



THE UNIVERSITY *of* EDINBURGH

## Edinburgh Research Explorer

### Constantinople 360 and Constantinople 381

A tale of two councils

**Citation for published version:**

Parvis, S 2020, Constantinople 360 and Constantinople 381: A tale of two councils. in N Baker-Brian & J Lössl (eds), *Studia Patristica Vol. CII - Including Papers Presented at the Seventh British Patristics Conference, Cardiff, 5-7 September 2018*. Studia Patristica, Peeters.

**Link:**

[Link to publication record in Edinburgh Research Explorer](#)

**Document Version:**

Peer reviewed version

**Published In:**

*Studia Patristica Vol. CII - Including Papers Presented at the Seventh British Patristics Conference, Cardiff, 5-7 September 2018*

**General rights**

Copyright for the publications made accessible via the Edinburgh Research Explorer is retained by the author(s) and / or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing these publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

**Take down policy**

The University of Edinburgh has made every reasonable effort to ensure that Edinburgh Research Explorer content complies with UK legislation. If you believe that the public display of this file breaches copyright please contact [openaccess@ed.ac.uk](mailto:openaccess@ed.ac.uk) providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.



## Constantinople 360 and Constantinople 381: A Tale of Two Councils

Sara Parvis, Edinburgh

On the face of it, few councils later deemed to be ecumenical have achieved as little as the Council of Constantinople of 381.<sup>1</sup> This, at any rate, would seem to be the verdict of the surviving ecclesiastical historians of the first fifty years after the Council. Neither Rufinus nor Philostorgius ever actually mentions the Council of 381, although Rufinus covers most of its significant actions separately. Jerome stops his *Chronicon* short with the death of Valens in 378, and never goes back to tell us what happened next. We must wait for Socrates and Sozomen in the 330s and 340s for an explicit historiographical discussion of the Council of 381, and even then, both treat it simply as one more acrimonious fourth-century council, with no greater status (or, if anything, rather less) than the Council of Constantinople of 383 which follows it.<sup>2</sup> It is only when we get to the ecclesiastical history of Theodoret, written shortly before Chalcedon, that the Council of 381 begins to appear in a starring role.<sup>3</sup>

The Council of Constantinople of 360 looms much larger in the early historiography than the Council of 381. The Council of 360 seems to have been the centrepiece of Philostorgius' work in particular.<sup>4</sup> Socrates devotes three modern chapters to Constantinople 360, and it is also extensively covered by Sozomen and Theodoret.<sup>5</sup> We shall return to the question of the sources on which Socrates and Sozomen are drawing, and the reasons for their balance in favour of 360 over 381. But for the time being, let us simply acknowledge the priority of Constantinople 360 over Constantinople 381 in the pre-Chalcedonian historiography in general.

I shall argue in this paper that the reason Constantinople 360 was so important in the historiography was not because of its strengths, but because of its weaknesses. After the death late in 361 of Constantius II, the emperor who sanctioned the Council and enforced its acts,

the ecclesiastical policies of the next four emperors in the East- Julian, Jovian, Valens and Theodosius- were all in their different ways an attempt to reverse and then avoid repeating Constantius' mistakes. I will argue that the genius of Theodosius, or at any rate his advisors, was to learn from the traps into which Constantius II fell in 360, and avoid all of them, despite the best efforts of the pro-Nicene bishops at Constantinople 381 to repeat all the mistakes of their anti-Nicene antecedents of 360. The published acts of Constantinople 381 were so brilliantly anodyne that Jerome, Rufinus, and even Philostorgius himself, could only assent to their implicit murmur of 'Nothing to see here'. The only attempt to argue otherwise came from the homoiousian/Macedonianist historian Sabinus of Heraclea, and his account, though extensively referred to by Socrates, was otherwise lost with the disappearance of the homoiousian Macedonianists themselves, in the wake of Theodosius' longer-than-expected reign and the general consolidation of political and theological support for the Creed of Nicaea by 395.<sup>6</sup>

### Constantinople 360

Let us begin, then, by quickly rehearsing the events of Constantinople 360, before discussing them at greater length. It was an odd council, or rather (in Constantius' usual fashion) series of conciliar and quasi-conciliar gatherings, which took place in the wake of two much bigger councils, the Councils of Ariminum and Seleucia of the previous year. It included two set-piece liturgical events, the consecration of Eudoxius, formerly bishop of first Germanicia and then Antioch, as the new Bishop of Constantinople on 27 January 360, and the consecration of the new Constantinopolitan Church of Hagia Sophia on 14<sup>th</sup> February.<sup>7</sup> Before, between and after these two consecrations, bishops assembled in groups of different sizes for various purposes. An initial group accepted the Creed of Nike and arraigned Aetius; some of its

members then invited more bishops and deposed the sitting Bishop of Constantinople, Macedonius, on existing charges, together with Basil of Ancyra. The same group, now about fifty in number, then elected Eudoxius as his replacement, who was consecrated towards the end of the month by seventy-two bishops. Part of this group then condemned Aetius for Anomoianism, and deposed, probably in several stages, an enormous number of other bishops besides. At some point, whether before or after the consecration of Hagia Sophia, a smaller group, led by Eudoxius and Acacius of Caesarea, then elected replacements for at least some of the bishops they had deposed.<sup>8</sup> Acacius of Caesarea, according to Philostorgius, returned home and continued deposing bishops and appointing replacements (presumably all within the Diocese of Oriens) after the Council had finished.<sup>9</sup> Constantius II seems to have given his legal seal to all of this, but it is difficult to be sure in exactly what form. It has been argued that the unhappiness the Council of Constantinople caused in Gaul in particular was a significant factor in Julian's self-promotion to Augustus and assumption of political and military control there that same spring.<sup>10</sup>

As for much of the reign of Constantius, by the first of January 360, when Constantius assumed the consulship once again with great ceremony, there were a good number of bishops at court.<sup>11</sup> These included two sets of delegates from the Council of Seleucia: ten from the majority party, led by Eleusius of Cyzicus and Silvanus of Tarsus, and possibly as many as eighteen from Acacius of Caesarea's minority group of 43 dissenting bishops.<sup>12</sup> Since Constantius had asked for ten delegates from both Ariminum and Seleucia to come and report to him, it is probable that Acacius had intended his group to be only ten, led by himself, George of Alexandria, Uranius of Tyre and Paul of Emesa, but that a group of Libyan bishops who were strong supporters of Aetius had accompanied or followed Acacius from Seleucia as well, since condemnation of the lower-class Aetius (if not his upper-class pupil Eunomius) was looking a likely bargaining chip in the debates over a new Creed to

replace Nicaea.<sup>13</sup> Four of them, Serras of Paraetonium, Stephen of Ptolemais, Heliodorus of Sozusa and Theophilus the Libyan, are mentioned by name as having refused to condemn him in the session of the synod devoted to his trial.<sup>14</sup>

