

## Palladius and the johannite schism\*

Peter Van Nuffelen

Summary: The ‘Dialogue on the life of John Chrysostom’, published by Palladius of Helenopolis ca. 408-9, is a key source for the history of the church at the beginning of the fifth century. This paper argues that the history of the johannite schism provides the background against which to understand the scope and nature of this work. It questions the received chronology of Palladius’ later life and shows that he is not so much a hard-core supporter of John who refused all contact with the official church, as someone who could envisage the followers of John accepting an offer of amnesty in 408/409 and reintegrating the church. The dialogue is a strategic work that accepts that after the death of John (407) the johannites can only bank on the support of Rome to gain cause. As a consequence, we cannot accept its trustworthiness at face value.

On 20 June 404, the bishop of Constantinople, John Chrysostom, finally obeyed an imperial order to leave the capital, after having refused for several months to accept his second deposition.<sup>1</sup> Since Easter of that year the civic authorities had attempted to break up the popular following of John, and the fire that engulfed the Great Church after his departure, possibly lighted by his followers,<sup>2</sup> was used as a pretext for an even more forceful crackdown. Imperial decrees deposed, imprisoned, and exiled bishops and clergy who refused communion with the new bishop Arsacius (404-405).<sup>3</sup> Not just Constantinople was the scene of a persecution, but also Asia Minor and Syria: anti-johannite bishops were, for example, installed in Antioch (Porphyry) and Ephesus (Victor). Whilst many followers of John yielded to this show of force, others refused: they would form the schism of the ‘johannites’, a schism that would last until well after

John's death on 14 September 407. There were still johannites in Constantinople when in 418 bishop Atticus (406-426) re-inscribed John's name on the diptychs of the death, an act that implied a formal rehabilitation.<sup>4</sup>

The sources for John's life are heavily marked by this dramatic history of intrigue, downfall, rehabilitation, and final crisis. The earliest, and most important, texts about John are obviously highly partisan. The *Epitaphios* by Pseudo-Martyrius, to be dated shortly after the death of John,<sup>5</sup> tries to keep up johannite moral after the death of John and to consolidate the schism when the disappearance of its leader put its survival at risk.<sup>6</sup> Palladius, bishop of Helenopolis, was deposed as a partisan of John and exiled, and wrote his *Dialogue* on the life of John Chrysostom supposedly in ca. 408. The church historian Sozomen, writing ca. 445, drew on johannite informants, who gave him several documents and the *Epitaphios* of Pseudo-Martyrius. His account is however less unilaterally positive than that of his sources: Sozomen also used his predecessor Socrates, who is the only exception in this series of admirers (writing ca. 439-440). Having frequented anti-johannites, his image of John is strongly dependent on the official version of events. Nevertheless, his account is not blatantly hostile, as Socrates was writing after the end of the Johannite schism and does not want to rekindle the passions.<sup>7</sup> A second characteristic of the sources, apart from their partisan nature, is their teleological view: John's tenure as bishop of Constantinople is seen as building up towards the crisis at its end. In effect, all accounts revolve around the same set of episodes that were seen as contributing to the animosity against him, such as the conflict with Theophilus of Alexandria, the controversial intervention of Epiphanius of Salamis, and the conflict with the empress Eudoxia. We know therefore a lot about the events of 403-404, but comparatively little about the years before. A striking illustration of such a teleological view is provided by Pseudo-Martyrius: whilst

theoretically an *Epitaphios* and thus supposed to treat the entire life of John, the orator has very little to say on his activities in Antioch and spends more than half of his lengthy discourse on discussing the events between the synod of the Oak (autumn 403) and John's final exile in June 404: John's life is eclipsed by the tragedy at its end.

These two characteristics already suffice to argue that a thorough deconstruction of the sources is a necessary precondition for the reconstruction of the events.<sup>8</sup> Yet there is a third characteristic that remains hitherto insufficiently acknowledged: all sources are also influenced by the history of the Johannite schism. The schism was not a static entity but underwent some important transformations in time: all texts have therefore to be situated at a specific conjuncture in the history of the schism. For example, Pseudo-Martyrius' *Epitaphios* is an instant reply to John's death in 407, which seems to have discouraged the johannites and led many of them to reintegrate the official church. As I have said, Socrates' basic hostility towards John is tempered by the official end of the schism which was supposed to have put an end to all tension. Yet, underneath Socrates' apparent neutral account of the church of Constantinople one can still sense the effects of the schism.<sup>9</sup> Rather than being an appendix to biographies of John Chrysostom, as is usually the case, a thorough consideration of the history of the schism should be its introduction.

This paper focuses on Palladius, whose *Dialogue* has been hailed as the main and trustworthy guide to John's life.<sup>10</sup> Starting out from a reconsideration of the chronology of Palladius' life in exile, it shall put the *Dialogue* in the context of the events that shook the johannite schism in 408/409, and in that way provide a context to understand some of the ambiguities of the work.

*The traditional chronology of Palladius' life after 400*

In her 1988 standard edition of the *Dialogue on the life of John Chrysostom* by Palladius of Helenopolis, A.M. Malingrey favourably contrasted the muddled chronology of Palladius' stay among the ascetics of Egypt between 388 and 400 with the relative clarity of his life after his election to the see of Helenopolis in 400.<sup>11</sup> She then reproduced the chronology drawn up by C.E. Butler, in an appendix to his 1898 edition of the *Lausiatic History*. For his life in exile this chronology runs as follows. Palladius was arrested in 405, when he was sent to Constantinople by pope Innocent I (401-417) to protest against the deposition of John Chrysostom. He was exiled to Syene in Egypt, where he spent two years, before being transferred to Antinoe. In 412, after 4 years there, and after the death of Theophilus, bishop of Alexandria and enemy of John, his exile was lifted. In 417 Palladius became bishop of Aspona in Asia Minor.<sup>12</sup> The clarity of this chronology is misleading, as it is based on questionable assumptions.

Two dates are undisputed. First, Palladius was part of a papal embassy sent to Constantinople in early 406, as has been shown by R. Delmaire,<sup>13</sup> to intervene in favour of John. Before the embassy could reach the city, its members were arrested. Palladius was separated from the papal legates, deposed, and exiled.<sup>14</sup> We know that the papal legates were imprisoned when Atticus was bishop, i.e. after March 406. They are also said to have returned to Rome after four months. This suggests that the embassy left early in 406 and returned in spring.<sup>15</sup> The second certainty is that when Palladius wrote the *Lausiatic History* in 419-420,<sup>16</sup> he was bishop of Aspona. In addition, we know that Palladius was exiled to Syene, according to his own statement in the *Dialogue*.<sup>17</sup> When Butler constructed his chronology, he took the death of Theophilus in 412 as the turning point of Palladius' exile, on the implicit assumption that the death of John's major enemy implied the return of the exiles. Butler then deducted four years from 412: he assumed that a reference to a four-year stay in Antinoe in the *Lausiatic History* referred to his exile, and not

to an earlier and longer stay in Egypt before 400.<sup>18</sup> This left two years in Syene, between 406 and 408, after which he presumed that Palladius was transferred to Antinoe. In 417, finally, Palladius was restored to the episcopacy and received the see of Aspona – on the assumption that the reinsertion of John in the diptychs of Constantinople would be a suitable occasion for this.

