

The condemnation and exile of John Chrysostom were controversial. His second and final deposition as bishop of Constantinople (404) was justified by the fact that he had returned from exile before his first condemnation by the so-called Synod of the Oak (403) had been annulled. Most of our sources depict the accusations brought against John at the Synod of the Oak (and implicitly confirmed in 404) as petty and false and emphasise the ultimately procedural nature of his condemnation:¹ Socrates asserts that John was ultimately deposed only for refusing to appear at the synod.² Modern scholars have understandably tended to accept these dismissive judgments of John's trial. The latest detailed biography, for example, fails to discuss them in any detail and quotes approvingly J.N.D. Kelly's judgement that the accusations were 'frivolous' and devoid of substance.³ In line with the assessment of our sources that personal animosities were crucial, scholars have paid more attention to tracing the network of enemies that John had created (and thus to the social basis of the animosity directed against him) than to the accusations themselves and their justification.⁴ In recent years, however, we have acquired a better understanding of the fact that all reports on John's deposition are fundamentally polemical: our main sources are composed by supporters of John,⁵ except for the church historian Socrates, who nevertheless has little positive to say about Theophilus of Alexandria. For Theophilus sought to condemn origenism, which Socrates defended.⁶ We cannot, therefore, accept these accounts at face value. Most importantly, alternative accounts did exist, in particular the one circulated by Theophilus himself, but they are now lost. A significant attempt to correct our one-sided information was made by Susanna Elm, who looked at events from Theophilus' perspective.⁷ This article follows Elm's lead, but does so by adding a piece of evidence: a reconstruction of the justification of John's deposition, published by Theophilus shortly after 404 and sent to Rome

¹ The main sources are PSEUDO-MARTYRIUS, *Epitaphios of John Chrysostom* 54-77; PALLADIUS, *Dialogue* 12-19; SOCRATES, *Historia ecclesiastica* 6.15; SOZOMEN, *Historia ecclesiastica* 8.17.

² SOCRATES, *Historia ecclesiastica* 6.15.17 = SOZOMEN, *Historia ecclesiastica* 8.17.10.

³ C. TIERSCH, *Johannes Chrysostomos in Konstantinopel 398-404 (Studien und Texten zu Antike und Christentum 6)*, Tübingen 2000, 349-51; cf. J.N.D. KELLY, *Golden mouth : the story of John Chrysostom : ascetic, preacher, bishop*, London 1995, 222; J.C.BAUR, *Der heilige Johannes Chrysostomus und seine Zeit*, 2 Vol., Munich 1930, II, 214.

⁴ W. LIEBESCHUETZ, *Friends and Enemies of John Chrysostom*, in A. MOFFAT (ed.), *Maistor. Classical, Byzantine and Renaissance Studies for Robert Browning* (Byzantina australiensia 5), Canberra 1984, 85-111; D. CANER, *Wandering, Begging Monks. Spiritual Authority and the Promotion of Monasticism in Late Antiquity* (The Transformation of the Classical Heritage 33), Berkeley 2002, 169-177, 190-199.

⁵ See F. VAN OMMESELAEGHE, *De lijkrede voor Johannes Chrysostomos toegeschreven aan Martyrius van Antiochië*, diss. Louvain 1974; ID., *Que vaut le témoignage de Pallade sur le procès de Saint Jean Chrysostome?*, in *AB* 95 (1977), 389-413; *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; 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. See also W. MAYER, *John Chrysostom: deconstructing the construction of an exile*, in *Theologische Zeitschrift* 62 (2006), 248-58; D.S. KATOS, *Socratic dialogue or courtroom debate?*, in *Vigiliae christianae* 61 (2007), 42-69; P. VAN NUFFELEN, *Palladius and the Johannite Schism*, forthcoming in *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 64 (2013), 1-19; M. ILLERT, *Johannes Chrysostomus und das antiochenisch-syrische Mönchtum*, Zürich and Freiburg 2000, 102-5.

⁶ VAN NUFFELEN, *op. cit.*, 27-30.

⁷ 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 (edd.), *Christian origins. Theology, rhetoric and community*, London 1998, 68-93.

to convince Innocentius I to accept the decision of the Constantinopolitan tribunal. Whilst it was already known that such a *liber* existed,⁸ its fragments have never been collected, nor have the implications of its contents for our understanding of John's deposition been assessed. The reconstruction of this *liber* will help us to re-assess three issues. First, a better insight in the accusations Theophilus' highlights will help us to understand the procedure followed at the Synod of the Oak and to determine on what grounds John is likely to have been deposed. I shall argue in particular against the tendency to see the procedure as irregular and the idea that John's accusers sought to swamp the procedure with a mass of rather irrelevant accusations.⁹ In fact, I shall defend the thesis that the Synod of the Oak only discussed five specific accusations and that John was deposed on these grounds. Second, there is the issue of doctrinal accusations brought against John. Susanna Elm has argued that Theophilus consciously avoided raising points of doctrine, in particular relating to origenism, and rather focused on disciplinary matters when accusing John.¹⁰ In his recent study of Palladius, S. Katos has, however, contended that doctrinal differences did play a role.¹¹ We shall see that Theophilus indeed raised doctrinal matters in his *liber*, thus suggesting that John was accused of holding wrong views. Thirdly, Theophilus' *liber* provides insight into the strategy that Theophilus pursued when trying to convince the wider Church, and in particular Rome, of the justice of John's deposition. This can then be usefully compared with the strategy followed by the johannites, and in particular Palladius, whose *Dialogue* was also aimed at Rome.

1. The acts of the Synod of the Oak.

Before we can turn to Theophilus, we have to understand the general accusations brought against John Chrysostom. We are fortunate to possess Photius' summary of the Acts of the synod of the Oak. Unfortunately, however, his account is not as clear as one would hope.

According to Photius, the acts were divided in thirteen *hypomnemata* or *praxeis*, twelve of which dealt with John and one with Heracleidas, bishop of Ephesus and an ally of John. Photius, however, does not summarise the thirteen *praxeis* but rather gives various lists of griefs as they were brought forward by certain individuals. He remarks that the accusations against John were successful, but that a conviction of Heracleidas was not reached. At the same time, Photius seems to follow some sort of protocol, noting, for example, that John was convoked after the first set of accusations.¹² It seems impossible to reconstruct the individual *praxeis* and I shall follow the individualised listing of accusations that Photius reports.¹³

He starts by noting that Heracleidas was accused by Macarius of Magnesia. Then he discusses the various persons who accused John himself: the deacon John,¹⁴ whose 29 accusations are listed, then the monk John, who accused both John and Heracleidas, followed by the bishop Isaac and his seventeen accusations.¹⁵ Photius' summary (and presumably the acts too) generate a sense of great disorder: first the synod discusses accusations 1 and 2 of the deacon John, then it examines the cases of the bishops Heracleidas and Palladius of Helenopolis, followed by the two accusations of the monk John, before the synod returns to accusations 9 and 27 of the deacon John. Subsequently, accusations 2 and 7 of Isaac are examined, followed

⁸ J.C. BAUR, *S. Jérôme et S. Chrysostome*, in *Rben* 23, 1906, 430-36; A. FAVALE, *Teofilo d'Alessandria; Scritti, vita e dottrina* (Biblioteca del Salesianum 41), Turin 1958, 155; D.S. KATOS, *Palladius of Helenopolis: the origenist advocate*, Oxford 2011, 57.

⁹ BAUR, *cit.*, II, 215; TIERSCH, *cit.*, 351.

¹⁰ ELM, *cit.*

¹¹ KATOS, *cit.*, 89.

¹² TIERSCH, *cit.*, 349 misrepresents the events.

