

THE CAPITULATION OF LIBERIUS AND HILARY OF POITIERS

T. D. BARNES

THE ARREST OF LIBERIUS, the bishop of Rome, by the *praefectus urbi* was an event conspicuous enough to be recorded by Ammianus Marcellinus, despite his evident determination to say as little as possible about the internal affairs of the Christian church during the reign of Constantius (15.7.6–10). Ammianus notes that, when Leontius was instructed to arrest Liberius and send him to the imperial court, he was only able to remove him from the city with difficulty and at night, because the whole population was so passionately devoted to him (*metu populi, qui eius amore flagrabat*). The passage, which immediately follows the arrest of Peter Valvomerus (15.7.4–5), so memorably discussed by Erich Auerbach,¹ deserves a full analysis for its extremely one-sided and tendentious presentation of Athanasius of Alexandria, whose condemnation and deposition Liberius refused to endorse.² The present article, however, confines itself to the problem of the date of this central event in the ecclesiastical politics of the 350s, for which Ammianus happens to provide the best evidence, and to the relevance of the correct date to the lost work of Hilary of Poitiers against Ursacius and Valens, which survives in fragments.³

The following frequently cited works are referred to hereafter by author's name alone: T. D. Barnes, *Athanasius and Constantius. Theology and Politics in the Constantinian Empire* (Cambridge, Mass. 1993); H. C. Brennecke, *Hilarius von Poitiers und die Bischofsopposition gegen Konstantius II. Untersuchungen zur dritten Phase des arianischen Streites (337–361)* (Berlin and New York 1984, Patristische Texte und Studien 26); A. Chastagnol, *Les Fastes de la Préfecture de Rome au Bas-Empire* (Paris 1962); L. Duchesne, "Libère et Fortunatien," *MEFR* 28 (1908) 31–78; A. L. Feder, *Studien zu Hilarius von Poitiers* 1, *SBWien Phil.-hist. Kl.* 162.4 (1909; publ. 1910) = Feder (1909); *id.*, *Studien zu Hilarius von Poitiers* 2, *SBWien Phil.-hist. Kl.* 166.5 (1910) = Feder (1910); R. P. C. Hanson, *The Search for the Christian Doctrine of God. The Arian Controversy 318–381* (Edinburgh 1988); O. Seeck, *Regesten der Kaiser und Päpste für die Jahre 311 bis 476 n. Chr. Vorarbeit zu einer Prosopographie der christlichen Kaiserzeit* (Stuttgart 1919).

¹E. Auerbach, *Mimesis. The Representation of Reality in Western Literature*, tr. W. R. Trask (Princeton 1953) chapter 3. His interpretation has recently been re-evaluated by J. F. Matthews, "Peter Valvomerus, Re-Arrested," *Homo Viator. Classical Essays for John Bramble* (Bristol and Oak Park 1987) 277–284.

²For the most recent discussion, see J. Matthews, *The Roman Empire of Ammianus* (Baltimore 1989) 421, 441.

³*Clavis Patrum Latinorum*² (Steenbrugge 1961) no. 436: the individual documents are listed as nos. 437–459. An English translation is forthcoming in the series *Translated Texts for Historians* (Liverpool).

