Jnl of Ecclesiastical History, Vol. 64, No. 1, January 2013. © Cambridge University Press 2013 1
doi:10.1017/S0022046912000772

Palladius and the Johannite Schism

by PETER VAN NUFFELEN
Ghent University
E-mail: peter.vannuffelen@ugent.be

The 'Dialogue on the life of John Chrysostom', published by Palladius of Helenopolis c. 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 into 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 improve their situation. As a consequence its trustworthiness cannot be accepted 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.[1] Since Easter of that year the civic authorities had attempted to break up John's popular following, and the fire that engulfed the Great Church after his departure, possibly lit by his followers,[2] was used as a pretext for an even

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 I was in receipt of a junior research grant from the foundation (May–June 2010). My sincerest thanks go to the anonymous reader for his comments. I dedicate this article to the memory of Boudewijn Dehandschutter.

[1] Accounts of John's life are C. Baur, *Der heilige Johannes Chrysostomus und seine Zeit*, Munich 1929–30; J. N. D. Kelly, *Golden mouth: the story of John Chrysostom: ascetic, preacher, bishop*, London 1995; R. Brändle, *Johannes Chrysostomus: Bischof, Reformer, Märtyrer*, Stuttgart 1999; C. Tiersch, *Johannes Chrysostomus in Konstantinopel (398–404): Weltsicht und Wirken eines Bischofs in der Hauptstadt des oströmischen Reiches*, Tübingen 2000.

[2] Socrates, *HE* vi.18.17–18, in *Sokrates: Kirchengeschichte*, ed. G. C. Hansen, Berlin 1995; Sozomen, *HE* viii.18, in *Sozomenos: Kirchengeschichte*, ed. J. Bidez and G. C. Hansen, 2nd edn, Berlin 1995; Pseudo-Martyrius, *Vita Johannis Chrysostomi* 111–13, in *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; Palladios, *Dialogus*

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0022046912000772 Published online by Cambridge University Press

more forceful crackdown. Imperial decrees deposed, imprisoned and exiled bishops and clergy who refused communion with the new bishop Arsacius (404–5).[3] There was persecution not only at Constantinople, but also in Asia Minor and Syria: anti-Johannite bishops were, for example, installed in Antioch (Porphyry) and Ephesus (Victor). Whilst many of John's followers yielded to this show of force, others refused: they would form the Johannite schism, 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 (406–26) reinscribed John's name on the diptychs of the dead, an act that implied a formal rehabilitation.[4]

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 Ps-Martyrius, dated to shortly after the death of John,[5] tries to keep up Johannite morale and to consolidate the schism at a time when the disappearance of its leader put its survival at risk.[6] Palladius, bishop of Helenopolis, was deposed as a partisan of John and exiled, and supposedly wrote his *Dialogue* on the life of John Chrysostom in *c.* 408. The church historian Sozomen, writing *c.* 445, drew on Johannite informants, who gave him several documents and the *Epitaphios* of Ps-Martyrius. His account is however less unilaterally positive than that of his sources: Sozomen also used his predecessor Socrates who, writing *c.* 439–40, is the only exception in this series of admirers. Having mixed with anti-Johannites, his image of

x.83–121, 11.7, in *Palladios: Dialogue sur la vie de Jean Chrysostome,* i, ed. A.-M. Malingrey and P. Leclercq, Paris 1988; Zosimus, *Historia* v.24.4–8, in *Zosime: Histoire nouvelle,* ed. F. Paschoud, Paris 1979–2000; *Pascal Chronicle* a. 404, p. 568.13–19, in *Chronicon paschale,* ed. L. Dindorf, Bonn 1832; Marcellinus Comes, *Chronicon* a. 404, in *Chronica minora,* ii, ed. T. Mommsen, Berlin 1961.

[3] *Codex Theodosianus* xvi.2.37 (29 Aug. 404); xvi.4.6 (18 Nov. 404), in *Theodosiani libri XVI cum constitutionibus Sirmondianis*, ed. T. Mommsen, P. Meyer and P. Krüger, Berlin 1905.

