishop in any cause, and he thinks that he has a good case, in order that the question may be reopened, let us, if it be your pleasure, honour the memory of St. Peter the Apostle, and let those who tried the case write to Julius, bishop of Rome , if he shall judge that the case should be retried, let that be done and let him appoint judges..."

³⁴ Hilary, *Against Valens and Ursacius*, 1.4.1, the letter refers to Col. 2:5, 2 Cor. 13:3, 1 Cor. 5:3, Col. 2:5.

35.Around fifty bishops from the Balkan provinces attended the council; for the various lists of the signatories; see Athanasius, *Defence*, 50; Athanasius *Letter 46 {To the Church of Mareotis from Serdica}*;

Hilary, *Against Valens and Ursacius* 1.4.5; a reconstructed list of ninety seven bishops of the western

assembly in the additional note of the Athanasius' *Defence* by Archibald

Robertson in *NPNF* 2nd series

vol. 4, pp.147-48. See also Barnard 1983,58-62,

³⁶ Jones 1971,23.

³⁷ Hilary, *Against Valens and Ursacius* 1.2.20; Barnes 1993,74; Barnard 1980,1-25.

38.Hilary, *Against Valens and Ursacius*, 1.2.20; Barnes 1993, 74.

³⁹ The eastern encyclical letter in Hilary, *Against Valens and Ursacius* 1.2.3.

⁴⁰ For Athanasius' relationship with Marcellus see Lienhard 1993,65-80,

⁴¹ Socrates, HE, 1,8; Sozomenus. HE, 1.21

⁴² Hilary, *Against Valens and Ursacius* 1.2.3.

⁴³ Athanasius, *Apologia de Fuga* (=Defence of His Flight),3; Athanasius, *History* 5.

⁴⁴ Abbreviations for the Ancient Sources:ACW=Ancient Christian Writers;ANF=Ante-Nicene

Fathers;HE=Historia Ecclesianstica;NPNF=Nicene and Post Nicene Fathers;