¹³ Cf. KELLY, *cit.*, 211-27.

¹⁴ Probably referred to by PALLADIUS, *Dialogue* 8.63-75.

¹⁵ Usually identified with Isaac, the leader of the monks of Constantinople.

by a return to 3 and 4 of the deacon John. The sense of chaos is, possibly, deliberate:¹⁶ the acts, as read by Photius, can be understood as wishing to generate the impression that the synod of the Oak was not a serious gathering and went about its affairs without any order. Several interjections in the text, which may not derive from Photius but from the original acts,¹⁷ can be taken to confirm this impression. In that case, the acts of the Synod of the Oak as read by Photius were a pro-johannite version that aimed at demonstrating the shoddy argumentation of Theophilus and his party. It is therefore not excluded that the confusion regarding the twelve *praxeis* in the actual presentation was already present in the original. Even if one does not accept this hypothesis, it is clear that the synod did not discuss every accusation, but rather treated specific ones, probably the ones that could be best substantiated or were most harmful to John.

John was thus deposed for a set of specific reasons, which can be clearly defined. The following list is based on the assumption that all accusations that were discussed were actually withheld, which is a maximalist but not necessary interpretation. As we shall see later, however, this assumption will be confirmed by an analysis of Theophilus' *liber*.

1. Mistreatment of clergy, more particularly the unjust suspension of the deacon John (= deacon John acc. 1), hitting and incarcerating the monk John (= deacon John acc. 2 = monk John acc. 2), levelling unjust accusations against three deacons (= deacon John acc. 9), and hitting a certain Memnon in church (= deacon John acc. 27).
2. the vending of church property (= deacon John acc. 3 and 4).
3. John's sympathy for the origenists (Isaac acc. 2), that is, his reception of the Egyptian monks condemned by Theophilus. As suggested by S. Elm, the accusation implies that John is accused of violating canon 5 of Nicaea, which states that persons excommunicated in one bishopric should not be readmitted by other bishops.¹⁸
4. John's thesis that Christ's prayer was not heard by God because of a error of form (Isaac acc. 7).¹⁹
5. The recurring references to Heracleidas of Ephesus, also within the context of the accusations brought against John, render it plausible that John's handling of the events in Ephesus was discussed, even though Heracleidas himself was not deposed.²⁰

Most of the accusations are thus disciplinary (1, 2, 3, and 5), but number 4 is theological in nature. Before we discuss how Theophilus and Palladius dealt with these accusations, one important point needs to be clarified.

It is commonly stated that the only reason for the deposition of John Chrysostom was his refusal to appear before the synod of the Oak and to answer the charges, notwithstanding four summons to do so.²¹ Johannite sources as well as Socrates highlight this fact²² and scholars have underlined this 'procedural matter' as proof for the levity of the charges.²³ But doubt is permitted as to this interpretation.

First, the synod did its utmost best to generate an impression of fairness: it summoned John four times, once more than legally needed to start a trial *in absentia*²⁴ – an act that was an

¹⁶ KATOS, *cit.*, 86 argues that the acts were a faithful rendering of the version sent to the emperor.

¹⁷ See, e.g., ll. 123-4.

¹⁸ ELM, *cit.*, 81.

¹⁹ This must be added to ELM, *cit.*, 74.

²⁰ SOCRATES, *Historia ecclesiastica* 6.17.1 suggests that discussions about Heracleidas continued after the deposition of John.

²¹ BAUR, *cit.*, II, 215; TIERSCH, *cit.*, 351; KATOS, *cit.* 2011, 15, 19; P. ALLEN and W. MAYER, *John Chrysostom*, London 2000, 10.

²² PALLADIUS, *Dialogue* 8.237-41; PSEUDO-MARTYRIUS, *Epitaphios of John Chrysostom* 72.

²³ TIERSCH, *cit.*, 351; KATOS, *cit.* 2011, 90, who he admits that some accusations might be serious.

²⁴ A. STEINWERTER, *Der antike kirchliche Rechtsgang und seine Quellen*, ZSSRG 54 (1934) kan. Abt. 23, 1-116, 66.

explicit gesture of leniency.²⁵ Socrates claims that the summons were carried to John within a single day. This is an impression also generated by Palladius' report²⁶ but Van Ommeslaeghe has argued that he has compressed his account and that it would be very difficult to practically execute the going and froing between Constantinople and Chalcedon on a single day.²⁷ Second, the trial was in agreement with established procedure. John first protested that the tribunal was biased and therefore refused to appear. A defendant had this right according to Roman law, but if the tribunal refused to accept the allegation of bias, the trial should take place. Clearly the Synod of the Oak refused to accept John's protestations.²⁸ In John's absence, the court did its work, called accusers and witnesses,²⁹ and decide to depose John. Importantly, even a conviction *in absentia* had to be based on substantial evidence.³⁰ In this respect, ecclesiastical procedure followed its secular model: in Roman law, a trial *in absentia* was permitted when the defendant refused to appear in court, even after three summons.³¹ It amounted, in practice, to an admission of guilt.³² John thus cannot have been deposed for not appearing because that was not a substantial legal ground: the Synod of the Oak found him guilty on some or all of the issues it had discussed.³³ It is therefore a deliberate misrepresentation of the johannite sources to emphasise that the refusal to appear was the ground for deposition. It is easy to understand why. A trial *in absentia* always was open to the charge of injustice³⁴ and could, from the defendant's side, signal that he did not accept the court's authority. That was clearly John's tactic. Highlighting the absence of substantial grounds for deposition was another tactic to show that it was not John but his enemies who had violated the law. Moreover, the accused had the right to appeal to a bigger council, and Palladius' suggestion that the bishops assembled around John were greater in number than their counterparts at the Oak³⁵ must be understood as an indication that the opinion of the bishops assembled at the Oak was overturned, as it were, in advance by this bigger council. Scholars may think that the accusations against John were not of sufficient weight to depose a bishop of Constantinople,³⁶ but all the five points highlighted by the Synod of the Oak imply violations of canonical law and orthodoxy. It suffices for us to notice that the synod judged

²⁵ SEVERUS OF ANTIOCH, *Select Letters*, VI.1.43. Even more lenient was *Regula Ecclesiae Carthaginiensis* 100 (CCsL 149, 217), which allowed (in a specific case) the start of new proceedings after three summons. A show of leniency is also acknowledged by PSEUDO-MARTYRIUS, *Epitaphios of John Chrysostom* 55.

²⁶ PALLADIUS, *Dialogue*, 8.178.

²⁷ VAN OMMESLAEGHE, *cit.* 1977, 406.

²⁸ TIERSCH, *cit.* 348 argues the opposite case, namely that the synod illegally disregarded John's protestations, but she seems to have misinterpreted STEINWERTER, *cit.*, 65.

²⁹ For reflections on the right procedure, see SEVERUS OF ANTIOCH, *Select Letters*, VI.1.6.

³⁰ STEINWERTER, *cit.*, 69. For ecclesiastical practice, see the case of Primian, discussed in Augustine, *Contra Cresconium*, IV.7 (8). The council allows Primian to defend himself before a bigger council when he refuses to appear after three summons. This is, however, only in appearance a special favour, for appeal to a bigger council was always permitted.

³¹ See PAULUS, *Sententiae*, 5.5a.6; *Dig.* 2.5.2.1, *Dig.* 48.1.10. For Roman legal procedure, see T. MOMMSEN, *Römisches Strafrecht*, Leipzig 1899, 332-6; B. KELLY, *Petitions, litigation, and social control in Roman Egypt*, Oxford 2011, 100.

³² According to *Dig.* 48.9.5 (Ulpian) a trial *in absentia* is permitted even for a punishment as severe as exile.

