
*Zlatomira Gerdzhikova*¹
(Institute of Balkan Studies and Center of Thracology-Bulgarian
Academy of Sciences)

ARIANS AT POWER²

Abstract: Ursacius, bishop of Singidunum, and Valens, bishop of Mursa, are the two most famous Arian bishops from the Balkans from the mid-4th century. This article presents their activities as leaders of the Arian party and their influence on the Arian-Nicene debate from the middle of the 4th c.

Keywords: Ursacius of Singidunum, Valens of Mursa, Constantius II, Arianism, Balkans

The importance of Ursacius of Singidunum and Valens of Mursa as indisputable authority figures who left their mark on the history of the Church in the decades following the Council of Nicaea has been repeatedly disputed.³ Despite the limited amount of evidence, their activity as bishops and leaders of the Arian community in the West clearly shows their leading role and their enormous influence on the development of the fourth-century Church and society.

With the present article, I will try to present the testimonies which can serve as proof of the authority of Ursacius and Valens as leaders of the Western Arians. In the following pages, however, I will not make a chronological list of their life and activity, at least because this has already been done.⁴ Instead, I will try to analyze the available information in two main directions – first, the

¹ Associate Professor at the Institute of Balkan Studies & Center of Thracology – Bulgarian Academy of Sciences, zlatomira.gerdzhikova@gmail.com

² This article is prepared as part of the project LABedia: encyclopedia of the Late Antique Balkans, funded by the National Scientific Fund of the Bulgarian Ministry of Education, Contract# KII-06-H30/6, 13.12.2018.

³ Latest Chr. Marksches, *Politische Dimensionen des homöischen Bekenntnisses? Oder: Ursacius und Valens in Sirmium 359 n.Chr.*, Kirche und Kaiser in Antike und Spätantike, ed. L. Heil, J. Ulruch (De Gruyter 2017), 111-130, and R.P. Hanson, *The Search of Christian Doctrine of God: The Arian Controversy, 318-381*, London 1988.

⁴ T. D. Barnes, *Athanasius and Constantius. Theology and Politics in the Constantinian Empire*, Cambridge, Mass. 1993; J. Zeiller, *Les origines chrétiennes dans les provinces danubiennes de l'Empire romain*, Paris 1918; M. Meslin, *Les ariens d'occident, 335-430*. Patristica Sorboniensis 8, Paris: Éditions du Seuil 1967.

information that presents Ursacius and Valens as the leaders of the Arian party in the Western parts of the Roman empire, and secondly, as far as possible, their theological activity, bearing in mind the fact that we have only circumstantial evidence of it. With this I aim to show that the two Balkan bishops were Christian leaders with considerable influence and authority, and their actions influenced the transformation of Christianity and the Church in the 4th century into imperial religion.

The main sources presenting the life and work of Ursacius of Simgidumun and Valens of Mursa are Hilary of Poitiers (Pictavia) – *Liber adversus Valentem et Ursacium*⁵; Athanasius of Alexandria – *Apologia contra Arianos*⁶, *Historia Arianorum ad monachos*⁷, *De Synodis*⁸, *Epistula ad Afros*⁹, *Epistula Festales*¹⁰; Socrates Scholastic – *Historia Ecclesiastica*¹¹; Sozoman – *Historia Ecclesiastica*¹²; Sulpicius Severus – *Chronicle*¹³, and Faustus and Marcellinus – *Adversus Damasum Libellus Precum ad Imperatores*.¹⁴ No texts written by the two Balkan bishops have reached us, despite the various testimonies that there were such. The debate over the authorship of the Creed adopted at the Council of Sirmium in 359 is still ongoing,¹⁵ so we will not dwell on its meaning, only analyzing the fact that Ursacius and Valens perceived as its authors. All the evidence we have are texts written against the two bishops. What was written by them, as well as by the rest of the Arians, was destroyed in the 4th and 5th centuries.¹⁶ The assessment of Athanasius of Alexandria and Hilary of

⁵ Hilarius, *Liber adversus Valentem et Ursacium*, Hilary of Poitiers, *Conflicts of Conscience and Law in the Fourth-Century Church*, transl. Lionel Wickham, Translated Text for Historians, Liverpool 1997.

⁶ Athanasius, *Apologia contra arianos*, ed. K. Metzler, K. Savvidis, Athanasius: Werke I.2 (Berlin - New York, De Gruyter, 1998), 177–260.