The trial of Aetius was a complex affair: it began as a disputation, supposedly simply for academic purposes, but ended in his eventual condemnation, though at exactly what stage stage is not clear.<sup>15</sup> Aetius seems to have been tricked into defending a theological proposition before the Emperor which he himself did not actually hold, the proposition that the Son was exactly like the Father. Although Eudoxius was professedly keen to distance himself from Aetius' theology, it is likely that Acacius was responsible for the ruse. Philostorgius tells us that Acacius wrote all of the synodal letters from Constantinople, 'of which there were many'- one of them, given by Theodoret, offers a defence to George of Alexandria of the Council's decision to condemn his deacon, arguing that it was not contrary to the ecclesiastical canons.<sup>16</sup> The Libyan bishops had clearly complained to George, because the letter notes that the synod did not condemn them outright, but gave them six months to condemn Aetius or be deposed. It is very likely that George and Eudoxius counted on being able to reverse the sentence against Aetius under these circumstances, as they would promise Eunomius.<sup>17</sup>

We are told by Sozomen that the group of bishops who had come to Constantinople with Acacius invited the bishops of Bithynia, led by Maris of Chalcedon, to join them for a council, and that together with a few others, including Ulfila the Goth, they made an initial Council of fifty members.<sup>18</sup> Constantius had in the middle of the night of 31<sup>st</sup> December 359 persuaded the last of the majority delegates from Seleucia to sign the new version of the so-called 'homoian' Creed which had been agreed at Nike in Thrace, so they could take part in the ceremonies the next day, but thereafter they would become targets rather than members of the assembling Council.<sup>19</sup> The bishops from Bithynia would themselves no doubt still have

been feeling extremely chastened at this point in time. The Eastern Council which had met in Seleucia the previous year had been originally intended to meet at Nicomedia in Bithynia, but Nicomedia had been almost wiped out by a terrible earthquake and fire there on 24<sup>th</sup> August 358, which had killed its bishop Cecropius.<sup>20</sup> This lent itself to interpretation as divine punishment, but it was not obvious exactly who or what was to be considered to have incurred the divine disapproval for blasphemy, since Cecropius was a homoiousian, the party which was most keen to hold to Scripture and avoid theological extremes of all kinds. In deposing all the homoiousians, but also condemning Aetius, and furthermore banning both the Dedication Creed of 341 and the Creed of Nicaea, as we shall see, Constantinople 360 can be considered to have impressively hedged its theological bets. Clearly it was only bishops such as Acacius and Eudoxius who were thoroughly inconsistent in their theology who could safely be considered not to count as divine targets for punishment.

A word should now be said about the Creed of Constantinople 360.<sup>21</sup> This profession of faith, known in the West as the Creed of Ariminum and in the East as the Creed of Constantinople, confessed the ‘only-begotten Son of God, begotten from God before all ages and every origin, One from the One Father (mo/non e)k mo/nou tou~ patro/j), like the Father who begot him according to the Scriptures, whose begetting no one knows except the Father only who begot him’. The Holy Spirit was confessed as the one whom ‘the only-begotten Son of God, the Christ, our Lord and God, promised to send to the human race as a comforter, as is written “the Spirit of Truth”, which he sent to them when he ascended into the heavens’. There followed a note that ‘We recognise that the term “ousia”, which was set down by the Fathers rather naively (a(plou/steron), caused scandal to the people, because the Scriptures do not contain it, so all mention of it whatsoever is to be set aside, because the divine Scriptures make absolutely no mention of ousia of Father and Son. Neither should the

term “hypostasis” be used concerning Father, Son and Holy Spirit. But we say the Son is “like the Father as the divine Scriptures say and teach”.

This creed and the statement which followed it are a classic example of the sort of ‘too clever by half’ solution which looks brilliant to its own creators, but quickly unravels. It was attempting to sideline two earlier imperially-sponsored creeds which still had considerable support: the Creed of Nicaea of 325 (initially championed by the Council of Ariminum of the previous year), and the ‘Dedication Creed’ of Antioch 341 (championed by its Eastern twin the Council of Seleucia). In doing so, it noted that it was setting aside the decision of ‘the Fathers’ to use the term ‘ousia’, without specifying whether it was referring to the bishops who met at Nicaea in 325, at Antioch in 341, or both. This would allow those who did not believe the bishops at Nicaea were their ‘Fathers’ at all to attribute the term instead to those at Antioch, and vice versa. (‘Hypostasis’, also used by both Nicaea and the Dedication Council, was also set aside, this time with no reason given, since the term is in fact Scriptural.) The problem, however, which was already very clear in the discussions at Seleucia, was that the new document thus implicitly insulted the decisions of both Nicaea and Antioch, as well as the martyrs and confessors who had signed their creeds, in favour of those of the small cabal who had drawn the new document up.<sup>22</sup> It made no attempt to engage with recent tradition, and wasted no words in ascribing good intentions to previous councils, even while designating those who had drawn them up ‘Fathers’. It simply declared the intention to wipe the theological slate clean and begin again, banning all discussion of the key terms. The Creed of 360, for all its attempt at universality, was therefore only attractive to those without particular reverence either for Nicaea or for the Dedication Creed. In 359, those who revered neither of these were a clear minority among the politically-active bishops of the East.<sup>23</sup> This was one reason why so many leading bishops had to be replaced at the Council of Constantinople of 360: they were too theologically literate to accept a *tabula rasa*.