Almost every step of Butler's reasoning must be challenged. First, although the assumption that Theophilus' death marked a change in policy towards the johannites is still repeated,<sup>19</sup> there is no evidence that it had an impact on the schism. The real turning point were the two years after the death of John Chrysostom (14 September 407), when, as we shall see, an amnesty was offered to the johannites. There is explicit evidence, in a letter of Synesius, that Theophilus himself was involved in this attempt at reconciliation.<sup>20</sup> Second, Butler's date of 417 for the re-insertion of John is uncertain, as we have to rely on an undated reference in the church historian Socrates and a letter of Atticus.<sup>21</sup> Basing himself on the chronology of papal involvement in the johannite crisis, C. Pietri has actually proposed 418 as the more likely date.<sup>22</sup> Apart from the uncertainty of the date, I shall suggest below that bishops who were recalled from exile, were usually immediately restored to a see as part of the amnesty deal, and it is thus a priori unlikely that Palladius would have had to wait from 412 to 417 (on Butler's chronology) to be installed in Aspona. Third, it has often been remarked that Butler juggles rather creatively with the numerous indications of time in the *Lausiaca History*.<sup>23</sup> As a matter of fact, if all of these would be added up, they would largely exceed the twelve years of Palladius' stay in Egypt and Palestine between 388 and 400.<sup>24</sup> Most of these figures probably are approximations and a rather shaky basis to construct a chronology on.

Butler's chronology has the advantage of limpidity, but it has to be discarded for relying on untenable premises. I shall propose an alternative chronology, which does justice to the sources

and situates the *Dialogue* better in the history of the johannite schism. It has, however, the disadvantage of being less clear-cut than Butler's: not every move of Palladius can be precisely dated.

*The Johannite schism and the amnesty of 408-409*

When describing the persecution of the johannites, the church historian Sozomen makes clear that it was partially successful: many partisans of John accepted communion with the new bishop Arsacius. From 404 onwards, there thus existed three groups within the church of Constantinople: the official church was composed of two factions, the enemies of John (grouped around Arsacius and Atticus, who became bishop in 406) and the former partisans of John who had accepted communion, whereas the schismatic johannites assembled outside the city.<sup>25</sup> The history of the schism is marked by the assimilation of the schismatic johannites into the non-schismatic ones. Indeed, a key moment was John's death in 407: it is clear from Pseudo-Martyrius that many schismatic johannites were disheartened and returned to the official church.<sup>26</sup> Palladius also alludes to disillusioned bishops who accepted communion.<sup>27</sup>

A key document suggests that the anti-johannites sought to exploit this situation by offering an amnesty to their enemies. In a letter to Theophilus of Alexandria, dated by its most recent editor D. Roques to 15-20 January 412,<sup>28</sup> Synesius, the philosopher-bishop of Ptolemais, describes his embarrassment in his dealings with Alexander, a young local curial who had gone to Constantinople and been ordained bishop of Basilioupolis in Bithynia by John Chrysostom. Alexander had been deposed and exiled after John's deposition, but an amnesty had been suggested by Theophilus to Atticus and apparently also offered to the johannites. Synesius' embarrassment stems from the fact that "we are now in the third year since the amnesty" (*ep.* 67.

22-23: touti; me;n e[to~ h[dh trivton ejxhvkei meta; th;n

ajmnhstivan kai; ta;~ diallagav~) and Alexander has not returned to Bithynia. Should he now be treated as a bishop or not? Synesius addresses his letter to Theophilus as his superior who knows about canon law, but also as the broker of the amnesty. Roques proposes to the date the amnesty to the end of 409, based on his interpretation of *triton etos* as ‘deux années pleines’, i.e. just a little bit more than two years. I am less optimistic than he that such an exact date for the letter and thus for the amnesty can be obtained. To start with, *to triton etos* can also be less strictly interpreted, and could on Roques’ dating of the letter refer to most of 409. Second, Roques dates Synesius’ acceptance of the position of bishop to the first of January 412 and as a consequence, the letter must belong to early 412, as Synesius states that ‘last year’ he was not yet bishop.<sup>29</sup> It would in itself be odd that someone would say he had not been bishop last year if he only had been it for a couple of weeks. Moreover, it has been argued against Roques that Synesius must have accepted the position of bishop earlier, in early 411, and that, consequently, the letter in question should be dated to that year.<sup>30</sup> This would yield a possible date of 408 for the amnesty.<sup>31</sup> The amnesty can thus only be dated in a rather imprecise way, between the second half of 408 at the very earliest and the end of 409 at the latest.

What did the amnesty consist of? One element is certain, a second plausible. During the persecution of John’s partisans, bishops that refused to subscribe to John’s deposition were deposed and exiled.<sup>32</sup> In Synesius’ letter Alexander is, however, described as a bishop: what puzzles Synesius is that Alexander refuses to return to Bithynia and take up the see ‘that has been allotted to him’ (*ep.* 67.24: oujde; th'~ sullacouvsh~ aujtw'/// kaqevdra~ ejlavbeto). This implies that the amnesty allowed former bishops to return with the rank of bishop: either their consecration had never been annulled or their deposition had been declared void. Synesius does not state explicitly that Alexander returned to Basilinoupolis

but only to 'the see that has been allotted to him'. This vagueness may not be accidental. It is well possible that another bishop had in the meantime been appointed to the see of Basilinoupolis. Rather than deposing the new incumbent, one can presume that a vacant see was assigned to Alexander. This interpretation is supported by a reference in Palladius to bishops who 'having lost hope, communicated with Atticus and were transferred to other sees in Thrace'.<sup>33</sup> Moreover, as we shall see below, a number of johannites are known to have been transferred after their return from exile. The first element of the amnesty was therefore that clergy could return to their former position, and that a pragmatic solution was sought for bishops whose see had in the meantime been occupied. In practice that may often have meant a translation to a different see.