⁷ Athanasius, *Historia Arianorum ad monachos*, Athanasius: Werke. Band 2.1: Die apologien, ed. H.-G. Opitz, Berlin 1940.

⁸ Athanasius, *De Synodis Arimini in Italia et Seleucia in Isauria*, ed. H.G. Opitz, Athanasius Werke, vol. 2.1, Berlin, 1940, 231–278

⁹ Athanasius, *Epistula ad Afros*, Athanasius: Werke. Band 2.8: Die dogmatischen Schriften, ed. H.C. Brennecke et al., Berlin, New York 2002; PG.26, ed. Migne 1857, 1029–1048.

¹⁰ Athanasius, *Epistula Festales*, PG 26, ed. Migne 1857, 1360–1444.

¹¹ Sokrates Scholasticus, *Historia ecclesiastica*, ed. Günther Christian Hansen, GCS N.F. 1, Berlin 1995.

¹² Sozomenos, *Historia ecclesiastica*, eds J. Bidez, G. Chr. Hansen, GCS 50, Berlin 1960.

¹³ Sulpitius Severus, *Chronicle*, ed. Karl Halm, Opera, CSEL 1, Vienna 1866.

¹⁴ Fausti et Marcellini Presbyterorum Partis Ursini Adversus Damasum Libellus Precum Ad Imperatores Valentinianum, Theodosium Et Arcadium, ed. O. Gventer, *Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum* 35, 1895; <https://catholiclibrary.org/library/view?docId=Fathers-OR/PL.013.html;query=&subDocument=PL.013.html.xml.00000041;brand=default/20.05.2022/>

¹⁵ R.P.S. Hanson, *The Search of the Christin Doctrine of God*, 362-371; J. N. D. Kelly, *Early Christian Creeds*, London and New York, 1972, 289-293.

¹⁶ Only the compilation of Maximin of Durostorum that include works of Palladius of Ratiaria and Auxentius of Durostorum is preserved in Maximini episcopi dissertatio contra

Poitiers, however, can be seen even today from their texts reused, copied and translated centuries after their death by church historians and theologians. In the fifth century Church historians added their understanding of who Ursacius and Valens are, which shaped the bishops' image as two of the most prominent Arian leaders, and hence the most hated.

Sources about Ursacius and Valens will be presented in the context of their activities organized in two parts. The first part will examine their participation in the Council of Tyre in 325; their inclusion in the delegation sent to Emperor Constantine I (306-337) to present him with the decisions taken at Tyre for approval; their participation in the election of Macedonius as bishop of Constantinople in 342; leadership of the Western Arians at the Council of Serdica in 343; their relations with Emperor Constantius II (337-361). The second part will be shorter and more theological, showing their participation in the creation of a new symbol of the faith and its implementation.

Ursacius and Valens in the church hierarchy

Immediately after the conclusion of the Council of Nicaea, held in 325, the efforts of Nicaeans and Arians in their interpretation of the divine nature to be accepted as the orthodox one continued in full force¹⁷. Leaders of the two main parties are Athanasius, the bishop of Alexandria, for the followers of the Nicene faith,¹⁸ and Eusebius of Nicomedia, for the Arian party.¹⁹ Athanasius will fight the destruction of Arianism until his last breath, and he will be the one marking Ursacius and Valens as an integral part of the leadership of the Arian party. The remaining members of this small group of followers of Eusebius of Nicomedia would constantly change, incorporating new names or forgetting others.²⁰ However, the Balkan bishops will be a constant thorn in the side of Athanasius for more than forty years. Athanasius was the leading, most influential, and most important opponent of the two bishops, and their most

Ambrosium, ed. R. Geysen, *Scripta Ariana Latina I*, Corpus Christianorum, Series Latina 87, Brepols 1982, 149-171.

¹⁷ F. M. Young, *From Nicaea to Chalcedon. A Guide to the Literature and its Background*, London 2007; R.O. Jimersen, *The Lasting Legacy of the Council of Nicea. The Creation, Roots, and Distorted Usage of Christianity*, Create Space 2016; R.P.S. Hanson, *The Search of the Christin Doctrine of God. The Arian Controversy 318-381*, New York 1988; J.N.D. Kelly, *Early Christian Creeds*, London and New York 1972.