THE HISTORICAL CONTEXT

Liberius had been consecrated bishop of Rome in the spring of 352.⁴ He avoided attending either the Council of Arles in the winter of 353/4 or the Council of Milan in the summer of 355, both of which were summoned by Constantius so that western bishops might ratify and subscribe to the decisions taken by the predominantly eastern Council of Sirmium in 351.⁵ When Liberius subsequently refused the emperor's request to endorse the synodical letter of the Council of Milan, he was arrested by Leontius, taken to the imperial court at Milan, and, when he persisted in his obduracy, sent into exile at Beroea in Thrace. After two years of exile, Liberius finally capitulated to Constantius' demands and was allowed to return to Rome (Athanasius, *Apol. c. Ar.* 89.3; *Hist. Ar.* 41.2; Theodoretus, *HE* 2.17.1). The *Liber pontificalis* certifies the day on which he re-entered Rome after his exile as 2 August (37.6, p. 208 Duchesne), but neither the year of his exile nor the year of his return is directly and explicitly stated by any reliable ancient source. Although modern ecclesiastical historians have usually preferred 355 to 356 as the year of Liberius' arrest, several scholars have recently claimed with a large measure of assurance that the later date of 356 is established by prosopography.⁶ For André Chastagnol's standard *fasti* of the urban prefecture in the fourth century prolong the tenure of Leontius' predecessor into June 356,⁷ and the full-scale study of Ammianus as a historian of the Roman Empire in the fourth century by John Matthews assumes without discussion that Leontius did not become prefect until 356.⁸ Hence Liberius (it seems) cannot have been arrested by Leontius before the summer of 356, from which it follows that he did not capitulate to the demands of the emperor Constantius until 358.⁹ But is the standard chronology of Leontius' prefecture correct?

THE PREFECTURE OF LEONTIUS

Leontius' predecessor, Memmius Vitrasius Orfitus, had become *praefectus urbi* on 8 December 353 (*Chron. min.* 1.67), and his tenure of the office

⁴The precise date was probably 17 May: see L. Duchesne, *Liber pontificalis* 1 (Paris 1883) cxl.

⁵On these three councils, see now Barnes chapter 13.

⁶C. Piétri, *Roma Christiana: Recherches sur l'église de Rome, son organisation, sa politique, son idéologie, de Miltiade à Sixte III (311-440)* (Rome 1976, BEFAR 224) 246-247; Brennecke 266, n. 99; Hanson 340, 358-360.

⁷Chastagnol 139-147.

⁸Matthews (above, n. 2) 24, 417-418, 421, 441. In the index, however, Leontius is "*praefectus urbi* 355-6" (592).

⁹The theory advanced by H.-G. Opitz, *Athanasius Werke* 2 (Berlin-Leipzig, 1934-1941), in his note on 167.19-20, that Liberius was exiled in 355 and allowed to return to Rome in 358, can be dismissed out of hand: it entails the improbable corollary that Liberius' contemporary Athanasius was wrong in stating that his exile lasted two years rather than three (*Apol. c. Ar.* 89.3: διετίων ἔμεινεν ἐν τῇ μετοικίᾳ).

is firmly attested by moderately abundant evidence until 6 July 355 (*CTh* 14.3.2). But the only evidence that Orfitus continued to serve as prefect into 356 is a fragment in the Theodosian Code addressed to him with what is clearly an incomplete subscription: *pp. [i.e., proposita] in foro Traiani Constantio Aug. VIII et Iuliano Caes. cons.* (*CTh* 9.17.3). The date of 13 June 356 for this imperial constitution results from two modern hypotheses: first, that the fragment comes from a constitution which originally accompanied the document addressed *ad populum* which follows it in the Theodosian Code and which was, according to the manuscripts, issued at Milan on 13 June 357 (*CTh* 9.17.4 = *CJ* 9.19.4); second, that the date of the latter document should be emended to 13 June 356 on the grounds that Constantius was not in Milan in June 357.¹⁰ But the month in the latter subscription could just as easily be emended as the year, and the emendation “dat. id. Ian.” for “dat. id. Iun.” (which gives an emended date of 13 January 357) commends itself on palaeographical grounds, since it is known that Constantius spent the winter of 356/7 in Milan.¹¹ Moreover, there is no compelling reason for holding that the two fragments were in fact issued on the same day at all. The constitution addressed to Orfitus and published in Rome in the consular year 356 may have been issued at Milan in the preceding summer, but only posted in the forum of Trajan after the lapse of several months, perhaps after Orfitus had ceased to be prefect of the city any more—such a phenomenon would not be unparalleled in the Theodosian Code or in reality.¹² Alternatively, the consular date assigned by the compilers of the Theodosian Code may be erroneous and the constitution may really have been issued in 354, when Constantius was consul for the seventh time and Gallus for the third: confusion between imperial

¹⁰Seeck 202. Seeck believed that “nothing hinders the assumption that [Orfitus] was still in office in 356” (45).