³³ KATOS, *cit.* 2011, 86-91 following KELLY, *cit.*, 221-7, deducts from the Acts as preserved by Photius that none of the accusations was withheld. This cannot be concluded from the acts and is, moreover, implausible: on Katos' own admission, the acts are a faithful rendering of the proceedings as sent to the emperor (86). Is it plausible to assume that Theophilus would circulate acts that provide no support for his position? As we shall see, Theophilus includes all five main accusations in his *liber*, thus showing that he believed them to be valid and substantial.

³⁴ MOMMSEN, *cit.* 333-4 (for the Republic).

³⁵ Palladius, *Dialogue* 8.175.

³⁶ TIERSCH, *cit.*, 349.

them sufficient to depose John and did so in a legally valid way. This is unsurprising as a conclusion: such an important and high-profile case would be lost in advance if one did not respect legal formalities.

2. Theophilus of Alexandria, *liber adversus Iohannem Chrysostomum*

As the preceding discussion has already suggested, it is one thing to be condemned and another to accept that condemnation: it is not because Theophilus could refer to the decision of the Synod of the Oak that other bishops, let alone partisans of John Chrysostom, would accept that condemnation as valid (let alone just). Theophilus was clearly aware of the need to achieve a universal consensus on the deposition of John. In the East that was fairly easy: the deposition and exile of John Chrysostom in 404 was supported by the incumbents of the main sees of the East: Theophilus of Alexandria, Porphyry of Antioch, as well as John's successors Arsacius and Atticus. Theophilus immediately sought to acquire the approval of the only other bishop that mattered, Innocent I of Rome.

Palladius gives a detailed but subtly biased account of the events in Rome soon after John's deposition. A reader of the Church of Alexandria arrived soon in Rome to inform Innocent of John's deposition. Palladius states that the bland nature of the letter, without further information, and its uncanonical nature (the synod should have written, not Theophilus) irritated Innocent who postponed response.³⁷ Soon a messenger from John, a deacon from Constantinople, arrived in Rome, followed by four bishops, to disclose details of the events and to hand over letters from John and his supporters.³⁸ It seems that both sides had raced to get to Innocent first: neither Theophilus' reader nor John's deacon carried detailed correspondence and were closely followed by more elaborate embassies. Indeed, shortly after the arrival of John's party, Peter, a priest of Theophilus, and Martyrius, a deacon of Constantinople,³⁹ arrived in Rome with another letter of Theophilus and a detailed report on the Synod of the Oak.⁴⁰ By that time, however, Innocent had already been swayed by the report of John's followers and, threatening to break off communion, he urged Theophilus to present himself at a new synod.⁴¹ In the subsequent weeks and months further visits were made by partisans of both sides.⁴² Ultimately – but not for a decade or so – it would be Innocent's insistence that led to the revocation of John's deposition.

The opening of Palladius' *Dialogue*, seemingly factual, skilfully sets the scene for the rest of the work. It argues that Rome is the only possible support left for the johannite faction in the East.⁴³ Innocent is thus depicted as instinctively and immediately supportive of John. As a plea to absolve John of all blame,⁴⁴ the sequence of embassies as narrated by Palladius immediately renders the focus clear: Theophilus of Alexandria is the main culprit and he blatantly fails to justify the deposition. Palladius belittles the detailed reports sent by Theophilus as *hypomnemata*,⁴⁵ and emphasises that the levity of accusations and procedure

³⁷ PALLADIUS, *Dialogue* 1.158-165.

³⁸ PALLADIUS, *Dialogue* 1.166-178. See G.D. DUNN, *The Date of Innocent I's Epistula 12 and the Second Exile of John Chrysostom*, in *Greek, Roman, and Byzantine Studies* 45 (2005), 155-70.

³⁹ In the acts of the synod of the Oak (= PHOTIUS, *Cod.* 59), l. 53, an archdeacon Martyrius is mentioned. Palladius may have ranked him down.

⁴⁰ Derided by PALLADIUS, *Dialogue* 3.10-11 as *hypomnemata*, 'semblances of reports'. Cf. N. RUSSELL, *Theophilus of Alexandria*, London 2007, 33.

⁴¹ PALLADIUS, *Dialogue* 3.22-33. The sequence of events is slightly distorted in KATOS, *cit.* 2011, 21.

⁴² PALLADIUS, *Dialogue* 3.34-157.

⁴³ VAN NUFFELEN, *art. cit.*

⁴⁴ As emphasised by KATOS, *passim*.

⁴⁵ The report seems to have consisted of *hypomnemata*: according to Photius, the Acts of the Synod of the Oak consisted of 13 *hypomnemata*, suggesting that (a version of) the acts were sent to Innocent.

was immediately clear to Innocent.⁴⁶ From the outset, then, Theophilus stands accused of persecuting John out of sheer hatred and of being unable to produce a sustained argument for his actions. Moreover, Palladius has Innocent agree in advance with the interpretation of events that he sets out in his *Dialogue* (see section 3 below).

This section argues that Theophilus, in fact, did write a further justification of his actions after the initial correspondence with Innocent. It is alluded to in Palladius' *Dialogue* itself, which can be understood as replying specifically to the charges uttered by Theophilus in that writing. I first gather testimonies and fragments of this work, before assessing the information we can derive from it.⁴⁷ As we shall see, a Latin translation of the work was ready by the autumn of 404 (T2) and probably was soon thereafter sent to Rome. It must therefore have been written soon after the deposition of John. It is impossible to connect the sending of the *liber* with any of the embassies reported by Palladius, who is, as we have seen, not a reliable witness in this respect. If his testimony is anything to go by, the *liber* must have been sent after the initial envoy of the report on the Synod of the Oak: Palladius reports that a letter of Theophilus accompanied these acts, but the *liber* was clearly more than a mere letter (Palladius calls the *liber* a *syggramma*). The *liber* may therefore have been a response to the pro-johannite attitude of Innocent.

F1 Palladius, *Dialogue on the life of John Chrysostom*

Ed.: A.-M. MALINGREY and P. LECLERCQ, *Palladios. Dialogue sur la vie de Jean Chrysostome* (Sources chrétiennes 341-342), 2 Vols., Paris 1988.

Palladius was a partisan of John Chrysostom and published an apologetic *Dialogue* on the life of John Chrysostom. The dramatic date of the work is 408/9, but the work can have been written several years after that.⁴⁸ Palladius clearly knew Theophilus' booklet and a first reference occurs at the beginning of the second major part of the *Dialogue*, dedicated to a refutation of the accusations brought against him (XII-XIX).⁴⁹ The first section (XII) deals with accusations of eating too much, followed by three sections (XIII-XV) discussing the Ephesus affair (400-402)⁵⁰ and refuting the accusation of Theophilus that John deposed sixteen bishops in a single day. The first three fragments (F1a-c) relate to the Ephesus affair; two further fragments refer to accusations of *philarchia* (authoritarianism) and *hyperephanie* (pride). As we shall see below, such accusations can be paralleled in other witnesses to Theophilus' book.

F1a = Palladius, *Dialogue* 13.127-145

Ο ΔΙΑΚ. Τίνα οὖν ἐστὶ τὰ παρακολουθήσαντα, καὶ ποῖον εἴληφε τέλος, καὶ πόθεν τὴν ἀρχὴν ἐσχηκότα, λεπτομερῶς μοι παράστησον· ἐπειδὴ μάλιστα ὁ Θεόφιλος ἐν οἰκείῳ συγγράμματι τὴν ἰδίαν προπέτειαν σεμνῶναι ἢ περιστεῖλαι σπουδάσας ἔφησεν τὸν μακάριον Ἰωάννην φιλαρχίας πάθει κινούμενον δέκα ἐξ ἐπισκόπους καθηρηκέναι ἐν ἡμέρᾳ μιᾷ καὶ ἰδίους ἀντ' αὐτῶν κεχειροτονηκέναι.