[4] 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'amoindrissement de certaines exigences romaines en Orient (415–604)', in P.-G. Delage (ed.), *Les Pères de l'Eglise et les dissidents: déssiner la communion*, La Rochelle 2010, 343–60.

[5] F. Van Ommeslaeghe suggests 13 November 407: 'De lijkrede voor Johannes Chrysostomos toegeschreven aan Martyrius van Antiochie', unpubl. PhD diss. Louvain 1974, 25, and 'La Fête de S. Jean Chrysostome dans l'Eglise grecque', *Analecta Bollandiana* xcvi (1978), 338; Wallraff and Ricci date the oration between November 407 and early 408 at the latest: *Oratio,* 13–14.

[6] The first edition of this work was Van Ommeslaeghe's 'Lijkrede'. I refer to Wallraff and Ricci's edition published in 2007. 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.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0022046912000772 Published online by Cambridge University Press

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 old passions.[7] 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 the 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. A lot is known about the events of 403–4, but comparatively little about the preceding years. A striking illustration of such a teleological view is provided by Ps-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: the story of John's life is eclipsed by the tragedy at its end.

These two characteristics are enough to argue that a thorough understanding and ordering of the sources is a necessary precondition for the reconstruction of the train of events.[8] Yet there is a third characteristic that has not been sufficiently acknowledged: all the sources are also influenced by the history of the Johannite schism. The schism was not a static entity but underwent some important transformations over time: all the texts have therefore to be situated at a specific point in the history of the schism. For example, Ps-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 rejoin the official Church, while Socrates's 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's apparently neutral account of the church of Constantinople, the effects of the schism can still be felt.[9] Rather than being an appendix to biographies of John Chrysostom, as is

[7] P. Van Nuffelen, *Un Héritage de paix et de piété: étude sur les histoires ecclésiastiques de Socrate et de Sozomène*, Louvain 2004, 27–30, 73–7. This analysis is independently confirmed by W. Mayer, 'The making of a saint: John Chrysostom in early historiography', in M. Wallraff and R. Brändle (eds), *Chrysostomosbilder in 1600 Jahren: facetten der Wirkungsgeschichte eines Kirchenvaters*, Berlin 2008, 39–51.

[8] See, for example, 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, 205–13 (it must be noted, however, that the depiction of Eudoxia in Socrates and Sozomen is more nuanced than she suggests), and 'John Chrysostom: deconstructing the construction of an exile', *Theologische Zeitschrift* lxii (2006), 248–58; and D. S. Katos, 'Socratic dialogue or courtroom debate?', *Vigiliae Christianae* lxi (2007), 42–69.

[9] Van Nuffelen, *Héritage*, 27–30.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0022046912000772 Published online by Cambridge University Press

usually the case, a thorough consideration of the history of the schism should be its introduction.

This paper focuses upon Palladius, whose *Dialogue* has been hailed as the main and most trustworthy guide to John's life.[10] Starting out from a reconsideration of the chronology of Palladius' life in exile, it will put the *Dialogue* in the context of the events that shook the Johannite schism in 408/409, and in that way provide a background against which to assess 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.[11] She then reproduced the chronology drawn up by C. E. Butler, in an appendix to his 1898 edition of the *Lausiac history*. For his life in exile the chronology runs as follows. Palladius was arrested in 405, when he was sent to Constantinople by Pope Innocent I (401–17) 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 four years there, and after the death of Theophilus, bishop of Alexandria and his enemy, his exile was lifted. In 417 Palladius became bishop of Aspona in Asia Minor.[12] The clarity of the chronology is misleading; it is based on questionable assumptions.

Two dates are undisputed. First, Palladius was a member of a papal embassy sent to Constantinople in early 406, as has been shown by R. Delmaire,[13] to intervene in favour of John. Before the embassy could

[10] *Palladii Dialogus de vita S. Joannis Chrysostomi*, ed. P. R. Coleman-Norton, 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, and M. Illert, *Johannes Chrysostomus und das antiochenisch-syrische Mönchtum*, Zürich–Freiburg 2000, 102–5.

[11] *Palladios* (Malingrey-Leclercq), 18.