The intended consecration of the new church on 14<sup>th</sup> February forced the question of who should preside over it as Bishop of Constantinople. Macedonius, whom Constantius had officially recognised as its bishop from the final exile of his rival Paul in 349, had already been accused since before the Council of Seleucia of violence of various kinds, and, as Gilbert Dagron has argued, Constantius had probably been keen for some time to be rid of him.<sup>24</sup> Macedonius had taken the see as part of a long-running and bloody struggle with Paul, which had caused many riots and the death of one of Constantius' generals. The accusations against him in 360 included causing still more deaths, and also receiving back into the Church of Constantinople a deacon who was found guilty of adultery. Zonaras also notes that Constantius was angry with him for moving the body of Constantine, and so it was easy for Macedonius' enemies to exploit that anger and have him deposed.<sup>25</sup> Once that was done, Eudoxius replaced him in the see, thus single-handedly demoting the see of Antioch to a status below the see of Constantinople, as Socrates points out.<sup>26</sup> It is not unlikely that this decision was in fact Constantius'. He had seen Eudoxius in action on the imperial stage at the time of his advent to Rome with Eudoxius in his entourage, and seems to have been impressed.<sup>27</sup> Eudoxius was clearly a consummate performer and an impeccable judge of his audiences, imperial and otherwise.<sup>28</sup>

The *Chronicon Paschale* tells us that seventy-two bishops were present at the consecration of Eudoxius, and lists fifty-five of them.<sup>29</sup> Besides those already mentioned, we might add another five who are probably to be identified amongst the party of Acacius condemned by the majority party at Seleucia: Eusebius of Seleucia in Syria, Basilicus, Phœbus of Polychalandus, Euty chius of Eleutheropolis, and Eustathius of Epiphaneia. Perhaps surprisingly, there is no sign of most of the bishops from the minority party of the Western Council of Ariminum the previous year, whose leaders were Ursacius of Singidunum, Valens of Mursa and Germinius of Sirmium. The only one of them who can be



identified in this list of names is Demophilus of Beroia in Thrace, who would succeed Eudoxius as Bishop of Constantinople ten years later. Presumably the others had returned to their long-suffering dioceses for the winter.

We now turn to the rest of the impressive list of bishops who were deposed at some point during the Council of Constantinople of 360, and those who replaced them. Besides Macedonius, whom Eudoxius replaced, there were Eleusius of Cyzicus (replaced by Eunomius), Basil of Ancyra, Eustathius of Sebasteia, Dracontius of Pergamon, Neonas of Seleucia, Heortasius of Sardis, Silvanus of Tarsus (replaced by another Acacius), Sophronius of Pompeiopolis in Paphlagonia, Elpidius of Satala in Macedonia, and Cyril of Jerusalem. Philostorgius claims that Acacius appointed most of the replacements, replacing the dead Cecropius with Onesimus as Bishop of the heavily damaged Nicomedia; Basil of Ancyra with a certain Athanasius; Silvanus of Tarsus with another Acacius; and Eudoxius with Meletius. Most of the replacement bishops mentioned by Philostorgius can be found making common cause with Acacius in 363 during the reign of Jovian and signing up to the Creed of Nicaea.

So let us summarise the achievements of the Council of Constantinople of 360, a Council of fifty to seventy-two bishops, which overturned the acts of Seleucia, a Council of 160 bishops. It deposed the Bishop of Constantinople and replaced him with the Bishop of Antioch. It deposed the metropolitan bishops of nearly half the provinces of the East. It sidelined two previous imperially-sponsored creeds, one or the other of which the vast majority of bishops of both East and West had espoused the previous year. It produced a new creed, a version of which the vast majority of bishops across the whole empire had already rejected the previous year. It condemned a deacon for heresy while promoting his pupil, a rather more aristocratic deacon who professed exactly the same theology, to a metropolitan see. It arrogated to itself the right while it was in session to adjudicate any clerical case anywhere in

the Eastern empire and not only depose any bishop or deacon at will, but also to appoint his replacement from anywhere in the Eastern empire. It encouraged the Emperor to condemn and banish clerics of any degree on his own initiative, having heard merely a few words of a disputation. After it was over, the emperor enshrined endorsement of its creed across the empire in law, although it was not long before his theological writ in much of the West ceased to run.<sup>30</sup>

Constantius has had a long-standing reputation as a persecuting, 'Arian' emperor, which has led to an understandable scholarly desire to rehabilitate him. It is only fair to allow that he was indeed no theological fanatic; he was too doctrinally vacillating for that. Nonetheless, it is also important to recognise with Ammianus Marcellinus and Julian, as well as Athanasius and Hilary of Poitiers, and no doubt also Eleusius of Cyzicus and Eustathius of Sebasteia, how incompetent and damaging to both Church and empire his ecclesiastical policy actually was by the end of his life. He seems to have had no idea either what the Church was for on its own terms, or how it might contribute to the stability of the empire, let alone what its norms of government were supposed to be. He arbitrarily based his entire policy on the views of first one and then another ambitious middle-ranking prelate, before abandoning him for a new favourite, often within a few months of one another. He threw money and favours at bishops, but encouraged them to hang about the court rather than use it to contribute to local well-being. He sponsored endless councils and quasi-conciliar gatherings without clear structures or purpose, constantly changing his plans for them and clogging up the imperial post, and then let them descend into chaos, without regard for how disruptive their decisions were, or how they were to be carried out or policed. So luminously bad were his policies that his four immediate successors in the East, whatever their own faults, were able to make some easy capital simply by avoiding or reversing them.

## Julian, Jovian and Valens

Let us now turn to the next three emperors of the East, Julian, Jovian and Valens. Julian is, of course, well known as a devotee of the old gods, who rejected the claims of Christianity once he entered Constantinople as sole Augustus on December 11 361. This is not the place to canvass the precise nature of Julian's theological beliefs. But it is worth noting how many of Julian's initial ecclesiastical moves make sense even on purely pragmatic grounds as ways of mitigating if not reversing some of Constantius II's mistakes.<sup>31</sup>

When Julian approached Constantinople, he was doubtless petitioned by Macedonius, the city's deposed bishop, probably with the aid of Eleusius of Cyzicus (a former civil servant), Basil of Ancyra and other leading bishops who had been deposed at Constantinople 360, to overturn the acts of that Council. We know, at least, that this group so petitioned the next two emperors, Jovian and Valens.<sup>32</sup> Julian had no reason to love the leading bishops from Constantius' court, who had effectively been his jailors in his younger days. But simply overturning the acts of Constantinople 360 would have created immediate chaos in the capital. Constantinople had suffered from riots caused by ecclesiastical struggles throughout the 340s, and Macedonius was a man with a history of violence against his enemies. His response probably did more to improve the accountability of episcopal governance to the Christian people than any other imperial ecclesiastical policy since the end of the Great Persecution. He decreed that all the banished bishops could return, but without offering them any support, legal or otherwise, to retake the churches they had been banished from.<sup>33</sup> He removed all imperial backing, financial, logistic and military, from bishops in general, treated their churches as the private property of a private organisation, and decreed that any property of others which they had destroyed (particularly temples dedicated to non-Christian deities) they had to rebuild at their own expense.<sup>34</sup>

The implications of this are often not fully recognised. Open local ecclesiastical competition immediately became possible. Multiple bishops of each city were suddenly in evidence, as they had not been since before Constantine's accession in the East in 324. Control of each of the city church buildings, in the increasingly interfering hands of the state since then, now returned to the local church (at least initially); alternative ecclesiastical buildings could also now be designated or established. We have a good indication of what the results were from a law passed by Valens in May 365 decreeing that 'bishops who had been deposed and expelled from their churches under Constantius, but who had retaken their bishoprics in the time of Julian's reign, should once again be expelled from their churches'.<sup>35</sup> Among bishops we know of, this touched Eleusius of Cyzicus, Eustathius of Sebasteia, Silvanus of Tarsus, Meletius of Antioch, Cyril of Jerusalem and Athanasius of Alexandria, who all seem to have repossessed their churches under Julian. Others, such as Marcellus of Ancyra and some of the other Old Nicenes, seem quietly to have set up private communities in their own city, without contesting the public church buildings; in consequence, as being no risk to the public peace, and having no pretensions to imperially-recognised positions (as well as being mostly of a certain age), they were left alone by both Valens and Theodosius.