⁴⁶ PALLADIUS, *Dialogue* 3.8-17.

⁴⁷ CPG, 2677 calls it *liber enormis*, taking a later judgment as the title. *Liber adversus Iohannem Chrysostomum* seems more appropriate.

⁴⁸ VAN NUFFELEN, *art. cit.*

⁴⁹ MALINGREY, *cit.*, 22.

⁵⁰ On the affair, see SOCRATES, *Historia ecclesiastica* 6.11.8-11; SOZOMEN, *Historia ecclesiastica* 8.6.1-9; THEODORETUS, *Historia ecclesiastica* 5.28.2; and BAUR, *cit.*, II, 119-134; TIERSCH, *cit.*, 309-28.

Ο ΕΠΙΣΚ. Οὐδὲν ἀπεικὸς τῶν ἰδίων τρόπων πεποίηκεν ὁ θαυμάσιος, καὶ γράψας κατὰ Ἰωάννου καὶ ψευδῆ γράψας, ἐξ ὧν γὰρ νομίζει καλύπτειν τὴν ἰδίαν ἀσχημοσύνην, ἐκ τούτων αὐτὴν μᾶλλον παραδειγματίζει, καὶ ἄκων σεμνύνων τὸ ἀθῶον Ἰωάννου κατὰ τὸ Βαλαὰμ ἐκείνον (Num. 22.5-35). εἰ γὰρ ἦν αὐτὸν καθελὼν, οὐ χρεῖα συγγράμματος ἢ ἐξορίας, ἰκανῆς οὐσίας τῆς καθαιρέσεως αἰσχῦναι τοὺς καθαιρουμένους· ἐπειδὴ δὲ ἀκαθαίρετος ἔστηκεν ὁ ἐνάρετος, τῇ ἡττῇ τὴν νίκην κατέχων, μένει ὁ φθόνος τὴν ἡτταν τῆς ἀλόγου νίκης ἀποφερόμενος, πομφόλυγος δίκην ἀναφυσώμενος, καὶ εἰς ἑαυτὸν συντριβόμενος, γράφων καὶ καταγράφων, τὸ τοῦ προφήτου Ἡσαίου· “οὐαὶ” ὁ ἐπισπώμενος τὸ πάντα ψευδῆ καὶ ποιεῖν καὶ λέγειν καὶ γράφειν· “Οὐαὶ,” γὰρ φησιν, “οἱ γράφοντες· πονηρίαν γὰρ γράφουσιν.” (Is. 10.1).

Palladius pursues the same rhetorical strategy as Theophilus (see F2), using biblical exempla and quotations to demonstrate the iniquity of the Alexandrian bishop. The text continues with a long discussion of the Ephesus affair.

F1b = Palladius, *Dialogue* 15.43-44

καὶ οὐκ εἰς μίαν ἡμέραν γεγένηται, ὡς ἐνεύσατο ὁ Θεόφιλος, ἢ ἐξέτασις, ἀλλ’ ἐπὶ δύο ἔτη. καὶ ἔστερξαν οἱ καθαιρεθέντες, τῆς μελλούσης κρίσεως ἐλευθερωθέντες, ὡς τὸν ἕνα ἐξ αὐτῶν ἔκδικον δημοσίων γενέσθαι πραγμάτων.

Theophilus alleged that the inquiry concerning possible simony by Antoninus of Ephesus only lasted one day; Palladius, who highlights his presence and refers to documents, argues that it lasted two years. It is hard to tell on whose side the polemic is to be situated: maybe Theophilus alleged that the trial only lasted briefly and Palladius counters by insinuating that Theophilus talked about the inquiry and not the trial; or Theophilus did indeed reduce the inquiry to the trial and Palladius unmasks this polemic.

F1c = Palladius, *Dialogue* 15.101-103

ταῦτα δέ ἐστι τὰ κατὰ τὴν Ἀσίαν γεγενημένα, περὶ ὧν ἐπηρώτησας, διὰ τὸν γράψαντα Θεόφιλον δέκα ἐξ ἐπισκόπους καθηρηκέναι τὸν Ἰωάννην.

Theophilus accused John of deposing sixteen bishops in a single day, without due inquiry. Palladius counters that only six were deposed and after a long inquiry. Sozomen (8.6.1) knows of thirteen bishops, the Synod of the Oak (Il. 35-6, ed. Malingrey) mentions four.

F1d = Palladius, *Dialogue* 16.302-25

Ο ΔΙΑΚ. Ὅτι εἰ μὴ σὺ ἐγύμνωσάς μοι τὸν λόγον, συλλογιστικῶς σαφηνίσας, <εἰς> τὴν ἀναίσθητον συναπηγόμην δόξαν, οὐ τῷ σκοπῷ τῆς ἀληθείας προσέχων, ἀλλὰ τοῖς Θεοφίλου θρύλοις.

Ο ΕΠΙΣΚ. Οὐκοῦν τὸ ἐναντίον, ἐὰν ἀποδειχθῶσιν οἱ ἅγιοι ἐκεῖνοι ἄνδρες οὐ μόνον οὐ κακοί, ἀλλὰ καὶ πολλοὺς ἀπὸ κακίας πρὸς ἀρετὴν ἐπαναγαγόντες, δῆλος ἔσται ὁ τούτων διώκτης ἄξιος οὐ διωχθῆναι, ἀλλὰ ἐλεηθῆναι, ὡς τοὺς μὲν καλοὺς ἀεὶ λυμαινόμενος, τοὺς δὲ κακοὺς ἀποδεχόμενος.

Ο ΔΙΑΚ. Οὕτως ἔχει, ὡς εἴρηκας. κἂν γὰρ μὴ ἀποδειχθῶσιν ἐκεῖνοι σοφοί τε καὶ ἅγιοι (ὥς φασιν οἱ πολλοί), ἐκτὸς μέμψεως ἔσται ἢ Ὀλυμπίας ἐκ τῶν προλαβόντων συλλογισμῶν, τὸ τοῦ Σωτῆρος μίμημα ἐπιδειξαμένη.

Ο ΕΠΙΣΚ. Καὶ ποῖαν μείζω ὁρᾷς μαρτυρίαν τῶν πράξεων, <τὴν> τοῦ Εὐαγγελίου ἢ τὴν Θεοφίλου;

Ο ΔΙΑΚ. Ἀπαγε, παρακαλῶ· ὠμολόγηται γὰρ παρὰ πᾶσι κάκείνους αὐτὸν ἀπὸ τινος ὀργῆς καὶ φιλαρχίας ἐρρῖφθαι, καὶ ταύτην ἀπὸ δεισδαιμονίας καὶ ἐχθρας λελοιδωρηκέναι, προφασισσαμένου ἐκείνου τοὺς μονάζοντας. ἀστοχήσας γὰρ ἐπὶ ταῖς δουλοπρεπέσι κολακείαις

τοῦ μηδὲν παρ' αὐτῆς εἰληφέναι πλὴν βρωμάτων ἢ ξενίων, εἰς λοιδορίαν ἐτρέπη· τοῦτο γὰρ αὐτοῦ τὸ ἔθος ἐπὶ πάντων.

As shown by S. Elm (*cit.*), Palladius reverses Theophilus' accusation that John was authoritarian against the bishop of Alexandria. For the accusation of eating alone, see Synod of the Oak (l. 91).