The second, plausible element was that an earlier condition of reintegration, namely, the subscription to John's deposition, was dropped. The evidence for this is inferential. In the earliest phase of the persecution, the official church and the state had tried to force the johannites to subscribe to the deposition of John.<sup>34</sup> For the legitimacy of the successors of John, Arsacius (404-405) and Atticus (406-425), this was a necessary condition, as the refusal to accept John's deposition obviously implied a refusal to accept either of them as his legitimate successor. This situation changed with John's death. As far as we know, the johannites never consecrated a successor to John. Without a rival johannite bishop, it became easier for the official church to drop the condition of subscription to John's deposition, as there was no danger anymore of a challenge to the position of the bishop of Constantinople. This could be the bait Atticus and Theophilus held out to the johannites: they did not have to betray John Chrysostom to return to the official church. There is no direct evidence for this interpretation, but three elements can be cited in its favour. First, in order for an amnesty to work, the anti-johannites had to offer their



opponents something. Not demanding a subscription to the deposition was a symbolically important concession, but with little effectiveness: it did not threaten the legitimacy of Atticus. Second, Synesius does not depict Alexander as a deserter of the johannite cause, which he could have done in a letter to John's enemy Theophilus. Alexander may have reintegrated the official church, but this did not mean he joined the anti-johannite party and signed the deposition. Third, the letters of Innocent of Rome indicate that his Constantinopolitan counterpart Atticus had given various signs of goodwill. The bishop of Rome had immediately sided with John after his deposition and continued to argue for a complete rehabilitation, even after John's death. Atticus, in turn, wished to re-establish communion with Rome. We do not know what Atticus offered to Innocent, but the dropping of the request to subscribe to John's deposition may have been one of these signs of good-will. For Atticus, this meant coming half-way to accommodate the susceptibilities of the johannites. But Innocent insisted that Atticus repented completely and that the exiled had to be received 'without discussion'.<sup>35</sup>

Given the date of the amnesty, within two years of the death of John Chrysostom, the amnesty must have been an attempt to exploit the disarray among the johannites to which Pseudo-Martyrius testifies. It offered rather favourable conditions to the johannites, without, however, redressing the injustice done to John. This might be enough to attract some johannites, but others, supported by Innocent of Rome, remained adamant that John needed to be rehabilitated.

#### *Palladius and the turn towards Rome*

The *termini* for Palladius' *Dialogue* are John's death in September 407 (*dial.* 5.1) and that of Theophilus in 412, who is the major culprit of Palladius' story and is clearly deemed still alive (*dial.* 20.435). Usually, the work is dated to 408 and said to be written between John's death and that of the emperor Arcadius (1/5/408).<sup>36</sup> The latter *terminus ante quem* is based on the care with

which Arcadius is cleared of all guilt by Palladius.<sup>37</sup> It has been argued recently that Palladius covertly refers to Arcadius' death in *dial.* 20.632 (duswvdh~ qavnato~ ... o{n i[sasi pavnte~), where he discusses the deaths of John's persecutors.<sup>38</sup> A date in late 408 is further supported by the reference to Heracleidas of Ephesus, who is said to have been in prison for four years.<sup>39</sup> As this bishop is unlikely to have been deposed and imprisoned before John's exile from 20th of June 404 onwards, and even before the law of 18 November 404, the legal justification for such acts,<sup>40</sup> this would suggest a date of late 408, or even early 409. There is one important proviso to make regarding this date: Palladius' *dialogue* is staged as a conversation between an elderly johannite bishop (explicitly not Palladius) and a Roman deacon. In other words, it has a literary setting and the date we have deduced from it can only represent the dramatic date of the dialogue, not necessarily the actual date of writing.

With a dramatic date of late 408/early 409, the *Dialogue* is thus set in the years following John's death. Yet, at first sight, Palladius hardly seems to engage with the climate of disaffection of those years: he only briefly refers to johannites who accepted communion with Atticus out of discouragement.<sup>41</sup> This seems to credit the interpretation of the *Dialogue* as a staunch defence of schism and separation.<sup>42</sup> indeed, the work ends on a long praise of the tribulations saints have to undergo and an attack on John's foes as enemies of God and tools of Satan.<sup>43</sup>

Yet, while the *Dialogue* clearly defends the johannite position and certainly is not a treatise of capitulation, Palladius twice puts remarkable words in the mouth of John, each time at key stages in his account. In 8.95-143 Palladius reports the last conversation of John with the johannite bishops before he is convoked by the synod of the Oak, i.e. before he is sent into exile for the first time. 'Inspired by the Holy Spirit,' John told them: 'Pray, brothers, and if you love Christ, that none abandons his church for my sake' (98-100: eu[xasqe, ajdelfoi; kaiv, eij

filei'te to;n Cristo;n, ejmou' e{neken mhv ti~ ajpoleivph/ th;n eJautou' ejkklhsivan). He then foretells them his own exile and death. At the end of a praise of prophets who suffered for their prophecies, Eulysius of Apamea in Bithynia remarks that remaining on their episcopal thrones implies that the bishops will be forced to enter into communion with John's enemies and sign his deposition. John replies: 'Accept communion, so that you do not divide the church, but do not subscribe: I am not aware of having thought anything worth of deposition.' (142-144: koinwnhvsate mevn, i{na mh; scivshete th;n ejkklhsivan, mh; uJpogravvyhte dev: oujde;n ga;r eJmautw/' suvnoida a[xion kaqairevsew~ ejnnohvsa~). The second key passage is John's conversation with his female followers, among whom the famous deaconess Olympias, just before he leaves for his second exile. His final advice is: 'May none of you break off her habitual devotion for the church. And if someone be involuntarily dragged to ordination (as a bishop), without intriguing for the position and with the consent of all, bow your heads for him as for John. For the church cannot be without bishop' (10.58-61: kai; o}~ a]n a[kwn ajcqh/' ejpi; th;n ceironivan, klivnate th;n kefalh;n uJmw'n wJ~ jIwavnnh/: ouj duvnatai ga;r hJ ejkklhsiva a[neu ejpivskopon ei\nai). Apart from illustrating John's desire for unity in the church and shifting the blame for the schism onto John's enemies, the first passage indicates the minimum threshold the johannites set for all future reconciliation: the refusal to subscribe to John's condemnation. The second emphasises the need to accept the properly elected bishop. In Palladius' depiction, John does not advise the complete breaking off of all relations with his successors; he accepts the judgement of the synod, unjust as it is. When read in the context of the years 408-409, when doubts were rising among the johannites, these passages suggest that

Palladius accepts that rejoining the official church whilst not subscribing to John's deposition was in line with John's own wishes. Situated at two key moments, and addressed to two key groups of supporters, bishops and pious women, these passages can be read as envisaging the possibility of a return to the communion of the official church. It is striking that Palladius' John sets as a basic condition what was actually offered in the amnesty of 408/9. To appreciate Palladius' moderate attitude towards reintegration, one has to contrast him with what Pseudo-Martyrius had to say about the johannites who had left the schism after John's death: they 'teach all of those coming later (...), when they wish to chase a just one and when a painful event disperses the sheep, to quickly kill him, so that the herd is gathered by the murder' (138:  $\text{i}\{n\}$   $\text{o}\{\text{tan qevlwsin ajpelavsai divkaion kai; luph'san to; pra'gma diaspeivrh/ ta; provbata, tacevw\~ aujto;n ajnevlwsin, w\{\text{ste th/' ajnairevsei sunacqh'nai ta; moivmnia}$ ). Martyrius depicts all the leavers as taking part in the murder of John, whereas Palladius envisages them acting in line with John's counsel. Palladius also explicitly rebukes apocalyptic sentiments among the johannites. Apocalyptic was a recurring element of the discourse of small, persecuted minorities in the Later Roman Empire, such as the Eunomians, which did not see a solution to their progressive marginalisation.<sup>44</sup> Palladius clearly had a much more optimistic view of things.