[12] C. E. Butler, *The Lausiac history of Palladius*, Cambridge 1898, i. 179–84; ii. 245–6, and 'Palladiana', *JTS* xxii (1921), 138–55 at pp. 152–4. He is followed by *Palladii Dialogus* (Coleman-Norton), pp. xv–xviii, and A. Wellhausen, *Die lateinische übersetzung der Historia lausiaca des Palladius*, Berlin 2003, 7–12. Katos dates the return of Palladius to 407, at the death of John, and the dialogue immediately afterwards:'Socratic dialogue', 45. He does not argue his case.

[13] R. Delmaire, 'Les "Lettres d'exil" de Jean Chrysostome: étude de chronologie et de prosopographie,' *Recherches augustiniennes* xxv (1991), 71–180 at p. 91.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0022046912000772 Published online by Cambridge University Press

reach the city, its members were arrested. Palladius was separated from the papal legates, deposed and exiled.[14] We know that the papal legates were imprisoned while 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.[15] The second certainty is that when Palladius wrote the *Lausiac history* in 419–20,[16] he was bishop of Aspona. In addition, we know that Palladius was exiled to Syene, according to his own statement in the *Dialogue*.[17] When Butler constructed his chronology, he took the death of Theophilus in 412 as the turning point in Palladius' exile, on the implicit assumption that the death of John's principal 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 *Lausiac history* referred to his exile, and not to an earlier and longer stay in Egypt before 400.[18] This left two years in Syene, between 406 and 408, after which he assumed that Palladius was transferred to Antinoe. In 417, finally, Palladius was restored to the episcopate and was granted the see of Aspona – on the assumption that the reinsertion of John into the diptychs of Constantinople would be a suitable occasion for this.

Almost every stage 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,[19] there is no evidence that it had an impact on the schism. The real turning-point was the two years after the death of John Chrysostom (14 September 407), when 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.[20] Second, Butler's date of 417 for the reinsertion of John is uncertain, as the only evidence is an undated reference in the church historian Socrates and a letter of Atticus.[21] Basing himself on the chronology of papal

[14] Palladius, *Dialogus* iv.1–68. Unless otherwise stated all citations of this text are from the Malingrey-Leclercq edition.

[15] A departure in winter seems likely, given that the embassy travelled by road: ibid. iv.6.

[16] Cf. D. F. Buck, 'The structure of the Lausiac history', *Byzantion* xlvi (1976), 292–307; B. Flusin, 'Palladius', in *Dictionnaire de spiritualité* xii/1 (1984), 114–21; and 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.

[17] Palladius, *Dialogus* xx.41–2.

[18] Idem, *Historia lausiaca* 58 (Butler edn).

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

[20] Synesius, *ep.* lxvii, in *Synésios de Cyrène*, III: *Correspondance: lettres LXIV–CLVI*, ed. D. Roques and A. Garzya, Paris 2000.

[21] Atticus, in Cyril of Alexandria, *ep.* lxxv, *PG* lxxvii.349c; Socrates, *HE* vii.25.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0022046912000772 Published online by Cambridge University Press

involvement in the Johannite crisis, C. Pietri has actually proposed 418 as the more likely date.[22] Apart from the problem of the date, it seems that bishops who were recalled from exile were usually restored immediately 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 (according to 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 *Lausiac history*.[23] As a matter of fact, if all of these were added up, they would greatly exceed the twelve years of Palladius' stay in Egypt and Palestine between 388 and 400.[24] Most of these figures are probably approximations and a rather shaky basis upon which to construct a chronology.

Butler's chronology has the advantage of limpidity, but has to be discarded for relying on untenable premises. There is an alternative 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 408–9

When describing the persecution of the Johannites, the church historian Sozomen makes it 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. The schismatic Johannites assembled outside the city.[25] The history of the schism is marked by the absorption of the schismatic Johannites into the non-schismatic ones. A key moment was John's death in 407: it is clear from Ps-Martyrius that many schismatic Johannites were disheartened and returned to the official Church.[26] Palladius also alludes to disillusioned bishops who accepted communion.[27]

[22] 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, ii. 1329–30.