How were the public churches retaken by previous incumbents? The evidence suggests that many of the Constantinople 360 bishops (Eudoxius' and Acacius of Caesarea's appointments) won little local support, but they were also in some cases (Eunomius and Meletius in particular) singularly lacking in pastoral commitment in times of hardship.<sup>36</sup> Episcopacy was now a job only for those prepared to risk legal, financial and possibly physical harassment, and with strong enough local support to hold onto the key property. In the case of Eustathius, his replacement Meletius had gone on to greater things, but the people of Sebasteia do not ever seem to have accepted him in any case, suggesting that Eustathius would have had no local rival to prevent his swift return under Julian.<sup>37</sup> Eleusius was likewise

far more committed to Cyzicus than Eunomius ever was.<sup>38</sup> The cases of Cyril and Silvanus, both of long-standing local prestige, seem to have been similar.<sup>39</sup> The lynching of George of Alexandria shortly after the death of Constantius was an extreme example of what local intolerance of an externally-imposed bishop might prove capable of.<sup>40</sup> Bishops under Julian also became liable for rebuilding temples they or their predecessors had destroyed: Eunomius may have vacated the see of Cyzicus in favour of Eleusius for precisely this reason.<sup>41</sup> The Nicene community in Antioch, meanwhile, had been meeting discreetly on private property for thirty-five years, but they were now able to take the opportunity to have a bishop of their own, Paulinus, consecrated for the first time by the exiled Nicene-supporting Bishop of Cagliari on his return journey to the West.<sup>42</sup> At the same time, the clergy of the Old Church in Antioch declared their allegiance to the deposed Meletius, not yet a public Nicene, who had been bishop briefly the previous year. Euzoius continued in the main church, but it was closed by Julian at the time of his own advent to the city, ostensibly because of the danger of riots.

Julian had no interest in policing Christian doctrine. Bishops in these circumstances could have subscribed to any creed or none. We do not positively know that he banned synods, but with no enforcement mechanism and no free travel, their attraction in any case waned considerably. If he had lived, the synodal tradition would probably have been privately revived on a smaller scale than previously, but as it happens there was no opportunity for this sort of development.

Jovian's short reign consolidated Julian's policy of allowing multiple bishops to remain in the same city, but otherwise his policy was, for obvious reasons, a consolidation of the apparent status quo, though open (presumably through ignorance or more pressing concerns) to inventive views as to what the Christian status quo actually was. He allowed Athanasius publicly to repossess the churches of Alexandria, from which Julian had removed

him, but he turned down a petition from Basil of Ancyra, Silvanus of Tarsus and Theophilus of Castabala to overturn the decisions of Constantinople 360, indicating that it would not make for peace.<sup>43</sup> The fact that neither Eustathius of Sebasteia nor Eleusius of Cyzicus signed this petition confirms that they had both repossessed the main churches of their cities by this point. It is likely that Jovian made one very significant ecclesiastical move, however, which would have lasting consequences: he probably recognised Meletius rather than Euzoius as the rightful Bishop of Antioch.<sup>44</sup> Acacius of Caesarea and Meletius of Antioch held a Council in Antioch during his reign, with representatives of twenty-five other sees (including Eusebius of Samosata, Pelagius of Laodicea and Athanasius of Ancyra) and wrote to the emperor formally confessing the Nicene Creed and presenting themselves as peace-makers.<sup>45</sup> Acacius thus disowned Euzoius as Bishop of Antioch, who would have found it hard to organise anything like a similar level of support in time, given that his main theological ally was Eudoxius in Constantinople, and the main public church in Antioch had been closed and was in the hands of the state. If Jovian really intended to restore the Nicene Creed, as Acacius and Meletius believed, Euzoius could easily have been represented as a figure too anti-Nicene for Jovian to work with, because he had been exiled at the Council of Nicaea alongside Arius.

What Jovian would have done if he had ever got to Constantinople, we do not know: he would have found it much harder to ignore Eudoxius than Euzoius, and it seems that Macedonius was dead by this time. His ecclesiastical policy may simply have been a function of geography: he approached the empire from south of Antioch rather than north of Constantinople, and so his approach was controlled by the politics of Antioch. But we do know that he was at least at the early stages inclined to allow a certain theological and ecclesiological diversity, since he seems to have confirmed Athanasius, Meletius and Eudoxius as bishops of the three great Eastern sees, none of whom was in communion with the others, and also seems to have left all the various Christian communities in Antioch (at

least four at this stage) to continue worshipping in peace. Since he had refused to overturn the acts of Constantinople 360 as such, he would presumably also have allowed a multiplicity of creeds, at least for a while. Even if he had lived, it would have been a long time before Jovian's regime would have had the spare money or military capacity to police the elections and activities of Christian bishops, and it is not clear that he would have wanted to do so.

Valens, on the other hand, began his reign in Constantinople, which meant that he began it by confirming Eudoxius as Bishop of Constantinople, and orienting everything else to that decision.<sup>46</sup> Eleusius of Cyzicus and the other victims of Constantinople 360 held a two-month synod at Lampsachus, but he angrily turned down their familiar petition to reverse the acts of the Council, and bade them make peace with Eudoxius.<sup>47</sup> His ecclesiastical policy by the end of his reign would prove nearly as brutal as Constantius', if not quite as brutal as some other aspects of his policy. But it is still important to note the ways in which his ecclesiastical policy avoided the mistakes of Constantinople 360 and its aftermath.