Palladius' *Dialogue* represents an important change of perspective in other respects too. Indeed, it is easy to forget that the work is not a straightforward history of John but a dialogue between a Roman deacon and an elderly johannite bishop, situated in Rome. As such, the work can be interpreted as having two audiences. By setting the dialogue in Rome, Palladius may have wanted to make the johannite view known in Rome in a systematic way: Innocent had received numerous letters and reports (as reported in the first part of the dialogue),<sup>45</sup> and Palladius' work

can be read as a summary and contextualisation. But Rome may not have been the primary audience: by choosing a Roman setting, and opening and concluding the dialogue on statements of Roman support for John and the johannites, he may have wanted to show to his fellow johannites that their view was being heard in Rome. In the context of 408-409, this may have been the more important message. Indeed, after John's death, the game could have seemed over for the johannites: there was nobody to challenge Atticus anymore, and, as contemporary observers knew, an acephalous schism was bound to disintegrate.<sup>46</sup> All major sees were in the hands of the anti-johannites. The only lever left for the johannites was the support of Rome: as long as the papacy refused communion with the Eastern churches, there was hope for the rehabilitation of John. The setting of Palladius' *Dialogue* thus betrays an acute awareness that the johannites were now dependent on others to achieve their own goals. Pseudo-Martyrius' *epitaphios*, by contrast, was written immediately after John's death and still insists on the internal coherence of the johannites against their enemies. For him Rome is only far on the horizon.

This change of perspective, conditioned by a change of condition for the Johannites, may also explain another distinctive feature of the *Dialogue*. While Pseudo-Martyrius openly points to the court as a key player in the downfall of John and is much more abrasive in his critique of the anti-johannites, Palladius refocuses the story on the ecclesiastical actors. In particular Theophilus is throughout the story depicted as the main culprit, whilst also Arsacius and Atticus, and Porphyry of Antioch get their share of the blame.<sup>47</sup> The secular actors, on the contrary, are explicitly spared. Arcadius is explicitly made not responsible for the events: Palladius even invents a demand of John to the emperor to order him to leave the city after his second deposition, supposedly to allow the bishop to leave Constantinople without seeming to abandon

his people.<sup>48</sup> Anthemius, the *magister officiorum*, co-responsible for the persecution of the Johannites, is depicted as unwilling to engage in violence and only yielding to the demands of Acacius of Beroa, the archenemy of John.<sup>49</sup> Political calculation surely is part of the explanation: Anthemius was virtually in charge of the empire until 415, and attacking the emperor would surely not help the johannites to have their exile lifted. But the refocusing of the story on the ecclesiastical actors also helps to get the recommended course of action straight: Rome could hardly influence the secular authorities in the East (it had tried to do so between 404 and 407, but had failed), but it could put pressure on the churches of Constantinople, Antioch, and Alexandria. The dialogue clearly reminded Rome of what arguments it could use against those three sees. It has been argued by D.S. Katos that Palladius wrote his *Dialogue* not as a biography<sup>50</sup> but with the aim of representing the events as in a courtroom with argument and counterargument.<sup>51</sup> This, Palladius may have felt, was the suited medium if he wanted to see Rome engage successfully with the churches in the East.

Palladius' *Dialogue* can be read as advancing a multi-pronged argument. It strongly defends the righteousness of the johannite cause, and especially addresses its arguments to Rome. It also is permeated by a strong belief that a solution can be reached and that time is on the side of the johannites. At the same time, Palladius signals that a possible reintegration without acceptance of John's deposition is acceptable. Indeed, we should not forget that the johannites, from their very origins, were to be found both inside and outside the official church. Rather than rejecting those who returned to the official church, Palladius may have sensed their potential to continue the struggle within the official church. These strands come together in the prophecy of Ammonius towards the end of the work: even before John's deposition, this ascetic had stated that 'a great persecution and a schism will happen to the churches. But the guilty will know a terrible end and

the churches will be reunited, something that has happened already in part and will happen in the future.<sup>52</sup> The final clause ('something...future) could be construed as referring only to the death of the persecutors of John, which are listed in the following sections. But the most obvious meaning of the passage is that the reunification has already started without being fully completed. Punishment of the evil doers, preliminary steps towards reintegration, and the prospect of a full resolution of the crisis with the help of Rome, that is the complex message of Palladius,<sup>53</sup> a complexity that is the result of the specific situation of the schism in the years after John's death.

#### *Palladius and the amnesty*

In a paper discussing the limited role played by doctrinal differences in the dispute between John and Theophilus, S. Elm has argued that Palladius' dialogue is strongly apologetic and should not be read as a straightforward account of John's life.<sup>54</sup> Can we take this a step further and argue that the *Dialogue* is not just apologetic for John but also for Palladius himself? As we have seen, it is possible that Palladius' *Dialogue* was written when the amnesty had just been agreed. It is thus theoretically possible that his return from exile was the result of the amnesty. In that case, his nuanced position on reintegration might be a personal justification. Although certainty is precluded by the state of the sources, it is worthwhile at least to raise the question: even the speculative argument that follows will generate insight in the dynamic of the johannite schism at a crucial moment of its existence.

Chronology does not preclude the possibility of Palladius at least knowing of the amnesty: the dialogue seems to take place in late 408/early 409, whereas the amnesty is to be dated between late 408 and late 409. In order to allow for some time to write the work and to absorb the implications of the reintegration, this would mean dating the amnesty very early and the dialogue

very late within their respective termini. Yet, it is important to realise that the date of 408/9 that we have deduced for the work is at best the dramatic date of the dialogue taking place in Rome, and not necessarily the date of actual writing or publication. If the *Dialogue* was meant to be a personal defence, it could have been in Palladius' own interest to represent it as a view expressed before the amnesty was actually offered and he himself was still in exile.

If no certainty can be reached on the basis of the date of the *Dialogue* and the amnesty, we can attempt to determine the date of Palladius' return from exile. As we have seen, Butler's date of 412 is based on thin air. The *termini* for his return are 408/early 409 (dramatic date for the dialogue, which still presumes that Palladius is exiled) and 418 (when John was reinserted in the diptychs of Constantinople, after which it is unlikely that any partisan of John would have remained exiled). When Palladius wrote the *Historia Lausiaca* in 419/20, he was bishop of Aspona. Is it possible to be more precise within these *termini*?