[23] P. Peeters, 'Une Vie copte de S. Jean de Lycopolis', *Analecta bollandiana* liv (1936), 359–81; W. Telfer, 'The trustworthiness of Palladius', *JTS* xxviii (1937), 379–82.

[24] Wellhausen notes that Palladius' explicit indications add up to seventeen years in Egypt and Palestine. Her n. 10 inventorises the numerous solutions proposed to that problem: *Übersetzung*, 5–6.

[25] Sozomen, *HE* viii.24. See M. Wallraff, 'Tod im Exil: Reaktionen auf die Todesnachricht des Johannes und Konstituierung einer "johannitischen" Opposition', in Wallraff and Brändle, *Chrysostomosbilder in 1600 Jahren*, 23–37.

[26] Ps.-Martyrius, *Vita* 3, 138.

[27] Palladius, *Dialogus* xx.64–7.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0022046912000772 Published online by Cambridge University Press

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,[28] 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 Basilinoupolis 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.* lxvii. 22–3: τουτὶ μὲν ἔτος ἤδη τρίτον ἐξήκει μετὰ τὴν ἀμνηστίαν καὶ τὰς διαλλαγάς) 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 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's dating of the letter refer to most of 409. Second, Roques dates Synesius' acceptance of the position of bishop to 1 January 412 and, as a consequence, the letter must belong to early 412 as Synesius states that 'last year' he was not yet bishop.[29] It would in itself be odd that someone would say that he had not been bishop the previous year if he had only been one 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.[30] This would yield a possible date of 408 for

[28] Synesius, *ep.* lxvii. See D. Roques, *Etudes sur la correspondance de Synesios de Cyrene*, Brussels 1989, 47–64, and *Synésios de Cyrène,* iii. 321. This letter is absent from, or not given its due importance in, almost all discussions of the Johannite schism: Baur, *Das Leben*, 372–83; Kelly, *Golden mouth*; Tiersch, *Johannes Chrysostomos*, 416; Wallraff, 'Tod'.

[29] Synesius, *ep.* lxvii.28; cf. Roques, *Etudes,* 47–64.

[30] 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 who argues for the traditional date: 'Why did Synesius become bishop of Ptolemais?', *Byzantion* lvi (1986), 180–95 at pp. 180–2. It can further be argued 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 of Roques see A. Cameron and J. Long, *Barbarians and*

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0022046912000772 Published online by Cambridge University Press

the amnesty.[31] 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 who refused to subscribe to John's deposition were deposed and exiled.[32] 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' (οὐδὲ τῆς συλλαχούσης αὐτῷ καθέδρας ἐλάβετο: *ep.* lxvii.24). 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 quite possible that another bishop had in the meantime been appointed to the see of Basilinoupolis. Rather than deposing the new incumbent, a vacant see could have been 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'.[33] Moreover, 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 sees had in the meantime been occupied. In practice that may often have meant translation to a different see.

The second, plausible element was that an earlier condition of reintegration, namely, 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 Johannites to subscribe to the deposition of John.[34] For the legitimacy of his successors, Arsacius (404–5) and Atticus (406–25), this was a necessary condition, as 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 is known, Johannites did not consecrate 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

politics at the court of Arcadius, Berkeley 1993, 20 n. 34, 409–10. They follow, in some of their arguments, W. Liebeschuetz, 'Synesius and the municipal politics of Cyrenaica in the fifth century AD', *Byzantion* lv (1985), 146–69.

[31] Liebeschuetz, 'Why did Synesius', 182.

[32] Palladius, *Dialogus* viii.140; Sozomen, *HE* viii.24.

[33] εἰς ἑτέρας μετατεθέντες ἐκκλησίας τῆς θρᾴκης: Palladius, *Dialogus*. xx.64–7.

[34] *Codex Theodosianus* xvi.4.6 (18 Nov. 404); Sozomen, *HE* viii.24.6; cf. Palladius, *Dialogus* viii.141–4.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0022046912000772 Published online by Cambridge University Press

longer any danger of a challenge to the position of the bishop of Constantinople. This could be the bait that Atticus and Theophilus held out to the Johannites: they did not have to betray John Chrysostom in order 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 subscription to the deposition was a symbolically important concession, but one which gave nothing away: 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 returned to the official Church, but this did not mean that 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 his 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 goodwill. For Atticus, this meant coming half way to accommodate the susceptibilities of the Johannites. But Innocent insisted that Atticus repent completely and that the exiled be received 'without discussion'.[35]

Given the date of the amnesty, within two years of the death of John Chrysostom, it must have been an attempt to exploit the disarray among the Johannites to which Ps-Martyrius testifies. It offered quite favourable terms 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 must be rehabilitated.