Firstly, he did not police the Creed of 360 by making new bishops subscribe to it. Although he seems to have frowned on profession of the Nicene Creed, particularly after the death of Athanasius, and to have insisted on imposing Lucius on Egypt without scruple after that point, he allowed the card-carrying pro-Nicene bishop Basil of Caesarea to remain in office. Those he exiled, such as the Egyptian bishops after 373, or Eusebius of Samosata after 374, were for specific disciplinary offenses, not simply for professing the Nicene Creed.

Secondly, except in cases where they were a clear political threat, or when he was himself visiting their city, Valens allowed a compromise to rival bishops, letting them remain in the vicinity of their city as long as they held their worship outside the city walls. This was the case with Eleusius of Cyzicus, Paulinus of Antioch, the Macedonianist community in Constantinople, and probably also Eustathius of Sebasteia and Cyril of Jerusalem. Meletius

spent most of Valens' reign on his own estates in Armenia, but that may have been largely his own choice once he was no longer the officially-recognised bishop of Antioch. The Nicene community in Constantinople worshipped with the Macedonianists in the building outside the city walls until the latter formally renounced the Creed of Nicaea in 375, leaving the Nicenes with no building until the advent of Gregory Nazianzen to the Church of the Anastasis in 379.

Thirdly, after his failed attempt in 365 to re-depose Athanasius, along with the other bishops whom Constantius had exiled who returned to their sees under Julian, he allowed Athanasius to remain bishop of Alexandria for the rest of his natural life, even though he was not in communion with Valens' chosen bishops of Antioch or Constantinople. However, he did follow Constantius in granting himself the right to establish or depose bishops at will, although he largely restricted himself to the three great sees. Eudoxius' successor in the see of Constantinople, Demophilus, until then Bishop of Beroia in Thrace, was chosen by Valens himself. He exiled the alternative local choice, Evagrius. He took Athanasius' chosen successor for the see of Alexandria, Peter, into custody, although he allowed him to escape to Rome, probably deliberately. And he did exercise considerable violence in given cases.

On the other hand, he called no councils, and did not encourage large numbers of bishops to hang around court. He backed his chosen bishops of Constantinople and Antioch, but he did not encourage them to fill all the other sees with like-minded individuals. Nor did he lavish money on bishops, although he did restore some of the pre-Julian ecclesiastical tax breaks. Much, though by no means all, of his ecclesiastical policy can be considered pragmatic. His 'church outside the walls' policy represented an interesting compromise between Constantius' ecclesiastical policy and Julian's, and he also seems to have learned from Jovian that having bishops of the major sees who were not in communion with one another might not be an insurmountable problem in the short term, though he supported appointments which would bring the sees back into communion when the opportunity arose.



## Constantinople 381

Theodosius' policy represents an interesting mix between the policies of his various predecessors. He is often considered an absolutist, closer to Constantius than to his successors, in that he demanded a return to acceptance of a specific Creed, the Nicene Creed, and deposed the sitting Bishop of Constantinople, Demophilus, on his own initiative for refusing to subscribe to it.<sup>48</sup> We may also point to the fact that he re-introduced large councils as a means of making ecclesiastical policy. But when we look at the Council of 381, I will now argue, we see the work of a very much more skilful operator than Constantius, whether that operator is Theodosius himself or one of his ecclesiastical advisors.

The aims of the Council of 381 were very similar to the aims of the Council of 360, *mutatis mutandis*: to elect a new Bishop of Constantinople, and to re-establish the Nicene Creed.<sup>49</sup> Constantius wanted rid of Macedonius; Theodosius wanted rid of Demophilus. Constantius wanted to sideline the Nicene Creed; Theodosius wanted to restore it. But the means he took to achieve his ends were very different.

We first of all need to acknowledge that the Council of 381 was, if not quite so unrepresentative as the Council at 360, given that it was three times as large, at least not as representative as it might have been.<sup>50</sup> 150 bishops signed up to Constantinople 381, but a quick glance at the areas they come from reveals that their representation was very patchy, particularly in Asia Minor.<sup>51</sup> Some Anatolian provinces, such as Lyconia, Pisidia, Isauria and Lycia, were well represented, others very sparsely, and others, such as Galatia and Paphlagonia, were not represented at all. In particular, the areas around Constantinople itself are very sparsely represented. This gets us to the heart of one of the Council's greatest problems.

The invitations for the Council of 381 were based on a Council of 153 bishops which took place in Antioch in 379.<sup>52</sup> This Council constituted a triumph for the Meletian party, the New Nicenes: it established Meletius as the Nicene bishop of Antioch, and recruited or replaced key bishops across the East in favour of the pro-Nicene party, at the expense of the other four episcopal parties with pretensions to them. Its actions had been meticulously planned and prepared by Eusebius of Samosata and Basil of Caesarea, neither of whom lived to see the Council of 381.

Among its many carefully laid plans, the Council of Antioch of 379 had lined Gregory Nazianzen up as their prospective New Nicene Bishop of Constantinople, and sent him to preside over the Nicene liturgy in a private church there, the Church of the Anastasis.<sup>53</sup> Peter of Alexandria had meanwhile lined up Maximus the Cynic for the same job on behalf of the Old Nicenes, with the aid of two Old Nicene presbyters, probably Evagrius of Antioch and Jerome. Though they all worshipped together in the same Church, the Old Nicenes attempted a traditional Alexandrian pre-emptive ordination while Theodosius was still in Thessalonica, no doubt feeling that this was warranted by Theodosius' edict of the previous February to the Constantinopolitans, *Cunctos Populos*, which decreed that their bishop must be in communion with the bishops of Rome and Alexandria, who were of course both Old Nicenes.<sup>54</sup> Maximus then headed off quickly to Thessalonica try and obtain Theodosius' confirmation. Theodosius refused to confirm the election. Meletius also made his way to Constantinople, ostensibly to support Gregory, although it no doubt crossed his mind that a bishop had moved from Antioch to Constantinople in the recent past.<sup>55</sup>

Theodosius, when he formally entered Constantinople in December 380, began by asking Demophilus if he would simply accept the Creed of Nicaea and remain as bishop, which would have made for an interesting time for all concerned, but fortunately for the Meletians, Demophilus turned him down and went into exile.<sup>56</sup> Theodosius, though he clearly

had his doubts about Gregory, installed him as Bishop of Constantinople with a considerable military presence to prevent rioting. Gregory's legitimacy was at this point paper-thin, as he himself was well aware, since the Creed of 360 setting aside Nicaea was the last piece of imperially-backed conciliar theology to which Constantinople was signed up, and so Theodosius scheduled a Council to re-instate the Creed of Nicaea and formally elect a bishop for Constantinople, then expected to be Gregory, prior to proceeding to Aquileia for an ecumenical council with bishops of the West, which would formally restore communion across the whole empire on the basis of the Nicene Creed.