F1e = Palladius, *Dialogue* 20.586-592

εἰ γὰρ ἦν Πνεύματος Θεοῦ συμφωνία ἐν τοῖς ἐπισκόποις καὶ ὡς αἴτιος πλημμελείας, ἢ ἀνάξιος ἱερωσύνης ἢ (ὡς ὁ Θεόφιλος λέγει) ὑπερηφανίας, ὥφειλεν εἰρχθῆναι ὁ Ἰωάννης, ἐδύνατο ἢ παντοδύναμος Θεοῦ σοφία ἐνθέσμως αὐτὸν κωλῦσαι τῆς ἱερατείας ἢ ἐφευρεῖν τρόπον, δι' οὗ ἀταράχως καὶ ἀκλαυστί ἐξεβάλλετο οὗτος ἢ θανάτῳ ἢ παραλύσει ἢ ἀφωνία, ὡς οἶδαμέν τινας τῶν ἀντιπесόντων αὐτῷ πεπονθότας καὶ τινας μέλλοντας πάσχειν.

John's pride was clearly a major theme in Theophilus' *liber*, as it also occurs in F2. The issue is addressed by Palladius in *Dialogue* 19.6, 38, 158 and 20.613.

F2 Facundus of Hermiane and Pelagius the deacon

Ed.: *Facundus d'Hermiane. Défense des trois chapitres (à Justinien)*. Texte critique par J.-M. Clément et R. Vander Plaetse; introduction, traduction et notes par Anne Fraïsse-Bétoulières (Sources chrétiennes (471, 478-479, 499), Paris 2002-2006; *Pelagii diaconi ecclesiae romanae in defensione trium capitulorum*. Texte latin du manuscrit aurelianensis 73 (70) par R. Devreesse (Studi e testi 57), Vatican 1932.

Shortly after the condemnation of the so-called Three Chapters by Justinian in 544,⁵¹ the African bishop Facundus of Hermiane published his *Twelve books in defense of the Three Chapters*. It was the main source for a similar treatise by Pelagius, then deacon and later bishop of Rome,⁵² which was written in 554. L. Abramowski has argued that Pelagius drew on the same version of the letter as did Facundus and excludes that he could have used Facundus as a source. Neither of her two arguments in favour of this view holds.⁵³ First, Pelagius does not cut the fragments differently from Facundus, as the juxtaposition below shows; he follows exactly the order in which Facundus reports them, deviating only in minor words. Second, it is not because Pelagius cites the letter in *oratio recta* that he did not draw on Facundus' version in indirect speech. In fact, whereas Facundus' report on the content of the letter is understandable as a collation of insults from Theophilus' letter and allows us to catch glimpses of their wider context, Pelagius' rendering of Facundus' collation as actual citations makes it hard to detect anything but a blurting out of unconnected and virtually meaningless insults. Pelagius has also rendered the quotations by Facundus more uniform: the apostrophe quoted by Facundus (6.5.21) has partially disappeared in his version. Pelagius therefore must have copied Facundus.

Facundus 6.5.16-24	Pelagius p. 70.16-71.16
--------------------	-------------------------

⁵¹ LIBERATUS, *Breviarium*, 24; EVAGRIUS, *Historia ecclesiastica*, 4.28. See P. BRUNS, *Zwischen Rom und Byzanz: die Haltung des Facundus von Hermiane und der nordafrikanischen Kirche während des Drei-Kapitel-Streits* (553), ZKG 106 (1995), 151-178.

⁵² PELAGIUS, *In defensione trium capitulorum*, p. 29, 10-12.

⁵³ L. ABRAMOWSKI, *Die Zitate in der Schrift "In Defensione Trium Capitulorum" des römischen Diakons Pelagius*, in *Vigiliae Christianae* 10 (1956), 160-93, 187. Followed by Clément, Vander Plaetse, Fraïsse-Bétoulières, *cit.*, Vol. 2, 378.

<p>(16) fratres, inquit, Iohannes persequitur immundo spiritu quo suffocabatur Saul; et iterum: sanctorum ministros necavit. Dicit illum contaminatum et in ecclesia primitiuorum impium, pestilentem, uesanum et tyrannicae mentis insania furibundum, atque in sua uesania gloriantem, animam suam adulterandam tradidisse diabolo. Haec autem omnia, sicut habentur in ipsius beati Theophili libro, ita posuimus.</p> <p>(17) Vocat illum etiam humanitatis hostem, et qui scelere suo latronum uicisset audaciam, sacrilegorum principem et sacerdotium agentem impium, atque oblationes sacrilegas offerentem, procacem et frontis durissimae. Hoc quoque adiciens, quod non his Iohannes laqueis irretitus tenetur qui possint aliquando dissolui, sed qui audiret pro merito flagitii sui comminantem Deum atque dicentem:</p> <p>(18) iudicate inter me et Iohannem; exspectavi ut faceret iudicium, fecit autem iniquitatem et non iustitiam, sed clamorem (Is 5, 37). Dicit etiam, quia sicut Satanas transfiguravit se in angelum lucis (2 Co 11,14), ita etiam Iohannes non esset quod uidebatur; nec tantum similem Satanae, sed et immundum daemonem eum appellat, more torrentis trahentem uerborum spurcitiam, quem et in Christum perhibet impium exstitisse et Iudae traditoris esse consortem.</p> <p>(19) Addit etiam quod arguatur in deum manus impias extendisse et quod Iacobus apostolus de quibusdam rerum mundanarum cupidis dixit: petitis et non accipietis eo quod male petatis (Jac 4,3); hoc beatus Theophilus beatum Iohannem asserit dixisse de christo. Ausus est, inquit, in ecclesia, dicere quod Christus orauerit et non fuerit exauditus, quia non bene orauerit.</p> <p>(20) Quis haereticorum deterius blasphemavit quam beatum Iohannem refert beatus Theophilus blasphemasse, quem affirmat etiam consortio Iudaicae impietatis semetipsum tradidisse, et offerre temeritate solita quod obtulerunt Iudaei, seipsum ac populos decipientem et Dathan atque Abiron aemulatorem (Nu 16, 24)? audiat, inquit, cum Iudaeis: iniquitas tua (Lam 4, 22) magnificata est nimis.</p> <p>(21) Adicit etiam hoc: Ariani et Eunomiani contra Christum Iohannis blasphemiis delectantur; Iudaei et idololatrae iustificati sunt comparatione tua gentiles. Et iterum dicit: non solum non est Christianus Iohannes, sed peior est rege Babylonio, multo sceleratior quam Balthasar, idololatratrix et ethnicis sceleratior est Iohannes.</p>	<p>Ac postea contra ipsum scribens sic dixit: fratres persequatur Iohannes immundi spiritu quo suffocabatur Saul, et sacrorum ministros necavit contaminatus, et in Ecclesiam primitivorum impius, pestilens, vesanus et tyrannice mentis insania furibundus, atque in sua vesania⁵⁴ animam suam adulteranti diabolo tradidit,</p> <p>Humanitatis hostis, qui scelere suo latronum vicit audaciam, sacrilegorum princeps et sacerdotium agens impium atque oblationes sacrilegas offerens, procax et frontis durissimi. Et post paululum dicit: non his Iohannes laqueis inretitus tenetur qui possint aliquando dissolui, sed qui audiat pro merito flagitii sui comminantem Deum atque dicentem:</p> <p>Iudicate inter me et Iohannem; exspectavi enim ut faceret iudicium, fecit autem iniquitatem et non iustitiam sed clamorem. Et rursus post pauca dicit: sic<ut> Satanas transfigurat se in angelum lucis, ita et Iohannes non erat quod videbatur; nec tantum similis Satane sed immundus daemon existens et more torrentis trahit verborum spurcitiam, qui in Christum extitit et Iudae traditoris consors effectus est.</p> <p>Et post pusillum adiunxit dicens: convincitur, quia in Deum manus impias extendit, et, quod Iacobus apostolus quibusdam rerum mundanarum cupidis dixit: petitis et non accipistis eo quod male petatis, hoc Iohannes de Christo ausus est dicere in ecclesia, quod Christus oraverit et non fuerit exauditus quia non bene oraverit.</p> <p>Et addidit: etiam consortio Iudaicae impietatis semet ipsum tradidit et obtulit temeritate solita quod obtulerunt Iudaei, decipiens semet ipsum et populos, Dathan et Abiron aemulatus est. Audiat cum Iudaeis: iniquitas tua magnificata est nimis.</p> <p>Et post aliqua dicit: Ariani et Eunomiani contra Christum Iohannis blasphemiis delectantur; Iudaei et idololatrae iustificati sunt comparatione eius. Et post pauca ait : non solum non est Christianus Iohannes, sed peior est rege Babylonio, multo sceleratior quam Balthasar.</p>
---	--