¹¹Seeck 202–203, cf. T. Mommsen, *ad loc.*: *aut in mense erratum est aut restituendus consulatus a. 356*.

PLRE 1. 652 adopts the date of 13 January 357 for both constitutions: they then provide the earliest attestation of Orfitus’ second urban prefecture, which is otherwise securely documented from late April 357 (Ammianus 16.10.4) to 25 March 359 (*CTh* 14.6.1).

¹²The normal lapse of time between the issuing of an imperial constitution in Milan and its publication in Rome was obviously much shorter: see R. Duncan-Jones, *Structure and Scale in the Roman Economy* (Cambridge 1990) 17–21. But one delay of several years between issue and publication is firmly attested and another seems probable. (1) Julian issued his *constitutio de postulando* (published by B. Bischoff and D. Nörr, *Eine unbekannte Konstitution Kaiser Julians [c. Iuliani de postulando]*, *AbhMünchen Phil.-hist.* Kl. 58 [1963] 7) to the newly appointed *praefectus urbi* Apronianus in Antioch on 17 January 363, but it was not read in the prefect’s court in Rome until the consular year 371. (2) *CTh* 3.5.6, which was published at Hispalis in Spain in April 336, may have been issued at Constantinople as long before as April 332: see T. D. Barnes, *The New Empire of Diocletian and Constantine* (Cambridge, Mass. 1982) 145, n. 17.

consulates is notoriously frequent in the Code.¹³ Whatever the explanation, it would be imprudent to prolong Orfitus' prefecture into 356 on the strength of a single imperial constitution with an incomplete, inconsistent, or problematical subscription.

On other grounds entirely, it seems probable that Flavius Leontius replaced Orfitus in 355 rather than the following year. The correspondence of Libanius reveals that the prefecture of Rome was offered to Anatolius, a native of Berytus, in the winter of 354/5 (*Ep.* 311, 391, 423).¹⁴ That implies that Orfitus' tenure was already drawing to a close, and it is not at all plausible to argue that Anatolius' refusal led Constantius to prolong Orfitus in office for almost another year.¹⁵ The emperor had good reason to replace the Roman aristocrat Orfitus by an easterner who was more beholden to him—and Leontius could be relied upon to enforce with enthusiasm an ecclesiastical policy which was proving to be unpopular in the West; for he shared Constantius' theological views and had been among the official witnesses who certified the accuracy of the minutes of the interrogation of Photinus by Basil of Ancyra at Sirmium in 351 (*Epiphanius Pan.* 71.1.5).¹⁶

Ammianus Marcellinus places his notice of the urban prefecture of Leontius before the proclamation of Julian as Caesar on 6 November 355 (15.7–8). It is hard to see why he should have placed it here if Leontius did not in fact become *praefectus urbi* until some eight or nine months after Julian was proclaimed Caesar.¹⁷ But, if Leontius became *praefectus urbi* in the summer or autumn of 355,¹⁸ he could have arrested Liberius in either 355 or 356. Moreover, the fact that Ammianus has chosen to place his notice of the conspicuous events of Leontius' prefecture before 6 November 355, *prima facie* implies that he thought that they occurred in the summer or autumn of 355—a date which is strongly preferable on all other criteria too.

THE ARREST OF LIBERIUS

On general historical grounds, Liberius' arrest should be an immediate consequence of his encouragement of resistance to Constantius at the Council of Milan.¹⁹ Moreover, the specific evidence of ecclesiastical sources points unambiguously to 355 as the date of his arrest and 357 as the year of his return to Rome. First, Hilary of Poitiers puts the arrest of Liberius

¹³ Seeck 23–66; R. S. Bagnall, Alan Cameron, S. R. Schwartz, and K. A. Worp, *Consuls of the Later Roman Empire* (Atlanta 1987) 72–76.