Palladius and the turn towards Rome

The possible *termini* for Palladius' *Dialogue* are the death of John in September 407 (*Dialogue* 5.1) and of Theophilus in 412. Theophilus, who is the major culprit of Palladius' story, is clearly deemed still alive at *Dialogue* 20.435. Usually, the work is dated to 408 and is said to have been written between John's death and that of the emperor Arcadius (1 May

[35] 'sine controversia recepturum': Innocent, *ep.* xxii, *PL* xx.546–7. See also *epp.* xx, xxi, *PL* xx.543–4, 544–5.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0022046912000772 Published online by Cambridge University Press

408).[36] The latter *terminus ante quem* is based on the care with which Arcadius is cleared of all guilt by Palladius.[37] It has been argued recently that Palladius covertly refers to Arcadius' death at *Dialogue* 20.632 (δυσώδης θάνατος … ὃν ἴσασι πάντες), where he discusses the deaths of John's persecutors.[38] 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.[39] As this bishop is unlikely to have been deposed and imprisoned before John's exile from 20 June 404 onwards, and even before the law of 18 November 404, the legal justification for such acts,[40] this would suggest a date of late 408, or even early 409. There is, however, 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 that 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.[41] This seems to credit the interpretation of the *Dialogue* as a staunch defence of schism and separation:[42] indeed, the work ends with a prolonged praise of the tribulations that saints have to undergo and an attack on John's foes as enemies of God and tools of Satan.[43]

Yet, while the *Dialogue* clearly defends the Johannite position and certainly is not a treatise of capitulation, Palladius twice puts remarkable words into John's mouth, each time at key stages in his account. At 8.95–143 Palladius reports John's last conversation 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' ('εὔξασθε, ἀδελφοὶ, καὶ, εἰ φιλεῖτε τὸν Χριστὸν, ἐμοῦ ἕνεκεν μή τις ἀπολείπῃ τὴν ἑαυτοῦ ἐκκλησίαν': 98–100). He then foretells his own exile and death. At the end of praise for prophets who suffered for their

[36] *Palladii Dialogus* (Coleman-Norton), pp. lxvii–lxix; *Palladios* (Malingrey-Leclercq), 19.

[37] See, for example, Palladius, *Dialogus* ix.89.

[38] Wallraff, 'Tod', 26.

[39] Palladius, *Dialogus* xx.62.

[40] *Codex Theodosianus* 16.4.6.

[41] Palladius, *Dialogus* xx.63–7. Wallraff sees in *Dialogus* xvi.168–73 a reference to lack of attendance at the Johannite mass, but the reference is rather to the lack of attendance in the official churches: 'Tod', 32.

[42] *Palladios* (Malingrey-Leclercq), 24; Wallraff, 'Tod', 31.

[43] Palladius, *Dialogus* xx.195–667.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0022046912000772 Published online by Cambridge University Press