In order to answer these questions, we must take a brief look at the return by johannite bishops to the official church. We know of a number of them who were transferred to a different see, which most likely happened after their return from exile. The most important source is a long digression in the church historian Socrates, who justified the translation of Proclus from Cyzicus to Constantinople (434) by listing a large number of precedents.<sup>55</sup> The inclusion of johannites in this list is deliberate: Proclus belonged to the anti-johannite faction of the church of Constantinople (having been a secretary of Atticus) and the critics of his translation were most probably johannites. Indeed, Proclus had been a candidate three times before and his election had each time been blocked by a johannite counter-candidate, Philip of Side.<sup>56</sup> By including johannites in his list, Socrates, who was a partisan of the anti-johannite faction, implicitly chides them for having double standards: they attack Proclus for a translation but many of them have



been translated themselves. Palladius is among the bishops mentioned, but also John of Gordum in Lydia who after his exile was transferred to Proconnesus.<sup>57</sup> Socrates also notes the translation of two bishops to Thrace: Theophilus of Apamea to Selybria and Hierophilus of Trapezopolis to Plotinopolis. It is tempting to link them with the disillusioned bishops mentioned by Palladius who had rejoined Atticus and had been transferred to churches in Thrace.<sup>58</sup> Another johannite is Optimus of Antioch, whose transfer happened, however, before the johannite crisis. Few of these returns and translations can be precisely dated.<sup>59</sup> The translations to Thrace mentioned by Palladius represent the earliest, probably around 408/409, and that of the Alexander as mentioned by Synesius also happened around 408/9. Other translations can simply not be dated, but Synesius suggests that Alexander was one of a few who had not yet returned.<sup>60</sup> Whilst it is thus likely that the amnesty had immediate success, it would be imprudent to presume that all exiled bishops returned immediately after the amnesty: the offer may well have remained valid for a long period after 408/9.

The conditions for return profoundly changed in 415 in Antioch, and in 418 in Constantinople. First Alexander of Antioch capitulated to the demands of Rome to fully reinstate John. This meant that the Syrian bishops Pappus and Elpidius could return: Palladius' *Dialogue* still presumes them to be under house-arrest,<sup>61</sup> but their return was an explicit demand of Innocentius.<sup>62</sup> A few years later Alexander was followed by Atticus of Constantinople. The latter waited until Innocentius of Rome was succeeded by Bonifatius to restore communion with Rome and to accept the demand of rehabilitation of John: relations between Atticus and Innocent must have been very sour after more than a decade of negotiations and argument. The change of personnel in Rome allowed Atticus to save his face. Atticus even tried to persuade Cyril of Alexandria to do the same, but the latter responded very harshly.<sup>63</sup> It is likely, however, that he

followed suit at some point, but it is impossible to say when.<sup>64</sup> The rehabilitation of John effectively meant the annulment of all punishments for his followers, and the unconditional return of all johannite bishops.<sup>65</sup>

In the state of our evidence, then, the turning points in the dealings with the exiled johannite bishops were 408/9 when they could return without having to condemn John, and 415 (for Antioch) and 418 (for Constantinople), when the official church abandoned its condemnation of John and the exiled could return without any conditions. The important consequence for Palladius is that at whatever date he returned before 418,<sup>66</sup> he would have had to enter into communion with those who had condemned John and had not yet rehabilitated him. This has an impact on how one sees Palladius. Only if we date his return from exile very late, in 418 and after the capitulation of Atticus, we can consider him to be a hard-line johannite. If he returned before that date, he will have had to make an important concession: namely to enter into communion with people who still clung to the condemnation of John. In the light of my reading of the *Dialogue* as a multi-layered work that also contemplates the possibility of reintegration, it seems unlikely that he can be catalogued as a hard-line johannite. In addition, Claudia Rapp has suggested that the demand by the *praepositus sacri cubiculi* Lausus to write a work discussing Egyptian monasticism, the so-called *Lausiaca History*, was an attempt by the Constantinopolitan elite to reintegrate the johannites into the establishment.<sup>67</sup> This would make more sense if Palladius was seen as a compromise figure who was acceptable for both sides. Again, this suggests a return before 418.

Is it possible, then, to argue that the *Dialogue* was written when Palladius had already returned from exile and accepted the amnesty? No certainty can be gained here. The lenient passages discussed above can be read as supporting that idea. Also, in 1947 C. Baur pointed out that

Palladius relies heavily on letters sent to and from Rome, and that it was unlikely that he could have obtained these documents while in exile in Egypt. He suggested Rome as place of composition.<sup>68</sup> Although one could construe a scenario whereby Palladius would have received them through correspondence (possible but implausible), the coherence of the focus of his documentation is indeed striking. But Rome is not the only possible place: we know that the johannites in Constantinople possessed an archive of documents relating to their struggle and that it contained the correspondence with Rome. The church historian Sozomen could still consult it in the 440s and cite two letters by Innocentius of Rome.<sup>69</sup> Constantinople may therefore be a more likely place of composition for the *dialogue*. At any rate, both options, Rome and Constantinople, presuppose that Palladius had returned from exile.

Palladius thus accepted the conditions of the amnesty and returned from exile at some point between 408/9 and 418, with a date close to the amnesty as the most probable.<sup>70</sup> It is possible that the *dialogue* was written after Palladius' return, but there is no definite proof. The exploration of these possibilities has shown, however, that the changing circumstances forced the johannites to make choices. A principled refusal to treat with the anti-johannites might mean taking the moral high ground, but effectively signalled a choice for a marginalisation. Indeed, it was Rome, and not the progressively marginalised schismatic johannites who succeeded in forcing the hand of Porphyry, Atticus, and Cyril. Accepting the amnesty may have felt like a betrayal to some, but it allowed the johannites to labour for the rehabilitation of John from within the church. Even if we cannot determine when Palladius precisely returned from exile and wrote his dialogue, he belonged in all likelihood to the second camp.

*Conclusion*

This article has made a double argument. First, it has argued against the received chronology of Palladius' life, which proclaimed false certainties and disregarded the history of the johannite schism. Palladius was exiled in 406 to Syene, and returned at some point before 418. In line with the conditions of the amnesty offered by Atticus and Theophilus to the johannites in 408/9, he returned to the official church as a bishop and was translated to the see of Aspona. When he actually returned, we cannot know: the most likely option remains shortly after the offer of amnesty in 408/9. Whilst losing some of the fixed dates for Palladius' career, we have gained insight in the evolution of the johannite schism. The death of John in 407 caused disarray among the johannites, soon exploited by their enemies with an offer of amnesty, which was accepted by a number, possibly the majority, of exiled bishops. The amnesty was advantageous to both sides. For the anti-johannites, it helped to weaken the schism by exploiting the uncertainties about the future among the johannites, and could be presented as a sign of good-will to Rome. For the johannites, it created the possibility of taking up their positions again, when all hope for a return of John had evaporated, without subscribing to his deposition. But the amnesty did not efface the battle lines: a group of johannites remained identifiable in Constantinople well into the tenure of Proclus (434-446). Crucially, Innocent of Rome refused to see the amnesty as sufficient and continued to request a full rehabilitation as a condition for the re-establishment of the communion with Constantinople, Antioch, and Alexandria. Although the Nicene church historian Socrates prefers to ascribe the resolution of the schism to the magnanimity of Atticus and Proclus,<sup>71</sup> it would not have happened without Innocent's doggedness.