The Council of Antioch of 379 clearly provided the basis for the list of invitations, but the problem was that that had been a council of the Diocese of Oriens, and very few of the bishops associated with it were from the regions adjacent to Constantinople.<sup>57</sup> The ghosts at the feast were the Homoiousians/Macedonianists/Pneumomachians, who represented probably a majority of the sees around Constantinople, especially now that Thrace had been overrun by Goths. This party were in a rather awkward position, because they had signed up to the Creed of Nicaea in 365 but repudiated it in 375 in order to be accepted back into the imperially-recognised episcopal fold, with rather unfortunate timing, since they threw away fifteen years of the high moral ground for what turned out to be a mere three years in power. Most of the Homoiousian group who had represented the majority at Seleucia and had been deposed at Constantinople 360 were now dead, including Macedonius, Marathonius, Basil of Ancyra, Silvanus of Tarsus, Sophronius of Epiphaneia and most recently Eustathius of Sebasteia, and others such as Cyril of Jerusalem and his nephew Gelasius of Caesarea had jumped ship to the Meletians, but Eleusius of Cyzicus was still leading the party with the help of Marcian of Lampsachus, and they clearly made their claims heard by Theodosius, because they were invited to the Council of 381. The fact that the Council of Antioch of 379 had carefully targeted all the sees of their deceased leading members, so that Meletius' presbyter

Diodore was now Bishop of Tarsus in place of Silvanus, and first Gregory of Nyssa and then his younger brother Peter had targeted Sebasteia immediately after Eustathius' death did not make for an amicable discussion. But Theodosius was conscious of the reasonableness of their claims to have a say in the election of a new Bishop of Constantinople, and at least 34 of them were invited to the Council. They no doubt had a candidate of their own for the See of Constantinople in mind.

The Council of Constantinople was long- at over two months, longer than the Council of 360, although that of course had been the end point of a much longer process- and acrimonious, as Gregory Nazianzen's poem *On his Life* amply testifies. We know that it drew up a new creed at some point, which would be dusted off and canonised at the Council of Chalcedon, and that it probably also attempted to promulgate a long list of canons of earlier Councils, the Antioch collection, with the addition of some canons of Basil of Caesarea. Most importantly, when Meletius of Antioch died in the middle of the Council, many among its members wanted to elect a new Bishop of Antioch, Flavian, then and there, despite the existence of an earlier pact not to elect a new bishop until Paulinus was dead. The thirty-four Homoiousians walked out at a certain point- when is disputed, though my own view is that it was only after Gregory resigned and Nectarius was elected the fourth Bishop of Constantinople in a year. All the ingredients of Seleucia and Constantinople 360 were there- a new and self-confident group of bishops feeling they were now coming into their kingdom, a controversial new Creed, grandstanding on the necessity or unorthodoxy of previous creeds, mass recriminations, mutual denunciations and anathematisations, bad blood with the Western churches, one party being replaced en mass as the official bishops of the leading sees by another, new bishops being invited from further afield in the middle to give the Council more legitimacy, personal enmities breaking out into the open. But despite the fact that Constantinople 381 went on for two months, discussed a large number of different agenda

items and included a great deal of drama, a death, a resignation and a mass walk-out, the only official documents issued at the time by the Council were a short note to Theodosius, the ‘Logos Prosphonetikos’, asking him to ratify their proceedings, and a synodikon of a few lines which would later be divided into four canons, noting that the Creed of Nicaea is not to be set aside but is to remain valid, setting out a list of post-Nicene heretics, stating that elections and judicial proceedings are to happen within the boundaries of their civil dioceses only, setting Constantinople above Alexandria and Antioch in ecclesiastical precedence, and stating that Maximus the Cynic is not Bishop of Constantinople and his ordinations are invalid.

Even this much would be too much for the Council of Rome meeting the following year, which condemned the idea that Constantinople should be placed above the two older sees, and the political reasoning on the basis of which this was done. But we should pause to note just how much potential and actual episcopal activity Theodosius had quashed in insisting that the Council hold to the original terms of its summons, and simply elect a Bishop of Constantinople, re-confirm the Nicene Creed, and issue a few neutral notes on canonical jurisdiction. The Council did not elect a Bishop of Antioch, despite the claims of some scholars- Theodosius introduced a long slow funeral march back to Antioch with Meletius’ body and a period of mourning, which meant that the election would have to be held in the diocese of Oriens by the bishops of that diocese. Although the bishops of Oriens did go ahead with electing Flavian to replace Meletius instead of recognising Paulinus, that meant that despite the complaints of Ambrose and Damasus, their beef was with one single diocese and not with the whole of the Eastern Church- the Council of Rome of 382 contented itself with formally breaking off communion merely with Flavian’s two consecrators rather than with a larger group, and of course continuing to recognise Paulinus as Bishop of Antioch for the two more years he was alive. The Council did not formally depose anyone, other than declaring

that Maximus was not Bishop of Constantinople, which Damasus of Rome was happy to accept, because he deemed Maximus to be an Apollinarian. It did not elect anyone other than the Bishop of Constantinople, even if it tacitly recognised a lot of elections in the diocese of Oriens which were probably in practice quite questionable. It did not issue a new creed, despite drawing one up, and it did not insist that anyone formally subscribe to the Nicene Creed, despite decreeing that the Creed of Nicaea was not to be set aside. It did not issue a collection of canons whose provenance the Westerners might have disputed. There was as big a theological sea-change after Constantinople 381 as there had been after Constantinople 360, and probably as many sees changed hands, but it was all done with much, much more subtlety. Even the list of heretics was pared down in Theodosius' post-synodal legislation- only Arians and Eunomians are legislated against. Theodosius I only after 383 began to legislate against the Macedonians, and never legislated against the followers of Marcellus of Ancyra.

Nonetheless, Theodosius' post-conciliar legislation was not without bite. By establishing 'touchstone' bishops with whom all other bishops in a diocese had to agree theologically, he handed as much power to his named individuals as Constantius had ever handed to his own theological favourites. In particular, he handed the diocese of Oriens over to the complete theological control of Diodore of Tarsus for the remaining ten years of his life, which would have serious long-term consequences for Eastern Christianity. But the Council of 381, while changing the theological scene completely, left no real purchase for anyone to start or renew a theological fight, or to demand a judicial review. The Creed of Nicaea had been introduced by Constantine- the Council of 381 was merely reaffirming its validity. A bishop of Constantinople needed legitimacy- this one was elected by 150 bishops. Over 50 years of wrangling was brought to an end, therefore, by this Council which did almost nothing, backed up by a lot of astute politics in its aftermath.