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 worthy of deposition'('κοινωνήσατε μέν, ἵνα μὴ σχίσητε τὴν ἐκκλησίαν, μὴ ὑπογράψητε δέ· οὐδὲν γὰρ ἐμαυτῷ σύνοιδα ἄξιον καθαιρέσεως ἐννοήσας': 142–4). The second key passage is John's conversation with his female followers, amongst whom was 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' ('καὶ ὅς ἂν ἄκων ἀχθῇ ἐπὶ τὴν χειροτονίαν, κλίνατε τὴν κεφαλὴν ὑμῶν ὡς Ἰωάννῃ. οὐ δύναται γὰρ ἡ ἐκκλησία ἄνευ ἐπίσκοπον εἶναι': 10.58–61). 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 that the Johannites should set for all future reconciliation: refusal to subscribe to the condemnation of John. The second emphasises the need to accept the properly elected bishop. According to Palladius, 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 408–9, when doubts were growing 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 communion with the official Church. It is striking that Palladius' John sets as a basic condition what was actually offered in the amnesty of 408/9. Palladius' moderate attitude towards reintegration is appreciated when compareed with what Ps-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' ('ἵν' ὅταν θέλωσιν ἀπελάσαι δίκαιον καὶ λυπῆσαν τὸ πρᾶγμα διασείρῃ τὰ πρόβατα, ταχέως αὐτὸν ἀνέλωσιν, ὥστε τῇ ἀναιρέσει συναχθῆναι τὰ μοίμνια': 138). Ps-Martyrius depicts all the deserters as taking part in the murder of John, whereas Palladius envisages them acting in line with John's own counsel. Palladius also explicitly rebukes those among the the Johannites who professed apocalyptic sentiments. Apocalypticism was a recurring theme in the discourse of small, persecuted minorities in the later Roman Empire, such as the Eunomians, who did not see a solution to their progressive

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0022046912000772 Published online by Cambridge University Press

marginalisation.[44] 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, it 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 stated in the first part of the dialogue,[45] 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 with statements of Roman support for John and the Johannites, Palladius may have wanted to show to his fellow Johannites that Rome was listening to them. In the context of 408–9, this may have been the more important message. Indeed, after John's death, the game could have seemed to be over for the Johannites: there was nobody to challenge Atticus anymore, and, as contemporary observers knew, an acephalous schism was bound to disintegrate.[46] All the major sees were in the hands of the anti-Johannites. The only lever left to them was the support of Rome: as long as the papacy refused to be in 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 upon others to achieve their own goals. Ps-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 on the far horizon.

This change of perspective, conditioned by a change in the situation of the Johannites, may also explain another distinctive feature of the *Dialogue*. While Ps-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 depicted as the main culprit throughout the story, whilst

[44] Ibid. xx.180–95. 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 and others (eds), *Philostorge: et l'historiographie de l'antiquite tardive*, Stuttgart 2010, 315–36.

[45] 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* lxv (2005), 155–70.

[46] Sozomen, *HE* viii.3.5.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0022046912000772 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Arsacius and Atticus, and Porphyry of Antioch, get their share of the blame.[47] The secular actors, on the contrary, are explicitly spared. Arcadius is completely absolved of responsibility for events: Palladius even resorts to invention in stating that John demanded that the emperor order him to leave the city after his second deposition, supposedly to allow the bishop to leave Constantinople without seeming to abandon his people.[48] 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 arch-enemy of John.[49] Political calculation surely is part of the explanation: Anthemius was virtually in charge of the empire until 415, and attacking the emperor would certainly not help the Johannites to have their exile lifted. But refocusing the story onto 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 the arguments that it could use against those three sees. It has been argued by D. S. Katos that Palladius wrote his *Dialogue* not as a biography[50] but with the aim of representing events as in a courtroom with argument and counterargument.[51] This, Palladius may have felt, was a suitable 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 is also permeated by a strong belief that a solution can be reached and that time is on the side of the Johannites. Simultaneously, Palladius signals that a possible reintegration without an acceptance of John's deposition is acceptable. Indeed, it should not be forgotten 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 from within it. 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

[47] For Theophilus see, for example, *Dialogus* v.65; xv.42; for Arsacius iii.66; xi.18; xi.31; for Atticus iv.41; xi.31–9; for Porphyry: iii.66; xi.39; xvi.14–31; xvi.95–124.

[48] Ibid. ix.89; ix.125–35.

[49] Ibid. ix.170–81; *Prosopography of the later Roman empire*, ed. A. H. M. Jones, J. R. Martindale and J. Morris, Cambridge 1975, ii. 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.

[50] In this sense see P. R. Coleman-Norton, 'The use of dialogue in the *Vitae Sanctorum*', *JTS* xxvii (1926), 388–95.

[51] Katos, 'Dialogue', 49.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0022046912000772 Published online by Cambridge University Press

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'.[52] The final clause ('something . . . future') could be construed as referring only to the deaths 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,[53] a complexity that is the result of the specific circumstances of the schism in the years after John's death.