¹⁴ For Anatolius' origin, Eunapius *Vit. phil.* 10.6.1–2; Libanius *Ep.* 339, 438.

¹⁵ As Chastagnol 143.

¹⁶ On the career of Leontius, see Chastagnol 147–149.

¹⁷ For Ammianus' care in such matters, see T. D. Barnes, "Structure and Chronology in Ammianus, Book 14," *HSCP* 92 (1989) 413–422.

¹⁸ As is correctly inferred from Ammianus in *PLRE* 1. 503, 1054.

¹⁹ Barnes chapter 13.

between the Council of Milan and his own condemnation at the Council of Baeterrae, i.e., between the summer of 355 and the late spring of 356 (*In Const.* 11).²⁰ Second, both Theodoretus and a document composed in Rome ca 370²¹ explicitly connect his return with Constantius' visit to Rome in the spring of 357. According to Theodoretus, the bishop returned from exile as a result of a demonstration during the emperor's visit to Rome, in which the crowd in the circus cried out "One God, one Christ, one bishop" (*HE* 2.17). Theodoretus (it is true) might be discounted as a witness for events in Rome, especially since he asserts that, when Liberius returned, his replacement Felix withdrew to become a bishop elsewhere—which appears to be totally false.²² But the account of *quae gesta sunt inter Liberium et Felicem episcopos* which stands as the first document in the so-called *Collectio Avellana* is another matter:

post annos duos venit Romam Constantius imperator; pro Liberio rogatur a populo. qui mox annuens ait "habetis Liberium, qui, qualis a vobis profectus est, melior revertetur." hoc autem de consensu eius, quo manus perfidiae dederat, indicabat. tertio anno redit Liberius, cui obviam cum gaudio populus Romanus exivit. (CSEL 35.2.3–8)

After two years the emperor Constantius came to Rome, and was petitioned by the people on behalf of Liberius. He duly assented <to the request> and said: "You have Liberius, who will come back a better man than he was when he departed from you." He alluded in this way to his [sc. Liberius'] compliance, in having set his hands to treachery. Liberius returned in the third year, and the people of Rome went out to meet him with joy.

This passage clearly puts Liberius' return "in the third year" after his arrest and shortly after the visit of Constantius to Rome (29 April–28 May 357), and thus implies that he was arrested in 355 and returned in the summer of 357.

The date of Liberius' return is obviously relevant to identifying what document it was which he subscribed in order to secure his release from exile. A narrative fragment from Hilary states that Liberius subscribed his name to the "perfidy of Sirmium" (CSEL 65.170.3). Hence it has recently been inferred that he accepted "the second Sirmian formula of summer 357."²³ But it is not certain that the words *perfidia apud Sirmium descripta* are Hilary's own rather than an addition or comment of the compiler of the collection or a later editor. For in the letter which immediately precedes

²⁰For discussion of this significant passage, see "Hilary of Poitiers on his Exile," *VigChr* 46 (1992) 129–140.

²¹*Clavis*² (above, n. 3) no. 1570.

²²On his career, see still T. Mommsen, "Die römischen Bischöfe Liberius und Felix II.," *Deutsche Zeitschrift für Geschichtswissenschaft NF* 1 (1896–97) 167–179, reprinted in his *Gesammelte Schriften* 6 (Berlin 1910) 570–581.

²³Brennecke 292–297.

the narrative fragment, Liberius writes to priests and bishops in the East and describes the document which he subscribed in the following terms:

nam ut verius sciatis me veram fidem per hanc epistulam meam proloqui, dominus et frater meus communis Demofilus quia dignatus est pro sua benivolentia fidem vestram et catholicam exponere, quae Sirmio a pluribus fratribus et coepiscopis nostris tractata, exposita et suscepta est ab omnibus, qui in praesenti fuerunt, hanc ego libenti animo suscepi, in nullo contradixi, consensum accommodavi, hanc sequor, haec a me tenetur. (CSEL 65.169.6–12)