Second, the history of the johannite schism provides the *Sitz im Leben* of Palladius' *dialogue*. It is a much more complex and subtle work than a discussion in terms of 'apology' or 'reliability' can suggest. The dialogue is obviously not an objective treatise. Even if one refuses to see it as a

personal defence for having accepted the amnesty, the *dialogue* is a strategic work, which responds to the troubled conditions of the schism by affirming the unity of the johannites – both the johannites who had accepted the amnesty and those who rejected it – and by refocusing on Rome as the only possible agent that could rehabilitate John. Palladius consciously de-theologises the conflict between John and his enemies in order to depict it as a disciplinary matter<sup>72</sup> and thus reduces the scope of the conflict and focuses on one particular, achievable goal, namely the complete rehabilitation of John, without risking to get involved in slippery theological discussions. It can be read as at once an instruction to Rome how to act and a exhortation to the johannites to keep faith in their cause. The success of the *dialogue* among modern scholars who have praised its reliability, is probably due to the fact that the outcome of the events proved Palladius' argument right: Rome did force the oriental sees to relent. But when he wrote it, it was strategy and not yet fact.

---

\* This paper was drafted in the summer of 2009, during a stay in Cincinnati as a Margo Tytus Fellow. The final version was written in the Fondation Hardt (Geneva), whilst enjoying a junior research stipend of the foundation (May-June 2010). My sincerest thanks go to the anonymous reader for his comments. I dedicate this paper to Boudewijn Dehandschutter, on the occasion of his retirement.

<sup>1</sup> Accounts of John's life are C. Baur, *Der heilige Johannes Chrysostomus und seine Zeit*, 2 Vols., Munich 1929-1930; J.N.D. Kelly, *Golden mouth: the story of John Chrysostom: ascetic, preacher, bishop*, London 1995; R. Brändle, *Johannes Chrysostomus: Bischof, Reformator, Märtyrer*, Stuttgart 1999; C. Tiersch, *Johannes Chrysostomus in Konstantinopel (398-404): Weltsicht und Wirken eines Bischofs in der Hauptstadt des oströmischen Reiches*, Tübingen 2000.

<sup>2</sup> Socrates, *Historia ecclesiastica* vi.18.17-18 (*Sokrates. Kirchengeschichte*, ed. G.C. Hansen, Berlin 1995); Sozomen, *Historia ecclesiastica* viii.18 (*Sozomenos. Kirchengeschichte*, ed. J. Bidez and G.C. Hansen, Berlin 1995, 2nd ed.); Pseudo-Martyrius, *Vita Iohannis Chrysostomi* 111-3 (*Oratio funebris in laudem sancti Iohannis Chrysostomi. epitaffio attribuito a Martirio di Antiochia (BHG 871, CPG 6517)*, ed. M. Wallraff and C. Ricci, Spoleto 2007); Palladius, *Dialogus* x.83-121, 11.7 (*Palladius. Dialogue sur la vie de Jean Chrysostome. Tome 1*, ed. A.-M. Malingrey and P. Leclercq, Paris 1988); Zosimus, *Historiai* v.24.4-8 (*Zosime. Histoire nouvelle*, ed. F. Paschoud, 5 Vols., Paris 1979-2000); *Pascal Chronicle* a. 404 p. 568.13-19 (*Chronicon paschale*, ed. L. Dindorf, Bonn 1832); Marcellinus Comes, *chronicon* a. 404 (*Chronica minora. Vol. 2*, ed. T. Mommsen, Berlin 1961).

<sup>3</sup> *Codex Theodosianus* xvi.2.37 (29/8/404) and xvi.4.6 (18/11/404) (*Theodosiani libri XVI cum constitutionibus Sirmondianis*, ed. T. Mommsen, P. Meyer and P. Krüger, Berlin 1905).

<sup>4</sup> Atticus in Cyril of Alexandria, *ep.* lxxv PG lxxvii.349c; Socrates, *HE* vii.25. On the role of diptychs, see R. Taft, *A History of the liturgy of St. John Chrysostom. IV. The diptychs*, Rome, 1991; P. Blaudeau, 'Hors des diptyques point du salut? Regard sur la genèse, le développement et l'amointrissement de certaines exigences romaines en Orient (415-604)', in P.-G. Delage (ed), *Les pères de l'Eglise et les dissidents. Dessiner la communion*, La Rochelle 2010, 343-60.

<sup>5</sup> F. Van Ommeslaeghe, *De lijkrede voor Johannes Chrysostomos toegeschreven aan Martyrius van Antiochie*, unpubl. PhD diss. Louvain 1974, 25; Id., 'La fête de S. Jean Chrysostome dans l'Eglise grecque', *Analecta*

---

*Bollandiana* xcvi (1978), 338 suggests 13 November 407; Wallraff and Ricci, *Oratio*, 13-4 date the oration between November 407 and early 408 at the latest.

<sup>6</sup> The first edition is Van Ommeslaeghe, *lijkrede*. I refer to the new one published by M. Wallraff and C. Ricci, *Oratio*. For some corrections to Wallraff and Ricci, see F. Fatti, 'Meglio non far nomi. Isidoro xenodochus e l'Oratio funebris in laudem S. Johannis Chrysostomi', *Augustinianum* xlix (2009), 177-90.

<sup>7</sup> P. Van Nuffelen, *Un héritage de paix et de piété. Etude sur les histoires ecclésiastiques de Socrate et de Sozomène*, Louvain 2004, 27-30, 73-77. This analysis is independently confirmed by W. Mayer, 'The making of a saint. John Chrysostom in early historiography', in M. Wallraff et R. Brändle (eds), *Chrysostomosbilder in 1600 Jahren. Facetten der Wirkungsgeschichte eines Kirchenvaters*, Berlin 2008, 39-51.

<sup>8</sup> See, e.g., W. Mayer, 'Doing violence to the image of an empress. The destruction of Eudoxia's reputation', in H. Drake (ed), *Violence in Late Antiquity*, Aldershot 2006, 205-213 (It must be noted, however, that the depiction of Eudoxia in Socrates and Sozomen is more nuanced than she suggests); W. Mayer, 'John Chrysostom: deconstructing the construction of an exile', *Theologische Zeitschrift* lxii (2006), 248-58; D.S. Katos, 'Socratic dialogue or courtroom debate?', *Vigiliae christianae* lxi (2007), 42-69.

<sup>9</sup> Van Nuffelen, *héritage*, 27-30.

<sup>10</sup> P.R. Coleman-Norton, *Palladii Dialogus de vita S. Joannis Chrysostomi*, Cambridge 1928, p. lxiii; E. Schwartz, 'Palladius', *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft* xxxvi (1937), 161-204. Questions about Palladius' trustworthiness have been raised by S. Elm, 'The dog that did not bark: Doctrine and patriarchal authority in the conflict between Theophilus of Antioch and John Chrysostom of Constantinople', in L. Ayres and G. Jones (eds), *Christian origins. Theology, rhetoric and community*, London 1998, 68-93; M. Illert, *Johannes Chrysostomus und das antiochenisch-syrische Mönchtum*, Zürich and Freiburg, 2000, 102-5.