¹⁸ D.M. Gwynn, *Athanasius of Alexandria: Bishop, Theologian, Ascetic, Father*, Oxford University Press 2012; T.G. Weinandy, *Athanasius. A Theological Introduction*, Washington 2018; T. D. Barnes, *Athanasius and Constantius. Theology and Politics in the Constan-tinian Empire*, Cambridge, Mass. 1993.

¹⁹ D. M. Gwynn, *The Eusebians: The Polemic of Athanasius of Alexandria and the Construction of the Arian Controversy*, Oxford, 2007.

²⁰ D. M. Gwynn, *The Eusebians: The Polemic of Athanasius of Alexandria and the Construction of the Arian Controversy*, Oxford, 2007; S. Parvis, *Marcellus of Ancyra and the Lost Years of the Arian Controversy 325-345*, Oxford University Press 2006.

authoritative supporter, in turn, was Emperor Constantius II. In opposition to the one and with the support of the other, Ursacius and Valens will obtain a power that will extend over the whole Christian world.

Who are Ursacius and Valens, and what do we know about their lives before becoming the key figures in the Arian debate? Ursacius was born around 300 AD, and probably c. 335 was ordained as bishop of Singidunum by the Arians in the city. Between 325 and 335 AD he was a presbyter of an Orthodox bishop, but because of his Arian inclinations was removed from the clergy. The first major event where we meet him is the Council of Tyre, held in 335. Unfortunately, the information about Valens's early years is even less, and our first encounter with him is at the Council of Tyre.

My study will begin at 355 with Ursacius and Valens's participation in the council of Tyre²¹ and will continue with the election of Macedonius as bishop of Constantinople.²² Both events occurred in their early years as bishops, but were key to establishing them as leaders of the Arian party.

Thus, the two Balkan bishops appeared for the first time on the political stage of the Arian conflict at the Council summoned by Emperor Constantine I in the city of Tyre (Socr. HE I.27-35; Soz. HE II.25-28).²³ The organization of the Council was untypical, as the bishops were supposed to meet in Tyre on their way to Jerusalem, where they should take part in the consecration of the newly built temple Holy Sepulture (Socr. HE I.32). Emperor's plan was simple – after a short discussion between representatives of the two arguing parties he expected a quick reconciliation. Thus, the consecration of the Christian temple would be a celebration of the achievement of church unity.

About 310 bishops gathered in Tyre, among whom were Ursacius and Valens (Socr. HE I.27; Soz. HE II.25). The main subject of this gettoeing was the accusations of Athanasius of Alexandria of violence against the other Egyptian bishops. The Council of Tyre can not be define as an ordinary synod but in some extent is decisive for the events that followed. On the one hand, it is a council summoned to deal with the accusations brought against one of the metropolitan bishops, to get acquainted with the presented facts, and to pass judgment. This synod is nothing more than an ecclesiastical court – a combination between a religious and a secular event. Summoned by the emperor, the council was presided by the bishop of Tyre – Paul and *comes* Flavius Dionysius – representative of Constantine.

Ursacius and Valens can not be identified among the participants in the several days of discussions of what Athanasius did or did not do, but they were

²¹ D. M. Gwynn, *The Eusebians: The Polemic of Athanasius of Alexandria and the Construction of the Arian Controversy*, Oxford, 2007, 85-57. R.P. Hanson, *The Search of Christian Doctrine of God*, 262-264; T. D. Barnes, *Athanasius and Constantius. Theology and Politics in the Constantinian Empire*, Cambridge, Mass. 1993, 22-24; T.D. Barnes, *Constantine and Eusebius*, Harvard University press, 1981, 235-240.

²² T. D. Barnes, *Athanasius and Constantius*, 22-24; T. D. Barnes, *Emperors and Bishops of Constantinople (324-431)*, Christianity, Democracy, and the Shadow of Constantine, eds George E. Demacopoulos, Aristotle Papanikolaou (Fordham University Press 2017), 176-180.