Palladius and the amnesty

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.[54] Can it further be argued that the *Dialogue* is not just apologetic for John but also for Palladius himself? 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 worth at least raising the question: even a speculative argument will generate insight into 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 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 has been 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

[52] ὡς μεγάλου διωγμοῦ ἐπιγενομένου καὶ σχίσματος ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις αἴσχιστον τέλος ἐπενεγκεῖν τοὺς αἰτίους καὶ οὕτως ἑνωθῆναι τὰς ἐκκλησίας. ὅ δὴ καὶ ἐκ μέρους γεγένηται καὶ γενήσεται: Palladius, *Dialogus*. xvii.26–9 .

[53] The complexity of Palladius' message may explain an apparent contradiction. In *Dialogus* xviii.164 he states that he does not wish the enemies of God to perish by the sword, but at the end of work lists the gruesome ends of the persecutors of John.

[54] Elm, 'The dog'.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0022046912000772 Published online by Cambridge University Press

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 while he himself was still in exile.

If no certainty can be reached on the basis of the date of the *Dialogue* and the amnesty, an attempt can be made to determine the date of Palladius' return from exile. Butler's date of 412 is based on thin air. The *termini* for Palladius' return are 408/early 409 (dramatic date for the dialogue, which still assumes that Palladius is in exile) and 418 (when John was reinserted in the diptychs of Constantinople, after which it is unlikely that any partisan of John would have remained in exile). 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, a brief look at the return of Johannite bishops to the official Church is in order. A number were transferred to a different see, which most likely happened after their return from exile. The most important source is a long digression by the church historian Socrates, who justified the translation of Proclus from Cyzicus to Constantinople (434) by listing a large number of precedents.[55] 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 to 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.[56] 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, as is John of Gordum in Lydia who after his exile was transferred to Proconnesus.[57] 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 those disillusioned bishops mentioned by Palladius who had rejoined Atticus and been transferred to churches in Thrace.[58] Another Johannite is Optimus of Antioch, whose transfer happened, however, before the Johannite crisis.

[55] Socrates, *HE* vii.36–7. 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.

[56] This should be added to the discussion in Van Nuffelen, *Héritage*, 30–7. For the disputed elections in Constantinople see P. Van Nuffelen, 'Episcopal succession in Constantinople (381–450 CE.): the local dynamics of power,' *Journal of Early Christian Studies* xviii (2010), 425–51.

[57] Palladius, *Dialogus* xx.52; Socrates, *HE* vii.36.

[58] Palladius, *Dialogus* xx.64–7.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0022046912000772 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Few of these returns and translations can be precisely dated.[59] 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 simply cannot be dated, but Synesius suggests that Alexander was one of a few who had not yet returned.[60] Whilst it is thus likely that the amnesty had immediate success, it would be imprudent to presume that all exiled bishops returned immediately: the offer may well have remained valid for a considerable period after 408/9.

The conditions for return changed profoundly in 415 in Antioch, and in 418 in Constantinople. First Alexander of Antioch capitulated to the demands of Rome that John be fully reinstated. This meant that the Syrian bishops Pappus and Elpidius could return: Palladius' *Dialogue* still assumes that they are under house-arrest,[61] but their return was explicitly demanded by Innocent.[62] A few years later Alexander was followed by Atticus of Constantinople. The latter waited until Innocent of Rome was succeeded by Boniface before returning to communion with Rome and accepting the 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 face. He even tried to persuade Cyril of Alexandria to do the same, but the latter responded very harshly.[63] It is likely, however, that he followed suit at some point, but it is impossible to say when.[64] The rehabilitation of John effectively meant the annulment of all punishments for his followers, and the unconditional return of all Johannite bishops.[65]

The state of the evidence, then, indicates that the turning-points in the dealings with the exiled Johannite bishops were in 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

[59] 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*, II: *Patriarchatus Alexandrinus, Antiochenus, Hierosolymitanus*, Padua 1988, 30.

[60] ἴδιον δὲ ἢ μετ' ὀλίγων: Synesius, *ep.* lxvii.22.

[61] Palladius, *Dialogus* xx.60.