Was it a far, far better thing Theodosius did in managing Constantinople 381 than ever a Christian emperor had done? That depends on one's opinion of the relative theological worth of the Creeds of Nicaea and Constantinople 360. And in allowing the Goths to go on worshiping in the custom and language of their ancestors, Constantinople 381 did store up theological problems for the future. But I think it is worth taking the time to compare the two councils side by side. One is often tempted- I am myself- to see Constantinople 381 as the weakest of the early ecumenical councils, and be frustrated that it did not promulgate a clearer theology of the consubstantiality of the Holy Spirit with the other two persons of the Trinity. But sometimes theological strength is best seen in weakness- and Constantinople 381 might well be one of those times.

---

<sup>1</sup> The best and most comprehensive work published on the Council to date is still Adolf Martin Ritter, *Das Konzil von Konstantinopel und sein Symbol: Studien zur Geschichte und Theologie des II. Ökumenischen Konzils*, *Forschungen zur Kirchen- und Dogmengeschichte* 15 (Göttingen, 1965), which offers thorough discussion of all the documents, the historiographical problems, and particularly of the problem of the Creed. For the Council's documents, see *Athanasius Werke* III 6, *Die Synoden von Konstantinopel (381) und Aquileia (381)*, ed. Annette von Stockhausen and Christian Müller (Tübingen, forthcoming). See also Sara Parvis, *Constantinople: the Making of an Ecumenical Council*, forthcoming.

<sup>2</sup> Socrates, *Historia Ecclesiastica* V 8—9 (Sokrates, *Kirchengeschichte*, ed. Günther Christian Hansen with Manja Širinjsn, GCS N.F. 1 (Berlin, 1995)); Sozomen, *Historia Ecclesiastica* VII 7.1—9.5 (Sozomenus, *Kirchengeschichte*, ed. Joseph Bidez and Günther Christian Hansen, 2<sup>nd</sup> edn., GCS N.F. 4 (Berlin, 1995)).

<sup>3</sup> Theodoret, *Historia Ecclesiastica* V 7.4—8.10 (Theodoret, *Kirchengeschichte*, ed. Léon Parmentier and Günther Christian Hansen, 3<sup>rd</sup> edn., GCS N.F. 5 (Berlin, 1998)).

---

<sup>4</sup> Philostorgius, *Historia Ecclesiastica* IV 12—V 3 (Philostorgius, *Kirchengeschichte, mit dem Leben des Lucian von Antiochien und den Fragmenten eines arianischen Historiographen*, ed. Joseph Bidez, 3<sup>rd</sup> edn. Friedhelm Winkelmann, GCS 21 (Berlin, 1981)).

<sup>5</sup> Soc., *HE* II 41—3; Soz., *HE* IV 24—5; Theod., *HE* II 28.3—30.2.

<sup>6</sup> In my view, Franz Geppert, *Die Quellen des Kirchenhistorikers Socrates Scholasticus*, *Studien zur Geschichte der Theologie und der Kirche* III 4 (Leipzig, 1898), 102-107 must be correct that the Macedonianist material in chapters V 8—9 in Socrates derives from Sabinus.

<sup>7</sup> *Chronicon Paschale* 543-4 (citation is by the pages of Ludwig August Dindorf (ed.), *Chronicon Paschale*, *Corpus scriptorium historiae Byzantinae* 16—17, 2 vols. (Bonn, 1832)); Soc., *HE* II 43.

<sup>8</sup> Soz., *HE* IV 23.3—25.6.

<sup>9</sup> Philost., *HE* V 1.

<sup>10</sup> Timothy D. Barnes, *Athanasius and Constantius: Theology and Politics in the Constantinian Empire* (Cambridge, MA, 1993), 153—4.

<sup>11</sup> Soz., *HE* IV 23.8.

<sup>12</sup> I have calculated this number by matching the names of bishops mentioned in the *Chronicon Paschale* 543—4 (Dindorf) with the names of those who signed Acacius' creed given in Epiphanius, *Panarion* 73.25 (Epiphanius, *Ancoratus und Panarion*, vol. 3, *Panarion haer.* 65—80; *De Fide*, ed. Karl Holl, 2<sup>nd</sup> edn. Jürgen Dummer, GCS 37 (Berlin, 1985)); as sees are not given in the *Chronicon Paschale*, one or two identifications may be misplaced, but the overlap is striking. Four of the Libyan bishops are mentioned in the letter to George of Alexandria included in Theod., *HE* II 29.3.

<sup>13</sup> On the trial of Aetius, which began in late 359 in the presence of Basil of Ancyra and the majority delegates of Seleucia but was confirmed by Eudoxius after the deposition of Basil,



---

see Richard Paul Vaggione, *Eunomius of Cyzicus and the Nicene Revolution* (Oxford, 2000), 224—6.

<sup>14</sup> Theod., *HE* II 29.3.

<sup>15</sup> Philost., *HE* IV 12.

<sup>16</sup> Philost., *HE* IV 12; Theod., *HE* II 29.

<sup>17</sup> Philost., *HE* V 3.

<sup>18</sup> Soz., *HE* IV 24.1.

<sup>19</sup> Soz., *HE* IV 23.8.

<sup>20</sup> Ammianus Marcellinus, *Rerum Gestarum Qui Supersunt* XVII 7; Soz., *HE* IV 16.5; T.D. Barnes, *Constantius* (1993), 140.

<sup>21</sup> For a critical text with translation, see Wolfram Kinzig (ed.) 2017. *Faith in Formulae: A Collection of Early Christian Creeds and Creed-related Texts*, 4 vols (Oxford, 2017). On the history of the theological problems it was pretending to address, see, for example, Lewis Ayers, *Nicaea and Its Legacy: An Approach to Fourth-century Trinitarian Theology* (Oxford, 2004).

<sup>22</sup> Soc., *HE* II 39—40.

<sup>23</sup> On the politics of the twin councils of Ariminum and Seleucia, see T.D. Barnes, *Constantius* (1993), chapter 16, and Soc, *HE* II 39—40. The proceedings of the Council of Seleucia are better documented than those of any other fourth-century council, and give a good flavour of the general discussion. Of the 160 bishops who attended the Council of Seleucia, Hilary of Poitiers, *Against Constantius* 12 (Hilaire de Poitiers, *Contre Constance*, ed. and tr. André Rocher, SC 334 (Paris, 1987)) tells us that 105 supported the theology of the Homoiousian party, which was in favour of the Dedication Creed, while the Egyptian bishops mainly supported *homoousios* (presumably in the form of the Nicene Creed). Forty-three supported Acacius of Caesarea's *ousia*-free creed (Epiph., *Pan.* 73.26; for the text, see

---

W. Kinzig, *Faith in Formulae* (2017), I 416—17). There was no support at all expressed for the initial version of the ‘homoian’ creed.