<sup>11</sup> Malingrey and Leclercq, *Palladios*, 18.

<sup>12</sup> C.E. Butler, *The Lausiaca History of Palladius*, Cambridge 1898, Vol. 1, 179-84 and Vol. 2, 245-6 and 'Palladiana', *Journal of theological studies* xxii (1921), 138-55 at pp. 152-4. He is followed by Coleman-Norton, *Palladii Dialogus*, pp. xv-xviii; A. Wellhausen, *Die lateinische übersetzung der Historia Lausiaca des Palladius*, Berlin 2003, 7-12. Katos, 'Socratic dialogue', 45 dates the return of Palladius to 407, at the death of John, and the dialogue immediately afterwards. He does not argue his case.

---

<sup>13</sup> R. Delmaire, 'Les "Lettres d'exil" de Jean Chrysostome. Étude de chronologie et de prosopographie,' *Recherches augustiniennes* xxv (1991), 71-180, at p. 91.

<sup>14</sup> Palladius, *dial.* iv.1-68.

<sup>15</sup> A departure in winter seems likely, given the fact that the embassy travelled by road: Palladius, *dial.* iv.6.

<sup>16</sup> Cf. D.F. Buck, 'The Structure of the Lausiac History', *Byzantion* xlvi (1976), 292-307; B. Flusin, art. Palladius, *dictionnaire de spiritualité* XII, 1 (1984), 114-21; C. Rapp, 'Palladius, Lausus and the Historia Lausiaca', in C. Sode and S. Takács (eds), *Novum millenium. Studies on byzantine history and culture dedicated to Paul Speck*, Aldershot 2001, 279-89.

<sup>17</sup> Palladius, *dial.* xx.41-42.

<sup>18</sup> Palladius, *hist. laus.* 58 (*The Lausiac History of Palladius*, ed. C.M. Butler, Cambridge 1898).

<sup>19</sup> Wellhausen, *Übersetzung*, 10 : 'Nach dem Tod des Theophilus im Jahre 412 wurde der Streit um Johannes Chrysostomos beigelegt'. B. Flusin, art. Palladius, 114-15 states that Palladius was recalled in 413, but his grounds for this are not specified.

<sup>20</sup> Synesius, *ep.* 67 (*Synésios de Cyrène. Correspondance*, ed. D. Roques and A. Garzya, Paris 2000).

<sup>21</sup> Atticus in Cyril of Alexandria, *ep.* lxxv PG lxxvii.349c; Socrates, *HE* vii.25.

<sup>22</sup> C. Pietri, *Roma christiana: recherches sur l'Eglise de Rome, son organisation, sa politique, son idéologie de Miltiade à Sixte III (311 - 440)*, Rome 1976, Vol. 2, 1329-30.

<sup>23</sup> P. Peeters, 'Une vie copte de S. Jean de Lycopolis', *Analecta bollandiana* liv (1936), 359-81; W. Telfer, 'The trustworthiness of Palladius', *Journal of theological studies* xxviii (1937), 379-82.

<sup>24</sup> Wellhausen, *Übersetzung*, 5-6 notes that Palladius' explicit indications add up to 17 years in Egypt and Palestine. Her note 10 inventorises the numerous solutions proposed to that problem.

<sup>25</sup> Sozomen, *HE* viii.24. See M. Wallraff, 'Tod im Exil. Reaktionen auf die Todesnachricht des Johannes und Konstituierung einer "johannitischen" Opposition', in M. Wallraff and R. Brändle (eds), *Chrysostomosbilder in 1600 Jahren. Facetten der Wirkungsgeschichte eines Kirchenvaters*, Berlin 2008, 23-37.

<sup>26</sup> Ps.-Martyrius, *vita* 3 and 138.

<sup>27</sup> Palladius, *dial.* xx.64-67.

<sup>28</sup> Synesius, *ep.* 67. See D. Roques, *Etudes sur la correspondance de Synesios de Cyrene*, Brussels 1989, 47-64 and D. Roques, *Synésios de Cyrène. Tome III. Correspondance. Lettres LXIV-CLVI*, Paris 2000, 321. This letter is



---

absent from, or not given its due importance in, almost all discussions of the johannite schism: Baur, *Das Leben*, 372-383; Kelly, *Golden Mouth*; Tiersch, *Johannes Chrysostomos*, 416; Wallraff, 'Tod'.

<sup>29</sup> Synesius, *ep.* 67.28 (πεvρyσι). Cf. Roques, *Etudes*, 47-64.

<sup>30</sup> The usual date for Synesius effectively becoming bishop is in the first quarter of 411, having been offered it in 410: Chr. Lacombrade, *Synesios de Cyrène. Hellène et chrétien*, Paris 1951, 210-12; T. Schmitt, *Die Bekehrung des Synesios von Kyrene*, Leipzig 2001, 54. An alternative chronology was defended by O. Seeck, 'Studien zu Synesius', *Philologus* lii (1883), 442-83 and T. Barnes, 'When did Synesius become Bishop of Ptolemais?', *Greek, Roman, and Byzantine Studies xxvii* (1986), 326-9, who situate the election in 406 and would date the amnesty to late 405. This view was criticised by W. Liebeschuetz, 'Why did Synesius become bishop of Ptolemais?', *Byzantion* lvi (1986), 180-95, 180-2, who argues for the traditional date. One can add to Liebeschuetz' arguments that the offer of amnesty in 405 does not square with the harsh measures taken by the authorities against the papal embassy of early 406, which is an act of confrontation and not of reconciliation.

For criticism on Roques, see A. Cameron and J. Long, *Barbarians and politics at the court of Arcadius*, Berkeley 1993, 20 n. 34 and 409-410. They follow in some of their arguments W. Liebeschuetz, 'Synesius and the municipal politics of Cyrenaica in the fifth century A.D.', *Byzantion* lv (1985), 146-69.

<sup>31</sup> Liebeschuetz, 'Why did Synesius', 182.

<sup>32</sup> Palladius, *dial.* viii.140; Sozomen, *HE* viii.24.

<sup>33</sup> Palladius, *dial.* xx.64-67: εij~ εJteβra~ metateqevnte~ ejkklhsiva~ th'~ qrav/kh~.

<sup>34</sup> *Codex Theodosianus* xvi.4.6 (18/11/404); Sozomen, *HE* viii.24.6. cf. Palladius, *dial.* viii.141-144.

<sup>35</sup> Innocentius, *ep.* xxii PL xx.546-7: *sine controversia recepturum*. See also *ep.* xx PL xx.543-4 and *ep.* xxi PL xx.544-5.

<sup>36</sup> Coleman-Norton, *Palladii Dialogus*, pp. lxxvii-lxxix; Malingrey and Leclercq, *Palladios*, 19.

<sup>37</sup> See, e.g., *dial.* ix.89.

<sup>38</sup> Wallraff, 'Tod', 26.