[62] Innocent, *epp.* xix, xx, xxiii, *PL* xx. 541–2, 543–4, 547. For the chronology see Pietri, *Roma Christiana*, ii. 1329–30.

[63] Atticus, in Cyril of Alexandria, *epp.* lxxv, lxvii, *PG* lxxvii, 349–52, 352–7.

[64] It happened at the very latest in 430: Baur, *Leben*, 379.

[65] Pietri, *Roma Christiana*, ii. 1327, 1332–3.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0022046912000772 Published online by Cambridge University Press

before 418,[66] 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 Palladius is viewed. Only if his return from exile is dated very late, in 418 and after the capitulation of Atticus, can he be considered 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. If the *Dialogue* is read 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 request by Lausus, the *praepositus sacri cubiculi*, that he write a work discussing Egyptian monasticism, the so-called *Lausiac history*, was an attempt by the Constantinopolitan élite to reintegrate the Johannites into the establishment.[67] This would make more sense if Palladius were seen as a compromise figure who was acceptable on 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? There can be no certainty. The 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 the place of composition.[68] Although one could construe a scenario in which Palladius would have received the letters through correspondence (possible but implausible), the coherence of his documentation is indeed striking. But Rome is not the only possible place: Johannites in Constantinople possessed an archive of documents relating to their struggle and it contained the correspondence with Rome. The church historian Sozomen could still consult it in the 440s and cite two of Innocent's letters.[69] 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.[70] It is possible that the *Dialogue* was written

[66] The see of Helenopolis fell under the jurisdiction of Constantinople.

[67] Rapp, 'Palladius'.

[68] 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.

[69] Sozomen, *HE* viii.26.

[70] A reference in the *Lausiac history* is tantalising but does not yield very much. In the section on Antinoopolis, where Palladius says he stayed for four years (Ἐν Αντινόῳ τῆς Θηβαίδος διατρίψας τέσσαρα ἔτη: Palladius, *Historia lausiaca* 58) he tells how a dying ascetic ordered that a copy of the *Stromateis* by Clement of Alexandria be given to 'the

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0022046912000772 Published online by Cambridge University Press

after Palladius' return, but there is no definite proof. Exploration of these possibilities has shown, however, that 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 marginalisation. Indeed, it was Rome, and not the progressively marginalised schismatic Johannites who succeeded in forcing the hand of Porphyry, of Atticus and of 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 the date when Palladius returned from exile and wrote his dialogue cannot be precisely determined, he belonged in all likelihood to the second camp.

An argument has been made 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. The date when he actually returned cannot be known: the most likely option remains shortly after the offer of amnesty in 408/9. Although some of the fixed dates for Palladius' career have been lost, insight into the evolution of the Johannite schism has been gained. 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. It was advantageous to both sides. For the anti-Johannites, it helped to weaken the schism by exploiting uncertainties about the future among the Johannites, and could be presented as a sign of goodwill to Rome. For the Johannites, it created the possibility of taking up their positions again, when all hope for the return of John had evaporated, but 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 (434–46). 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 communion with Constantinople, Antioch and Alexandria. Although the Nicene church historian Socrates prefers to

exiled bishop': Palladius, *Historia lausiaca* 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 early as 410.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0022046912000772 Published online by Cambridge University Press

ascribe the resolution of the schism to the magnanimity of Atticus and Proclus,[71] it would not have happened without Innocent's persistence.

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 apology 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 those who had accepted the amnesty and those who rejected it – and by refocusing on Rome as the only possible agent for the rehabilitation of John. Palladius consciously de-theologises the conflict between John and his enemies in order to depict it as a disciplinary matter[72] and thus reduces the scope of the conflict and focuses on one particular, achievable goal, namely the complete rehabilitation of John, without risking involvement in slippery theological discussions. It can be read as at once an instruction to Rome in how to act and an 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 right: Rome did force the oriental sees to relent. But when he wrote it, it was strategy and not yet fact.

[71] Van Nuffelen, *Héritage*, 30–7.
[72] Schwartz, 'Palladius', 185–6; Elm, 'The dog'.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0022046912000772 Published online by Cambridge University Press