So that you may more truly know through this letter of mine that I proclaim the true faith, since my lord and brother in communion Demophilus has out of his benevolence kindly explained your catholic creed, which was discussed by many of our brothers and fellow bishops at Sirmium, then formally put forward and received by all who were present, I <too> have received this <creed> with an eager heart, I have not contradicted it in any particular, I have given my full assent, I follow it, I hold fast to it.²⁴

Since the “blasphemy” of 357 was not a creed propounded or adopted by the eastern bishops as a body,²⁵ it does not fit Liberius’ description of the document that he accepted. Moreover, if Liberius returned to Rome on 2 August 357, then it is chronologically impossible for him to have subscribed to the “blasphemy of Sirmium” before he was released from exile at Beroea (no later than mid-July, even if he travelled post haste to Rome). Furthermore, the list of names which Hilary quoted as responsible for the creed which Demophilus, the bishop of Sirmium, presented to Liberius clearly belongs to 351:

perfidiam autem apud Sirmium descriptam, quam dicit Liberius catholicam, a Demofilo sibi expositam, hi sunt, qui conscripserunt: Narcissus, Theodorus, Basilus, Eudoxius, Demofilus, Cecropius, Silvanus, Ursacius, Valens, Euagrius, Hireneus, Exuperantius, Terentianus, Bassus, Gaudentius, Macedonius, Marcus, Acacius, Iulius, Surinus, Simplicius et Iunior. (CSEL 65.170)

The second name provides the decisive argument: Theodorus of Heraclea was dead by 355 (Theodoretus *HE* 2.16.11). The document to which Liberius set his hand was, therefore, the synodical letter of the Council of Sirmium in 351, which had previously been endorsed by the Councils of Arles and Milan, and in doing so he fulfilled the demand made of him by Constantius in 355.²⁶

²⁴The manuscript of this passage has been heavily interpolated by a scribe who could not stomach the idea that a bishop of Rome accepted an “Arian” creed: see Feder (1909) 123 ff.

²⁵As Hilary, *Syn.* 8 (*PL* 10.485), makes clear.

²⁶Duchesne 46–48; Feder (1910) 101–103.

THE DATE OF HILARY'S SO-CALLED *OPUS HISTORICUM*

Jerome reports that Hilary of Poitiers wrote a *Liber adversus Valentem et Ursacium, historiam Ariminensis et Seleucensis synodi continens* (*De viris illustribus* 100). It was presumably a work which combined historical and theological polemic and quoted documents on a lavish scale like Athanasius' *Defence Against the Arians*, and hence must be the ultimate source of the collection of extracts preserved in a ninth-century manuscript in Paris (Bibliothèque de l'Arsenal 483 fols 76^r–113^v), which have no title, only a subscription which states *explicit sci hilarii ex opere historico*.²⁷ The extracts were first printed in 1598 from derivative manuscripts by Nicole le Fèvre (Nicolaus Faber) and republished by Coustant in the Maurist edition of Hilary as *Fragmenta ex opere historico* (whence *PL* 10.627–721). Alfred Feder was the first editor to use the early manuscript which is the extant archetype of all the others: he edited the collection critically in 1916 as *Collectanea Antiariana Parisina* (*CSEL* 65.43–177). The documents included among these fragments are listed below with Feder's numbering and pagination and a statement of the date of each. All the documents are letters unless it is specified otherwise; the numbering is discontinuous because this summary excludes the narrative fragments which connect the documents and which Feder included in his continuous numeration.²⁸

SERIES A

I (43–46)	Council at Paris to eastern bishops	360
II (46–47)	Eusebius of Vercellae to Gregory, bishop of Iliberris	360/1
III (47–48)	Creed of Germinius, bishop of Sirmium	366
IV.1 (48–67)	The eastern bishops at Serdica to certain named western bishops	343
IV.2 (68–73)	Creed of the eastern bishops at Serdica Also preserved: (1) by Hilary, <i>Syn.</i> 34, (2) in Cod. Ver. LX (58), fols 78 ^v –79 ^v , (3) in Paris, ms Syriaques 62, fols 185–186 ²⁹	343
IV.3 (74–78)	Subscriptions to the preceding letter and creed	343

²⁷The collection itself was probably compiled from Hilary as early as the fifth century: see Feder (1910) 113–133.