<sup>39</sup> Palladius, *dial.* xx.62.

<sup>40</sup> *Codex Theodosianus* 16.4.6.

<sup>41</sup> Palladius, *dial.* xx.63-67. Wallraff, 'Tod', 32 sees in *dial.* xvi.168-173 a reference to lack of attendance of the Johannite mass, but the reference is rather to the lack of attendance in the official churches.

---

<sup>42</sup> Malingrey and Leclercq, *Palladios*, 24; Wallraff, 'Tod', 31.

<sup>43</sup> Palladius, *dial.* xx.195-667.

<sup>44</sup> Palladius, *dial.* xx.180-195. On apocalyptic and the Eunomians, see B. Bleckmann, 'Apokalypse und kosmische Katastrophen: Das Bild der theodosianischen Dynastie beim Kirchenhistoriker Philostorg', in W. Brandes and F. Schmieder (eds.), *Endzeiten – politische und gesellschaftliche Implikationen universaleschatologischer Vorstellungen in den drei monotheistischen Weltreligionen (5.-16. Jahrhundert)*, Berlin, 2008, 13-40 and P. Van Nuffelen, 'Isolement et apocalypse: Philostorge et les eunomiens sous Théodose II,' in D. Meyer e.a. (eds), *Philostorge: actes du colloque tenu à Strasbourg juin 2006*, Stuttgart 2010, 315-36.

<sup>45</sup> Part of this correspondence has been revisited by G.D. Dunn, 'The Date of Innocent I's *Epistula* 12 and the Second Exile of John Chrysostom,' *Greek, Roman, and Byzantine studies* lxxv (2005), 155-70.

<sup>46</sup> Sozomen, *HE* viii.3.5.

<sup>47</sup> Theophilus: e.g. *dial.* v.65, xv.42; Arsacius: iii.66, xi.18, xi.31; Atticus: iv.41, xi.31-9; Porphyry: iii.66, xi.39, xvi.14-31, xvi.95-124.

<sup>48</sup> Palladius, *dial.* ix.89, ix.125-35.

<sup>49</sup> Palladius, *dial.* ix.170-181. *Prosopography of the later Roman empire*, ed. A.H.M. Jones, J.R. Martindale, J. Morris, Cambridge 1975, vol. 2, 94 (2). Anthemius organised relic transfers in 406 (*Paschal Chronicle* a. 406). This may have been an attempt to shore up popular support for the official church.

<sup>50</sup> In this sense, see P.R. Coleman-Norton, 'The use of dialogue in the *Vitae Sanctorum*', *Journal of theological studies* xxvii (1926), 388-95.

<sup>51</sup> Katos, 'Dialogue', 49.

<sup>52</sup> Palladius, *dial.* xvii.26-29: wJ~ megavlou diwgmou' ejpigenomevnou kai; scivsmato~ tai'~ ejkklhsivai~ ai[sciston tevlo~ ejpenegkei'n tou;~ aijtivou~ kai; ou{tw~ eJnwqh'nai ta;~ ejkklhsiva~. o{ dh; kai; ejk mevrou~ gegevntai kai; genhvsetai.

<sup>53</sup> The complexity of Palladius' message may explain an apparent contradiction: in *dial.* xviii.164 he states that he does not wish the enemies of God to perish by the sword, but the end of work lists the gruesome ends of the persecutors of John.

<sup>54</sup> Elm, 'The dog'.

---

<sup>55</sup> Socrates, *HE* vii.36-37. For Proclus' case, see J. Rist, 'Ut episcopus non transeat: Die Problematik der Translation von Bischöfen in der Spätantike dargestellt am Beispiel des Proklos von Konstantinopel', *Studia Patristica* xxix (1997), 119-26.

<sup>56</sup> This should be added to the discussion in Van Nuffelen, *Héritage*, 30-7. For the disputed elections in Constantinople, see now P. Van Nuffelen, 'Episcopal Succession in Constantinople (381-450 C.E.): The Local Dynamics of Power,' *Journal of Early Christian Studies* xviii (2010), 425-51.

<sup>57</sup> Palladius, *dial.* xx.52; Socrates, *HE* vii.36.

<sup>58</sup> Palladius, *dial.* xx.64-67.

<sup>59</sup> Other johannites who returned cannot be identified without a great degree of speculation. A possible johannite is Dositheos of Seleucia, who transferred to Tarsus (Socrates, *HE* vii.36). Theodorus of Tyana might be another johannite who later returned: G. Fedalto records two bishops Calliopius and Longinus between two stints of Theodorus (*Hierarchia ecclesiastica orientalis : series episcoporum ecclesiarum christianarum orientalium. 2 : Patriarchatus Alexandrinus, Antiochenus, Hierosolymitanus*, Padua 1988, 30).

<sup>60</sup> Synesius, *ep.* 67.22: i[dion de; h] met' ojlivgwn.

<sup>61</sup> Palladius, *dial.* xx.60.

<sup>62</sup> Innocentius, *ep.* xix, PL xx. 541-542, *ep.* xx PL xx.543-544, *ep.* xxiii PL xx.547. See Pietri, *Roma Christiana*, Vol. 2, 1329-30 for the chronology.

<sup>63</sup> Atticus, in Cyril of Alexandria, *ep.* lxxv PG lxxvii, 349-52, lxxvi PG lxxvii, 352-7.

<sup>64</sup> It happened at the very latest in 430: Baur, *Leben*, 379.

<sup>65</sup> Pietri, *Roma Christiana*, Vol. 2, 1327, 1332-3.

<sup>66</sup> The see of Helenopolis fell under the jurisdiction of Constantinople.

<sup>67</sup> Rapp, 'Palladius'.

<sup>68</sup> C. Baur, 'Wo wurde der dem Palladius von Helenopolis zugeschrieben Dialog über das Leben des Hl. Johannes Chrysostomus verfasst?', *Zeitschrift für katholische theologie* lxxi (1947), 466-8.

<sup>69</sup> Sozomen, *HE* viii.26.

<sup>70</sup> A reference in the *Lausiaca History* is tantalising but does not yield very much. In the section on Antinoopolis, where Palladius says he stayed four years (Palladius, *hist. laus.* 58: jEn jAntinovw/ th'~ qhbaivdo~

---

diatrivya~ tevssara e[th), he tells how a dying ascetic ordered that a copy of the *Stromateis* by Clement of Alexandria be given to ‘the exiled bishop’ (Palladius, *hist. laus.* 60). If Palladius is the exiled bishop, then it becomes possible that the four years in Antinoe were part of his exile in Egypt, and that these have to be situated at some point between 406 and 418. Palladius was exiled to Syene, but we do not know how long he stayed there, or if he was forced to remain in one place. If he went to Antinoe fairly soon, and the end of the four years represent the end of his exile, then he may have returned as soon as early 410.

<sup>71</sup> Van Nuffelen, *héritage*, 30-7.

<sup>72</sup> Schwartz, ‘Palladius’, 185-6; Elm, ‘The dog’.