⁵⁴ DEVREESE, *cit.*, 70 : adds <glorians> *ex Facundo*. Pelagius' text makes sense as it stands.

<p>Tibi, ait, praesens ignominia, aeterna in futuris saeculis poena reddetur.</p> <p>(22) Hoc quoque uisum est et idem beato Theophilo dicere: Saluator clamauit et dicit: tollite Iohannem et mittite in tenebras exteriores (Mt 25, 30). Et iterum: largissimos fomites ante tribunal Dei suo ministravit incendio. Et haec omnia non suffecerunt irae atque furori Theophili nisi etiam hoc de memorato sanctissimo uiro Iohanne diceret quod alia ei poena quaerenda sit, eo quod uinceret sceleris magnitudo multitudinem tormentorum.</p> <p>(23) Si quis autem experiri uoluerit quod non sententias tantum, uerum etiam ipsa uerba posuimus et nosse quotiens haec ab illo replicata sunt, legat innormem librum, non solis contumeliis, sed ipsa quoque saepe repetita maledictorum recapitulatione, nimis horribilem, ab Hieronymo presbytero translatus. De quo idem beatus Theophilus exspectauit ut per eius eloquium, qualis Iohannes fuerit Latini cognoscerent.</p> <p>(24) Nos autem in illo libro, non qualis Iohannes, qui nihil horum merebatur, nec qualis Theophilus, cuius uirtus in multis probata, non ex isto accedenti morbo iudicanda est, sed potius qualis sit miserabilis humana uita cognoscimus, de qua scriptum est: quia tentatio est super terram (Job 7, 1).</p>	<p>Et iterum : Iohannes, inquit, tibi et praesens ignominia et eterna in futuris saeculis poena reddetur.</p> <p>Saluator clamat et dicit : tollite Iohannem et mittite in tenebras exteriores. Et iterum addidit : largissimos fomites a tribunali Dei suo ministravit incendio</p>
---	--

As the reference to Jerome's translation in 6.5.23 indicates, Facundus had direct access to a full Latin version of Theophilus' book.⁵⁵ Yet the tone of the treatise seems, at first sight, very different from what we noticed in Palladius, where the strong polemic as reported by Facundus is absent. This can, however, be explained by looking at the use Theophilus' accusations have in Facundus. One argument against Ibas, one of the three authors concerned in the condemnation of the Three Chapters, was that he had condemned Cyril of Alexandria, the bedrock of orthodoxy at Chalcedon. Facundus argues that accusations and partial or temporary errors do not invalidate the general correctness of one's theology. As an example to illustrate this point, Facundus chose the conflict between John and Theophilus: both counted as venerable Fathers of the Church in his time. Was Theophilus to be accused of heresy because he had attacked John? The case of John is used elsewhere in Facundus too⁵⁶ and its choice in this particular context may have been motivated by the fact that Cyril himself has also vituperated against John, using Theophilus' book.⁵⁷ Is Cyril then to be condemned too? In this argumentative context we can understand that Facundus consciously collated the most scurrilous insults against John that he could find in Theophilus: his aim is to show how vulgar Theophilus (and indirectly Cyril) could be whilst still being seen as a Father of the Church (and thus that Ibas' condemnation of Cyril is no proof of his heresy). Whilst there is no reason to doubt that Theophilus used strong language, we must be cautious not to see vulgar polemic as the only or main content of the work: it would not be very difficult to collate a similar set

⁵⁵ Pace ABRAMOWSKI, *cit.*, 187 who assumes that he used a florilegium.

⁵⁶ FACUNDUS 4.1.3-8.

⁵⁷ FACUNDUS 6.5.30.

of insults against Theophilus from Palladius' *Dialogue*, which usually is read as a rather factual account.⁵⁸ The fact that Palladius is concerned with rebutting the accusations brought by Theophilus against John demonstrate that there was substance in the work.

As reported by Facundus, the *liber adversus Iohannem Chrysostomum* developed several of the accusations withheld against John at the synod of the Oak:

1. The injustice of John as a judge, and the concomitant manhandling of his clergy, was one of the main accusations at the Synod of the Oak and is also first reported by Facundus (16). Theophilus seems, however, to have gone beyond the accusations actually withheld, for he accuses John of killing ministers – an accusation that was indeed brought at the synod but not further discussed.⁵⁹
2. Next in Theophilus comes the accusation of being a thief (*latro*), and associated with that, a sacrilegious person. This is probably to be related to the accusation of the selling of church property, in particular *keimelia*,⁶⁰ that is, sacred objects.
3. The next specific accusation raised in Facundus' report is that John taught that Christ had prayed to God but was not heard (19). This obviously is the fourth accusation that was withheld at the Synod of the Oak. Katos rightly interprets this as an allusion to subordinationism⁶¹ – an accusation also brought against Origen. Origen's ideas about prayer were indeed contentious: in a fragment of a letter sent to Atticus, then presbyter of Constantinople but to become the next bishop (405), Theophilus accuses Origen of stating in his work *On Prayer* that one should not pray to Christ, nor to the Father with Christ, again implying that the Son is subordinate to the Father.⁶² If, then, John's alleged thoughts about prayer point into the direction of origenism, another accusation does so too. That the Arians and Eunomians enjoy John's christology (21) may seem at first gratuitous polemic, but this changes when we notice that Theophilus depicts Origen as providing the bedrock for Arian and Eunomian thought.⁶³

In Facundus' report, the *liber* may at first sight seem a torrent of verbal abuse. Closer inspection shows that Theophilus clearly focused on the main heads of accusation withheld against John. Not all accusations are reported in Facundus: there is no reference to the welcoming of Origenists and the Heracleidas affair is not mentioned. The latter probably was not included as no conviction was reached there, whereas the former surely was mentioned in the *liber*, as Jerome, *ep.* 113 (=T1 below) shows. But Theophilus did not stick to the accusations that were withheld: he also included many of the allegations simply brought against John: in addition to the ones already signalled, there may be an allusion to the association with pagans (cf. Synod of the Oak l. 102-104) in par. 21.

Theophilus develops a multi-pronged polemical strategy, besides adding allegations to the main accusations. He associates John with Old Testament figures, such as Saul and Dathan and Abiron, who progressively lapsed in error and opposed God and rightful authority.⁶⁴ He also casts John as an unchristian ruler like Balthasar, king of Babylon, and as a deceptive demon. As usual in polemic, these strategies overlap and are up to a certain point

⁵⁸ John Chrysostom was also accused of using strong language: he supposedly called Epiphanius 'little devil' (*daimonion*): *Synod of the Oak* l 25.