²⁸On the other versions which exist of some of the documents, see Feder's prolegomena to his edition, *CSEL* 65 (1916) xxxix ff.

²⁹The two latter versions are edited in C. H. Turner, *Ecclesiae Occidentalis Monumenta Iuris Antiquissima* 1 (Oxford, 1899–1939) 638–640; H. Schulthess, *Die syrischen Kanones des Synoden von Nicaea bis Chalcedon*, *AbhGött Phil.-hist. Kl. NF* 10.2 (1908) 167–168.

V.1 (78–85)	The pro-Nicene bishops at Ariminum to Constantius (Quoted in Greek by Athanasius, <i>Syn.</i> 10)	359
V.3 (85–86)	Minute of the adoption of a creed at Nike in Thrace	10 October 359
VI (87–88)	The anti-Nicene bishops at Ariminum to Constantius	359
VII (89–93)	Liberius to Constantius	353/4
VIII (93–94)	Constantius to the Council of Ariminum	359
IX.1 (95–96)	Creed of the pro-Nicene bishops at Ariminum (Also extant in Ms. Bodl. e Mus. 101, fol. 62 ^v)	359
IX.3 (96–97)	Condemnation of the anti-Nicene leaders at Ariminum	20 July 359

SERIES B

II.1 (103–126)	The western bishops at Serdica to all the churches This letter survives in three other versions: (1) Cod. Ver. LX (58), fols 81 ^r –88 ^r : apparently a Latin retroversion from a Greek translation of the original; (2) Athanasius <i>Apol. c. Ar.</i> 44–49: with a list of signatories, including more than 200 who subscribed their names after 343; (3) Theodoretus <i>HE</i> 2.8.1–54. Hilary's text is close to Athanasius' (2), while versions (1) and (3) not only agree closely in wording, but also include a theological statement which both Athanasius and Hilary omit. ³⁰	343
II.2 (126–130)	The western bishops at Serdica to Julius	343
II.3 (130)	Names of the Arian leaders deposed by the council, appended to the preceding letter	343
II.4 (130–139)	List of the original subscriptions to the same letter	343
II.6 (143–144)	Ursacius and Valens to Julius	347
II.8 (145)	Ursacius and Valens to Athanasius	347
II.10 (150)	The Nicene creed	325
III.1 (155)	Liberius to the bishops of the East	357
IV.1 (156–157)	Liberius to the bishops of Italy	362/3
IV.2 (158–159)	Bishops of Italy to the bishops of Illyricum	363
V (159–160)	Valens and others to Germinius	366

³⁰On its probable origin, see now M. Tetz, "Ante omnia de sancta fide et de integritate veritatis. Glaubensfragen auf der Synode von Serdica," *ZNTW* 76 (1985) 243–269.

VI (160-164)	Germinius to Rufianus and others	366
VII.2 (164-166)	Liberius to Eusebius, Dionysius, and Lucifer	355
VII.4 (166)	Liberius to Caecilianus of Spolegium (excerpt)	353/4
VII.6 (167)	Liberius to Ossius (excerpt)	353/4
VII.8 (168-170)	Liberius to the eastern bishops	357
VII.10 (170-172)	Liberius to Ursacius, Valens and Germinius	357
VII.11 (172-173)	Liberius to Vincentius of Capua	357
VIII.1 (174-175)	Envoys from the Council of Seleucia to the envoys from the Council of Ariminum	359