²³ T. D. Barnes, *Athanasius and Constantius*, 21-24.

selected to be part of a group of six bishops (Theognis of Nicaea, Maris of Chalcedon, Theodore of Heraclea, and Macedonius) who were assigned the task to go to a place called Mareotis, in Egypt, to investigate the charges brought against the bishop of Alexandria (Socr. HE I.31). How important their inclusion in this investigative group is for the establishing them as leading bishops, and to what extent it affects their establishment as one the leaders of the Arian community in the Balkans, is a matter of personal interpretation.²⁴ However, to the participation in the Council of Tyre and the task the two Balkan bishops were charged with, we must add Athanasius's testimony about them, namely that they were disciples of Arius from the time of his first exile in Illyricum in 325 (ad Episc. Aegypt. 7) and that they are still young „physically and mentally“. Their age can be further evidence of the atypical role they have been assigned with.

According to the testimony of Socrates Scholasticus (Socr. HE I.27), Ursacius and Valens, together with Eusebius, bishop of Nicomedia, Theognis, bishop of Nicaea, and Maris, Bishop of Chalcedon participated in the preparation of the charges against Athanasius at the Council of Tyre, which included theft, sacrilege, and murder. Combining them with the rest of the accounts about Ursacius and Valens, and the absence of such an accusation on the part of Athanasius, we may rather add this indictment to the body of evidence revealing the fear the two bishops evoked and the memory of it a century later.

After the Council in Tyre ended, and the majority of the bishops voted for the ex-communication of Athanasius from his chair, a delegation of six bishops was sent to Constantinople to present the decisions of the council to Constantine I for approval (Socr. HE I.35, Soz. HE II.28). The delegation included Eusebius, bishop of Nicomedia, Theognis, bishop of Nicaea, Patrophilus, bishop of Scythopolis, Eusebius, bishop of Caesarea, Ursacius, and Valens (Athan. ap. cont. arian. 87.1). Their arrival in the capital presented them with another conflict, another debate and another political intrigue that they have to deal with. I will not dwell on what happened in Constantinople, enough has been written about it.²⁵ I will focus my attention solely on the fact that the „young“ Ursacius and Valens were included in the delegation on an equal footing with the leaders of the Arian party. We do not learn whether they contributed anything to what happened in Constantinople, but the fact that they were part of this important delegation is in itself evidence of the authority they already had or the role that had been prepared for them as leaders of the Western Arians.

We have no information about where Ursacius and Valens were and what they were doing for seven years. In AD 342, the two bishops (again together) appeared in Constantinople to participate in the election and consecration of the Arian Macedonius as bishop of the city (Socr. II.13). The election of Macedonius as bishop of Constantinople marked a new stage in establishing the new imperial capital as an episcopal see.²⁶ However, before reaching the

²⁴ R.P. Hanson, *The Search of Christian Doctrine of God*, 262-264; T. D. Barnes, *Athanasius and Constantius*, 22-24

²⁵ R.P. Hanson, *The Search of Christian Doctrine of God*, 262-264; T. D. Barnes, *Athanasius and Constantius*, 22-24

²⁶ T. D. Barnes, *Athanasius and Constantius*, 212-217.

subsequent changes, a struggle began between the supporters of the Arians and the Nicaeans, in which all the Christians, citizens of Constantinople, and the emperor himself, took part. At the beginning of the 40s of the 4th century, although established as a Christian city, Constantinople had not yet found its place in the ecclesiastical structure, and its bishops did not enjoy the respect they should be given as religious leaders of the capital city. Christian bishops were aware of the city's importance, and a fierce battle began between the Arians and the Niceneans for the imposition of their representative as bishop. The election of Macedonius in 342 turned out to be key for the Arians and the capital itself,²⁷ and it was Ursacius and Valens representing the Western Arians during the election. What were they doing in Constantinople and what ecclesiastical norms allowed their participation in the election is debatable. Even if they were only lateral participants their presence in the consecration reveals their importance at the moment.

We cannot ignore the relationship between Ursacius, Valens and Emperor Constantine. Most of the information is implicit but in most of the situations the well-established mutual respect is undeniable.

A story, preserved in the Chronicle of Sulpitius Severus is indicative for the relations between the emperor and the Balkan bishops. In 351 Constantius faced a decisive battle against the usurper Magnentius near Mursa, the city of which Valens was bishop. The bishop immediately took advantage of the opportunity presented to him. Sulpicius Severus tells us (Sulp. Sev. Chron. II.38) the following. During the battle of Mursa, September 351, Constantius did not find the strength to personally join the battle but settled in the martyrion located immediately next to the city gates. The bishop of the city Valens, arranged through his spies that he should be the first to learn the outcome of the battle. He aimed to be the first to bring him the good news in case of victory and to give him time to escape in case of loss. Thus Valens had the opportunity to be the first to inform the imperial retinue of the retreating army of Maxentius, and when Constantius asked to see the bearer of the good news, the bishop said, that an angel himself had brought him the good news. So Constantius declared that the victory was achieved by the merit of Valens and not by the bravery of his army.