⁵⁹ *Synod of the Oak*, l. 41-44, 109-113. See also l. 52-55, where John is accused of being an unjust judge.

⁶⁰ *Synod of the Oak*, l. 19.

⁶¹ KATOS, *cit.*, 89. The accusation is omitted in TIERSCH, *cit.*, 350.

⁶² M. RICHARD, *Nouveaux fragments de Théophile d'Alexandrie*, Göttingen 1975, 11 (NAWG ; 1975, 2, fr. 12 p. 65, see also fr. 13 from a letter to Serapion. Cf. E. Clarke, *The Origenist controversy: the cultural construction of an early christian debate*, Princeton 1992, 118-9.

⁶³ The formulation in Facundus is similar to that in a fragmentary letter of Theophilus: RICHARD, *cit.*, fr. 3 p. 61: Ὁριγένης Ἀρειανοῖς καὶ Εὐνομianoῖς τὰς ἀνοσίους εἰς τε τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ εἰς τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα παρέδωκε βλασφημίας.

⁶⁴ Used later by Cyril in defending his case: FACUNDUS 4.1.3-8, 6.5.30.

contradictory. Crucially, the point is repeatedly made that John has brought it all on himself: he himself is responsible for his unglorious end. Theophilus carries no responsibility for John's downfall.

T1&2 Jerome, *epistulae* 113-114

Ed. I. HILBERG, *S. Eusebii Hieronymi Epistulae* (CSEL 55), Vienna 1912, 393-5.

Facundus used Jerome's Latin translation of Theophilus' *liber* (6.5.23-24). Among Jerome's letters, there still exists a fragment of the covering letter that Theophilus attached to his Greek text (*ep.* 113) when sending it to Jerome. The manuscript tradition associates the fragment of Theophilus with *ep.* 114,⁶⁵ which is Jerome's covering letter when he sent the translation. Presumably, Jerome had both letters precede the translation as a sort of preface: the conclusion of his letter has all the hallmarks of a dedicatory preface.⁶⁶ Jerome's letter is dated to autumn 404:⁶⁷ Theophilus presumably asked for a translation soon after composing his *liber*.

T1 = Fragmentum epistolae Theophili ad Hieronymum (*ep.* 113)

(1) Paucis in exordio placet iudicium veritatis; dicente autem domino per prophetam: et iudicium meum quasi lux egredietur (Is 51,5), qui tenebrarum horrore circumdati sunt nec naturam rerum clara mente perspiciunt, pudore operiuntur aeterno et cassos se habuisse conatus ipso fine cognoscunt. unde et nos Iohannem, qui dudum Constantinopolitanam rexit ecclesiam, deo placere semper optavimus et causas perditionis eius, in quas ferebatur inprovidus, nequaquam credere volumus. sed ille, ut cetera flagitia eius taceam, Origenistas in suam recipiens familiaritatem et ex his plurimos in sacerdotium provehens atque ob hoc scelus beatae memoriae hominem Dei Epiphanium, qui inter episcopos clarum in orbe sidus effulsit, non paruo maerore contristans meruit audire: cecidit, cecidit Babylon (Is 21, 9). (2) scientes ergo dictum a Salvatore: nolite iudicare secundum faciem, sed iustum iudicium iudicate (Jo 7, 24), ne quoquam...

T2 = Hieronymus, Ad Theophilum episcopum (*ep.* 114).

Dilectissimo atque amantissimo papae Theophilo episcopo Hieronymus. (1) <quod> tardius beatitudini tuae Latino sermone translatum librum tuum remitterem, multa in medio impedimenta fecerunt: Isaurorum repentina eruptio, Phoenicis Galilaeae que uastitas, terror Palaestinae, praecipue urbis Hierosolymae, et nequaquam librorum, sed murorum extructio, ad hoc asperitas hiemis, fames intolerabilis nobis praesertim, quibus multorum fratrum cura inposita est. inter quas difficultates lucratiuis et, ut dicam, furtiuis per noctem operis crescebat interpretatio et iam in scidulis tenebatur, cum diebus sanctae quadragesimae scripta ad purum – conlatione tantum indigerem – grauissimo languore correptus et mortis limen ingrediens domini misericordia et tuis orationibus reseruatus sum ad hoc forsitan, ut inplerem praeceptum tuum et uolumen disertissimum, quod scripturarum floribus texuisti, eadem, qua a te scriptum est, gratia uerterem, licet inbecillitas corporis et animi maeror ingenii quoque acumen obtuderit et uerba prono cursu labentia uelut quibusdam obicibus retardarit. (2) mirati sumus in opere tuo utilitatem omnium ecclesiarum, ut discant, qui ignorant, eruditi testimoniis scripturarum, qua debeant ueneratione sancta suscipere et altaris christi ministerio deseruire sacrosque calices et sancta uelamina et cetera, quae ad cultum dominicae pertinent passionis,

⁶⁵ BAUR, *art. cit.*, 434 rejects the association but attributes it incorrectly to a modern editor.

⁶⁶ See T.JANSON, *Latin Prose Prefaces. Studies in Literary Conventions*. Stockholm 1964.

⁶⁷ SCHWARTZ, *Palladiana*, ZNTW 36 (1937), 161-204, 184 (404); FAVALE, *cit.*, 155 (Autumn 404); MALINGREY, *cit.* (405); RUSSELL, *cit.*, 34 (autumn 404).

non quasi inania et sensu carentia sanctimoniam non habere, sed ex consortio corporis et sanguinis domini eadem, qua corpus eius et sanguis, maiestate ueneranda. (3) suscipe igitur librum tuum, immo meum et, ut uerius dicam, nostrum; cum que mihi faueris, tuus fautor eris. tibi enim meum sudauit ingenium et facundiam Graecam Latinae linguae uolui paupertate pensare. neque uero, ut disertis interpretes faciunt, uerbum uerbo reddidi nec adnumeraui pecuniam, quam mihi per partes dederas, sed pariter appendi, ut nihil desit ex sensibus, cum aliquid desit ex uerbis. epistulam autem tuam idcirco in Latinum uerti et huic uolumini praeposui, ut omnes, qui legerint, sciant me non temeritate et iactantia, sed praeceptis beatitudinis tuae suscepisse onus ultra uires meas. quod an consecutus sim, tuo iudicio derelinquo. certe, si inbecillitatem reprehenderis, uoluntati ueniam commodabis.

In his letter, Theophilus picks up several arguments that we have already noticed in Facundus: he opens with an appeal to divine justice and emphasises at the end that the trial was just.⁶⁸ Interestingly, the letter highlights John's connections with the Origenists, even accusing him of having ordained some of them as presbyter. The reference to Epiphanius is also connected to the origenist controversy and John's attitude towards the bishop of Salamis was mentioned at the Synod of the Oak.⁶⁹ Theophilus' tone is clearly different from the one suggested by Facundus. This need not cause surprise: Facundus had an interest in selecting and condensing the polemic; Theophilus wished to depict his argument as setting out facts.

Jerome's letter strikingly avoids any of the themes broached by Theophilus in *ep.* 113 or in the *liber*: in fact, when reading *ep.* 114.2, one would presume the *liber* was a treatise about the Eucharist. One can use this discrepancy to argue that the association of *ep.* 113 and 114 is mistaken,⁷⁰ but one can also consider it an attempt by Jerome to decrease his association with Theophilus' polemic, or even to enhance the status of the *liber* by showing that it is about more than a particular case.⁷¹ The latter option presumes that somehow the eucharistic argument be associated with the critique on John. A possibility is that it highlights that John, as a flawed character, was unable to celebrate the Eucharist properly, for Facundus reports that John offered *oblaciones sacrilegas* (17).