APPENDIX (181-184)³¹

The western bishops at Serdica to Constantius 343

Many of these documents are not preserved elsewhere. Among those which survive only because Hilary quoted them in his lost work are the synodical letter of the eastern bishops at Serdica (A IV.1) and nine letters of Liberius, the authenticity of some of which used to be challenged (A VII; B III.1; IV.1; VII.2, 4, 6, 8, 10, 11). The principal (or rather, the only) objection to the letters was *a priori* and invalid, viz., that, if genuine, they indicated that a bishop of Rome not only condemned Athanasius but also subscribed to a creed later considered heretical—an action which some scholars found hard to reconcile with their acceptance of the dogma of papal infallibility.³² Yet there is nothing in the letters themselves that tells against Liberius' authorship and much, on the contrary, that speaks strongly for it, especially the precise historical allusions to events whose significance was soon forgotten or misrepresented (e.g., Liberius' reference to the Council of Milan of 345 in A VII).³³

On the other hand, the date of Liberius' exile, and hence of the letters announcing his *volte face* (B III.1; B VII.8, 10, 11), is very relevant to the date of the first edition of Hilary's lost work. The common view has been that Hilary composed the first edition or first version of the work either in 356, perhaps even before his exile, or at latest in early 357, and hence

³¹For the identification of this letter and the narrative fragment which follows it (184-187), see A. Wilmart, "L'Ad Constantium liber primus de S. Hilaire de Poitiers et les *Fragments historiques*," *Revue bénédictine* 24 (1907) 149-179, 291-317; Feder (1909) 133-151. These two pieces have an entirely different textual tradition from the *Collectanea Antiariana Parisina* and had previously been published in the standard editions of Hilary as *Ad Constantium Augustum liber primus* (PL 10.557-564, from Coustant).

³²H. M. Gwatkin, *Studies of Arianism*² (Cambridge 1900) 194, acidly remarked: "Believers in papal infallibility may hesitate, but the historian cannot." For a brief survey of the controversy, Brennecke 271-274. The decisive blows in favour of the authenticity the letters were struck by Duchesne (31-78) and Feder ([1909] 153-183). But the letters are still occasionally rejected, as by P.-P. Joannou, *Die Ostkirche und die Cathedra Petri im 4. Jahrhundert* (Stuttgart 1972) 126-127.

³³Barnes chapter 10.

that he cannot have included in it the letters of Liberius, but must have added them later when he revised and expanded the work.³⁴ But if Liberius returned to Rome on 2 August 357 (rather than 358), then he capitulated before the "blasphemy of Sirmium." If it was this event which provoked Hilary to compose the lost work (as seems probable),³⁵ then there is no obstacle to holding both that Hilary composed the first version of his *liber adversus Ursacium et Valentem* in the winter of 357/8,³⁶ and that this first edition or first book included all the nine letters of Liberius.

DEPARTMENT OF CLASSICS
UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO
TORONTO, M5S 1A1

³⁴B. Marx, "Zwei Zeugen für die Herkunft der Fragmente I und II des sog. *Opus historicum* s. Hilarii. Ein Beitrag zur Lösung des Fragmentenproblems," *Theologische Quartalschrift* 88 (1906) 390–406; Wilmart (above, n. 31) 291–317; Feder (1909) 151–153; C. F. A. Borchardt, *Hilary of Poitiers' Role in the Arian Struggle* (The Hague 1966) 31–37; C. Kannengiesser, *Dictionnaire de Spiritualité* 7 (1969) 474–475; J. Doignon, "L'Eloge d'Athanase dans les fragments de l'*Opus Historicum* d'Hilaire de Poitiers antérieurs à l'exil," in C. Kannengiesser (ed.), *Politique et théologie chez Athanase d'Alexandrie. Actes du Colloque de Chantilly 23–25 septembre 1973* (Paris 1974, *Théologie historique* 27) 337–348; Hanson 469–470; J. Doignon, *Handbuch der lateinischen Literatur der Antike* 5 (Munich 1989) 470–473.

³⁵See Brennecke 301–312.

³⁶As argued by D. H. Williams, "A Reassessment of the Early Career and Exile of Hilary of Poitiers," *JEH* 42 (1991) 202–217.