According to the testimony of Sulpicius Severus (Chron. II.38), the Arians won over the emperor, but more than that, „all the bishops of the two Pannonias, and many of the eastern bishops, as well as all of Asia, joined their false faith.“ Sulpicius Severus pointed out Ursacius of Singidunum as the leader of the Arian party, followed by Valens of Mursa, Theodoret of Heraclea, and only after them Stephen of Antioch, Acacius of Caesarea, Menophantus of Ephesus, George of Laodicea, and Narcissus of Neronopolis. These were the bishops without whose consent the emperor did not take any action related to ecclesiastical affairs. No doubt that the two Balkan bishops from Illyricum were recognized as among the leaders of the Arian party not only in the West but in the East too. When this happened can only be assumed, but we can be sure that in 351 at the battle

²⁷ E. Manders, *Macedonius, Constantius, and the Changing Dynamics of Power, Episcopal Networks in Late Antiquity: Connection and Communication Across Boundaries*, eds. C.A. Cvetkovic, P. Gemeinhardt (De Gruyter 2019), 249-265.

near Mursa was not the highest point of their career. Presented data are partial, subjective, and sometimes exaggerated, but the main sense is constant for all of them – as bishops in the Christian church Ursacius and Valens were leaders since the moment of their consecration. They were accepted as peers by the universally recognized authority of Eusebius of Nicomedia and Eusebius of Caesarea and became close advisors of Constantine since the early years as emperor. They were so hated by the orthodox bishops that the memory of them outlived them and *damnation memoriae* of their work passed to us through the narratives of their opponents. This, I think, is a powerful testimony to the significance of their acts as Arian leaders.

The second group of information that will be examined is related to the theological activity of Ursacius and Valens. We have no information about their origin or the education they received, but from some circumstantial testimonies, we can assume that the two bishops had at least a Christian education. If they are students of Arius, as Athanasius represents them, they could be trained by him according to the traditions of the school of Libanius. For now, we can only imagine what the situation was, so let's see how they put their theological knowledge into practice.

In 343 emperors Constantius II and Constans I (337-350) summoned a second great council at Serdica, the metropolitan city of *Dacia Mediterranea*. The main goal of the council was to resolve the Arian controversy.²⁸ Ursacius and Valens were present as leaders of the Western Arians. At Serdica nothing happened as planned and after a few days' informal conversations the council split – after refusing to participate in the official proceedings the Eastern bishops left for Philippopolis.²⁹ Bishops in Serdica, mostly representatives of the Western parts of the Roman world, excommunicated some of the Arian leaders and Eastern leaders, before leaving to Philippopolis prepared an encyclical letter and discussed a new creed.³⁰ What interests us in this particular case, however, is Hall's opinion³¹ that Ursacius and Valens had a leading role in the preparation of a symbol of faith that should have been presented for discussion and acceptance at the council in Serdica but due to its division in two parties, bishops never got an opportunity to even hear it. I will not discuss the creed but only what means that Ursacius and Valens were an active part of the discussion. There is no doubt that at this point there were already leaders of the Arian party in the West but what is important here is their capacity to write and discuss a new creed. Although there is no information about their education and only assumptions that they knew and study under Arius this implicit evidence of their erudition presents the questions about where, when, and with whom they

²⁸ H. Hess, *The Early Development of the Canon Law and the Council of Serdica*, Oxford University Press, 2022; L. Barbard, *The Council of Serdica 343 A.D.*, Sofia 1983; T. D. Barnes, *Athanasius and Constantius*, 71-81.

²⁹ Council of Philippopolis is studied mainly by Peter Gramatikov, see P. Gramatikov, *Philippopoljskiyat Sabor (Nikejsko pravoslavie i arianska eres)*, Plovdiv 2019. [П. Граматиков, *Филипполският събор (Никејско православие и арианска ерес)*, Пловдив 2019]

³⁰ For the discussions see J. N. D. Kelly, *Early Christian Creeds*, 275-279.