<sup>24</sup> Gilbert Dagron, *Naissance d’une capitale: Constantinople et ses institutions de 330 à 451*, 2nd edn. (Paris, 1984), 440—1.

<sup>25</sup> Zonaras, *Epitome XIII* 11.25—6 (Ioannis Zonarae *Epitomae Historiarum*, Vol. 3, *Libri XIII—XVIII*, ed. Theodor Büttner-Wobst, *Corpus scriptorium historiae byzantinae* 33 (Bonn, 1897)).

<sup>26</sup> Soc., *HE* II 43.

<sup>27</sup> T.D. Barnes, *Constantius* (1993).

<sup>28</sup> For example. Philost., *HE* VI 1.

<sup>29</sup> *Chronicon Paschale* 543—4 (Dindorf).

<sup>30</sup> For appeals to the Creed of Ariminum/Constantinople in law, see, for example, Valentinian II in 385.

<sup>31</sup> Timothy Barnes (*Constantius* (1993), 153—4) notes that Julian made moves to conciliate the bishops of Gaul, in particular, fairly quickly after the Council of Constantinople.

<sup>32</sup> Soc., *HE* III 25; Soz., *HE* VI 7.

<sup>33</sup> *Historia acephala* 3.2 (Annik Martin and Micheline Albert (eds.), *Histoire ‘acéphale’ et Index syriaque des Lettres festales d’Athanasie d’Alexandrie*, SC 317 (Paris, 1985), 150).

<sup>34</sup> Theod., *HE* III 6.5; Soz., *HE* V 15.5

<sup>35</sup> *Historia acephala* 5.1—7; Noel Lenski, *Failure of Empire: Valens and the Roman State in the Fourth Century A.D.* (Berkeley, 2002), 247.

<sup>36</sup> Athanasius of Ancyra is the only Constantinople 360 appointment who can clearly be shown to have remained in the see he was appointed to throughout the reigns of Julian and Jovian, and to have continued there until his death under Valens.

<sup>37</sup> Theod., *HE* II 32.3.

---

<sup>38</sup> See the discussion of the pastoral aims of the Eunomians in R.P. Vaggione, *Eunomius* (2000), 275—80.

<sup>39</sup> Cyril's ongoing rivalry with Acacius and the importance of his see saw him replaced with three different men between 361 and 381, but he was always successfully able to displace them. Silvanus is back in harness in Tarsus by the time of the projected 367 council (Soz., *HE* VI 12.4).

<sup>40</sup> *Historia acephala* 2.8—10.

<sup>41</sup> R.P. Vaggione, *Eunomius* (2000), 275.

<sup>42</sup> For the politics of this, see Johannes Zachhuber, 'The Antiochene Synod of AD 363 and the Beginnings of Neo-Niceneism', *ZAC* 4 (2000): 83—101.

<sup>43</sup> Soc., *HE* III 24—25.

<sup>44</sup> On Jovian's probable recognition of Meletius and the council of 363 in general, see Zachhuber, 'The Antiochene Synod of 363' (2000).

<sup>45</sup> For the conciliar letter, see Soc., *HE* III 25.6—18.

<sup>46</sup> On the reign of Valens generally, see N. Lenski, *Failure of Empire* (2002). I have largely espoused his view of Valens' religious policy, which changed dramatically (Soz., *HE* VI 7) on Athanasius' death in 373.

<sup>47</sup> Soz., *HE* VI 7.

<sup>48</sup> See, for example, Stephen Williams and Gerard Friell, *Theodosius: The Empire at Bay* (Routledge, 1994), chapter on religious policy.

<sup>49</sup> Ἐπὶ τῷ κρατύναι τὴν ἐν Νικαίᾳ πίστιν καὶ χειροτονῆσαι τῇ Κωνσταντινουπόλει ἐπίσκοπον (Soc., *HE* V 8.1—7); this is probably the exact wording used in the official convocation. Sozomen (VII 7.1) has paraphrased it, as is his wont.

<sup>50</sup> For the list of the bishops who signed at Constantinople 381, see Cuthbert Hamilton Turner, 'Canons Attributed to the Council of Constantinople, A. D. 381, together with the

---

Names of the Bishops from Two Patmos MSS POB' and POG", *JTS* 15 (1913—14): 161—78; Hubert Kaufhold, 'Griechische-syrische Väterlisten der frühen griechischen Synoden'; *Oriens Christianus* 77 (1993): 1—96, at 72—8; and Noel Quinton King, 'The 150 Holy Fathers of the Council of Constantinople 381 A.D.: Some Notes on the Bishop-lists', *Studia Patristica* 1 (1957): 635—41; see also Parvis, 'The bishops of Constantinople 381', forthcoming.

<sup>51</sup> See the map in Noel Quinton King, *The Emperor Theodosius and the Establishment of Christianity* (London, 1961).

<sup>52</sup> See the discussion of this council in Gustave Bardy, 'Le concile d'Antioche (379)', *RBén* 45 (1933): 196—213. The conciliar letter of Constantinople 382 implies that it was largely the same group of bishops who attended the Council of Antioch in 379 and the Councils of Constantinople of 381 and 382 (Theod., *HE* V 9.13).

<sup>53</sup> See Gregory of Nazianzen's poem *On His Life* (especially line 596: Gregory of Nazianzus, *Autobiographical Poems*, ed. and tr. Caroline White (Cambridge, 1996)), and the discussion in John A. McGuckin, *St. Gregory of Nazianzus: An Intellectual Biography* (New York, 2001). Gregory presents himself in that poem as having been sent to Constantinople by 'the invitation of many shepherds and their flocks', but he also believed himself to have been sent by Basil of Caesarea (*Oration* 43.2).

<sup>54</sup> See *Codex Theodosianus* XVI 5.17 (*Codex Théodosien. Livre XVI*, ed. Theodor Mommsen, tr. Jean Rougé, with Roland Delmaire and François Richard, SC 497 (Paris, 2005)); Greg. Naz., *On His Life*.

<sup>55</sup> Soc., *HE* V 5.

<sup>56</sup> Soc., *HE* V 7.4—9.

<sup>57</sup> Cf. Theodoret's Letter of the Council of 382.