³¹ S. G. Hall, *The Creed of Serdica*, *Studia Patristica*, ed. E. A. Livingstone, (Leuven 1989), 173-184.

studied Christian literature. In the second half of the fourth century will rise a new wave of bishops – well-educated and part of the ruling elite, but still in 343 reading and writing bishops were not many and well-educated bishops were rare.

After the council of Serdica Ursacius and Valens participated in way too many councils summoned by the adherents of the Nicæan and Arian doctrine. I will discuss their role in a few of them: 351 – the Second Council of Sirmium; 357 – council of Sirmium; 359 – council of Arimini/Seleucia. These three councils are significant with the creeds they produced and the two Balkan bishops had a leading role in the process.

While in Sirmium in 351 Emperor Constantius summoned a council³². Along with the excommunication of some bishops a creed was discussed and voted. It is known as the First Sirmium Creed (Ath. De Syn. 27, Socr. HE II.30), although it is nothing more than an Antiochian creed of 341 (Dedication Council) supplemented with 26 anathemas.³³ The First Sirmium (Latin version in Hil. De syn. 37) creed will mark the beginning of a process of establishing a new and acceptable for all formula aiming to put an end of the Arian controversy. Ursacius and Valens were the bishops that Emperor Constantius counted to succeed, unfortunately the council of 351 was not it.

Ursacius and Valens used the third exile of Athanasius to attempt to impose Arianism in the western parts of the empire. In 357, again at Sirmium and in the presence of the emperor, Ursacius, Valens and Germinius, bishop of Sirmium, proposed the so-called Second Sirmium symbol (Ath. Apol. Sec. 39, Apol. de Fuga 5, Hist. Aria. 45; Hilary De synod. 11; Socr. HE II.29; Sozom. HE IV.6 1-16).³⁴ This symbol was prepared in the emperor's presence the shortly before the Fourth Council of Sirmium was held (Latin text Hilary De synod. 11) and is known as "The Blasphemy of Sirmium". Authors of this creed were Ursacius, Valens, Potamius of Lisbon and Germinius of Sirmium and it was a bold attack on the Nicæan party. Emperors' insistence for unity of the Church and the help of Ursacius and Valens who applied enough pressure to the leaders of Christian world provided the signatures even of Osius of Cordoba and Pope Liberius.³⁵ Unfortunately, the signatures were not enough.

Constantius continued with his dream to unite the Church and under the influence of Ursacius and Valens, two years later summoned parallel councils at Arimini for the Western and at Seleucia for the Eastern bishops. Before the council, a small group of bishops met at Sirmium and drafted a new creed hoping³⁶. Like the other creed, Ursacius and Valens³⁷ participated in the prepara-

³² The church historians Socrates and Sozomenus confuse the councils of Sirmium of 351 and 357 – see more in R.P. Hanson, *The Search of Christian Doctrine of God*, 325 n. 52.

³³ About the council and the creed in details see R.P. Hanson, *The Search of Christian Doctrine of God*, 325-329; J.N.D. Kelly, *Early Christian Creeds*, 281-283.

³⁴ R.P. Hanson, *The Search of Christian Doctrine of God*, 343-347; J.N.D. Kelly, *Early Christian Creeds*, 285-287.

³⁵ R.P. Hanson, *The Search of Christian Doctrine of God*, 343.

³⁶ R.P. Hanson, *The Search of Christian Doctrine of God*, 362-371; J.N.D. Kelly, *Early Christian Creeds*, 289-293.

³⁷ J.N.D. Kelly, *Early Christian Creeds*, 291.

tion of this one too. The gathering in Seleucia was chaotic due to an earthquake near Nicomedia shortly before the council. Nothing was achieved except splitting the Eastern bishops. Completely different was the situation in the West in Arimini. Close to 400 bishops attended the council and after the new creed was presented it not only was rejected but Ursacius and Valens were excommunicated.

Ursacius and Valens participated in more than 12 different councils some summoned by them other excommunicating them. Every one of these councils defining the Church structure, hierarchy, and doctrine was important not only for the two Balkan bishops but for the whole Christian world. The presented three councils reveal not only the administrative role of Ursacius and Valens as bishops but their theological and political abilities, as well as their relationship with the emperor Constantius II.

After 371 we no longer find information about Ursacius of Singidunum. In all probability, he was succeeded as bishop by Secundianus, the bishop condemned by the council at Aquileia with Palladius of Ratiaria. The last evidence of Valens is from 369 when a council at Rome excommunicated him. He probably died before 375 AD.

Ursacius and Valens are two of the most influential bishops from the Balkans. Not only did they lead the Arian party in the West, but they succeeded in becoming personal advisers to Emperor Constantius II, and from this position, they tried to impose a creed that was a compromise between Arians and Nicenes. After the success of the followers of the Nicene faith, they were denounced as heretics and represented as destroyers of Christendom. Despite this negative image imposed by the established Orthodox party, we cannot deny that their position and influence had a significant impact on the course of the Arians-Nicene controversy. Nor can we ignore the obvious knowledge and skill they possessed to be able to form the basis of a religious doctrine.

Sources

Athanasius of Alexandria, *Epistula ad Episcopos Aegypti et Libyae*, K. Metzler (ed.) *Athanasius: Werke* I.1 (Berlin, 1996–2000), 39–64.

Translated in A. Robertson (ed.) (1892) *St. Athanasius: Select Works and Letters*, Select Library of Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers, Second Series, vol. 4, (Oxford), 222–235.

Athanasius of Alexandria, *Apologia contra arianos*, ed. K. Metzler, K. Savvidis *Athanasius: Werke* I.2 (Berlin - New York, De Gruyter, 1998), 177–260.

Athanasius of Alexandria, *Historia Arianorum ad monachos*, *Athanasius: Werke. Band 2.1: Die apologien*, ed. H.-G. Opitz, Berlin

Athanasius of Alexandria, *De Synodis Arimini in Italia et Seleucia in Isauria*, ed. H.G. Opitz, *Athanasius Werke*, vol. 2.1, Berlin, 1940, pp. 231–278

Athanasius of Alexandria, *Epistula ad Afros*, *Athanasius: Werke. Band 2.8: Die dogmatischen Schriften*, ed. H.C. Brennecke et al., Berlin, New York, 2002; PG.26.1029–1048.

Athanasius of Alexandria, *Epistula Festales*, PG 26, 1360-444.

Faustini Et Marcellini Presbyterorum Partis Ursini Adversus Damasum Libellus Precum Ad Imperatores Valentinianum, Theodosium Et Arcadium, ed. O. Gventer, Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum 35, 1895

Hilarius *Liber adversus Valentem et Ursacium*, Hilary of Poitiers, Conflicts of Conscience and Law in the Fourth-Century Church, transl. Lionel Wickham, Translated Text for Historians, Liverpool 1997.

Philostorgius, *Historia Ecclesiastica*, J. Bidez (ed.) (1981) *Philostorgius: Kirchengeschichte*, GCS, 3rd edn, rev. by F. Winkelmann.

P. R. Amidon (tr.) *Philostorgius: Church History* (Atlanta, Georgia, 2007)

Maximini episcopi dissertatio contra Ambrosium, ed. R. Geysen, Scripta Ariana Latina I, Corpus Christianorum, Series Latina 87, Brepols 1982, 149-171

Sokrates Scholasticus, *Historia ecclesiastica*, Günther Christian Hansen (ed.), GCS N.F. 1 (Berlin, 1995).

Sozomenos, *Historia ecclesiastica*, Joseph Bidez and Günther Christian Hansen (eds), GCS 50 (Berlin, 1960);

Ernst Walford (tr.), *The ecclesiastical history of Sozomen, comprising a history of the church from A.D. 324 to A.D. 440* (London, 1855).

Sulpitius Severus, *Chronicle*, ed. Karl Halm, *Opera*, CSEL 1, Vienna 1866.

Златомира Герджикова

(Балканолошки институт и центар за тракологију-БАН)

АРИЈЕВЦИ НА ВЛАСТИ

Урсакије епископ Сингидунума, и Валенс епископ Мурсе, два су најпознатија аријанска епископа са Балкана из средине 4. века. У овом чланку ће бити представљено њихово деловање као вође аријевског покрета и њихово учешће у Никејској расправи из средине 4. века. Акцент ове студије је њихов ауторитет као епископа, као и дуготрајан утицај који су вршили на формирање хришћанске догме. Ово последње се користи да покаже квалитете и важност Урсација и Валенса као вођа аријанског покрета.