The fragments of Theophilus' *liber* yield a fairly consistent picture: the work focused primarily on the five accusations that formed the legal basis for John's deposition at the Synod of the Oak. Obviously, Theophilus embedded them in a wider polemical strategy by throwing in accusations that had been brought but never investigated or withheld and by providing a negative assessment of John's character. Such polemical strategies, familiar to any reader of Cicero and Demosthenes, should not detract from the important conclusion: Theophilus' *liber* aimed at gaining support for the court decision. That Theophilus highlighted the legality of John's deposition is hardly surprising, as he had legality on his side. Importantly, theological issues played a role in John's deposition and in Theophilus' defense of it. It has been correctly observed that John could not be deposed for Origenism, as it was not an official heresy, and that the welcoming of the origenist monks was a disciplinary matter (harbouring of clergy from a different Church who were condemned by their own Church).⁷² Yet the accusation relating to John's views about Christ's prayer shows that he was

⁶⁸ BAUR, *cit.* 1906, 436.

⁶⁹ *Synod of the Oak*, 125.

⁷⁰ BAUR, *cit.* 1906, 434.

⁷¹ Jerome may have had his reasons for supporting Theophilus against John: John belonged to the Melitian faction in Antioch, whereas Jerome had supported Paulinus, Melitius' opponent: S. JÉRÔME, *Lettres*, édité par J. Labourt (CUF), Vol. 6, 1958, 166.

⁷² ELM, *cit.*, 74.

firmly associated with origenist thought⁷³ and that Theophilus was willing to make the argument that John was also theologically flawed – even to Rome.⁷⁴ Thus, as Theophilus battled to have origenism condemned in the years of the Chrysostomian crisis and as John was accused of supporting origenism and (at least perceived to be) sharing views with it, the conclusion must be that for Theophilus the condemnation of John was part of the combat against origenism.⁷⁵ This may contradict the tendency of scholars to downplay the role of origenism in the conflict, but, as we shall see in the next section, this is the result of their adoption of a johannite perspective.

3. Palladius, *Dialogue on the life of John Chrysostom*.

The johannites pursued a double polemical strategy against the decision of the Synod of the Oak. On the one hand, they attacked its formal credentials, by emphasising John's adherence to, and Theophilus' flaunting of, correct procedure.⁷⁶ On the other, they highlight the frivolous nature of the accusations and contrast them with the good works and character of John.⁷⁷ I shall illustrate this briefly by focusing in greater detail on Palladius, whose account has fundamentally influenced modern narratives of John's deposition.

Palladius' dialogue is an attempt to demonstrate the injustice of John's deposition.⁷⁸ It has recently been interpreted as a 'court room' response to the accusations brought against John.⁷⁹ Yet, when compared with Theophilus' *liber*, his defense shows up some striking features: Palladius fails to address most of the accusations withheld at the Synod of the Oak and highlighted by Theophilus. In sections XII-XIX, which form the systematic core of the defense, Palladius addresses a number of issues, many of which did not matter for John's condemnation during the Synod of the Oak. First, Palladius dedicates an entire section (XII) to the accusations about gluttony and bad hospitality, which were levelled but not withheld against John. Then he discusses at length the Ephesus affair, which explicitly tackles the accusations brought in Theophilus' *liber* (XIII-XV). XVI returns the argument against John's enemies and focuses on the improper ordination of Porphyry of Antioch, an enemy of John. XVII addresses the reception of the origenists, but in a rather oblique way: the role of Olympias is highlighted instead of that of John, implicitly imputing this action to her.⁸⁰ The last two sections expand on John's virtues, and can be read as addressing, again obliquely, the accusations of mistreatment of his clergy⁸¹ and other character accusations.

Palladius' strategy of defense is thus to highlight John's virtues (opening and closing the defense) and to focus on two specific allegations: the Ephesus affair and the reception of the origenists. If the mistreatment of clergy is implicitly addressed, the accusations about the selling of church property and the unorthodox views about Christ are absent. Just as Theophilus had thrown in allegations that were not withheld, Palladius addresses charges of gluttony, which never formed a basis for John's deposition. As shown by S. Elm, Palladius

⁷³ See already, on other grounds, J.-M. LEROUX, *Jean Chrysostome et la querelle origéniste*, in J. FONTAINE and C. KANNENGISSER (edd.), *Epektasis. Mélanges patristiques offerts au cardinal Jean Daniélou*, Paris, 1972, 336-337.

⁷⁴ Cf. Russell, *cit.*, 33.

⁷⁵ Writing was important in this combat: cf. P. NAUTIN, *La lettre de Théophile d'Alexandrie à l'Église de Jérusalem et la réponse de Jean de Jérusalem (juin-juillet 396)*, *RHE* 69 (1974), 365-394; Clark, *cit.*, passim.

⁷⁶ PSEUDO-MARTYRIUS, *Epitaphios of John Chrysostom* 54-56; PALLADIUS, *Dialogue* 8.163-86.

⁷⁷ PSEUDO-MARTYRIUS, *Epitaphios of John Chrysostom* 60-65, 70-77; PALLADIUS, *Dialogue* 8.187-225.

⁷⁸ For the partisan nature of Palladius, see KELLY, *cit.*, 292; ELM., *cit.*; KATOS, *cit.*, passim.

⁷⁹ KATOS, *cit.*

⁸⁰ KATOS, *cit.*, 77-82.

⁸¹ PALLADIUS, *Dialogue*, 8.63-75 implicitly refutes the mishandling of clergy.

depicts Theophilus very much as he had depicted John (albeit valued in a diametrically opposite way): he thus uses the same polemical categories and stereotypes.⁸²

Palladius thus consciously avoids tackling *all* the accusations withheld against John at the Synod of the Oak, and chooses to bank on a character defense.⁸³ He is hence not a good guide to what really mattered in John's deposition. At the same time, Palladius knew Theophilus' *liber* and there must be specific reasons for this defense strategy. The reason has, I would contend, to do with Palladius' own position. S. Elm has argued that Palladius consciously downplays the role of Origenism in the deposition of John so as to suggest that that doctrinal debate was a red herring.⁸⁴ It is indeed interesting to note that Palladius did not choose to refute the accusation about John's interpretation of Christ's prayer. The choice for silence against refutation can be explained: Palladius himself was discussed at the Synod of the Oak in the context of his association with origenists.⁸⁵ Entering into the doctrinal debate would expose himself as an origenist.⁸⁶ That he chose to focus on the Ephesus affair is understandable for similar reasons. As we have seen, the acts of the Oak did not reach a conclusive decision sufficient to depose Heracleidas: it may thus have been one of the weaker points in the opponents' accusations. It was thus a suitable issue to expand upon to suggest the general weakness of Theophilus' case. More importantly, however, Palladius had been involved in John's Asian 'campaigns':⁸⁷ this meant that he was well-placed as an eye-witness to bring out the truth, but also that, if the accusations against John stuck, they also stuck to him. The dialogue presents itself as an apology of John, but it clearly also is an apology of its author.⁸⁸

Apart from the refutation of the Ephesus affair, Palladius' defense strategy is based more on deflection and silence than on actual refutation: the association with the origenists is attributed to Olympias' naive generosity, whereas the accusations of mishandling his clergy are contrasted with John's general virtues. The selling of church property and the theological issues are not mentioned. Someone favourably disposed to John would accept Palladius' suggestion that these accusations are too frivolous to be believed; someone of a less johannite inclination might think they hit too close for comfort. Crucially, the avoidance of the doctrinal issue was a choice of Palladius, not of Theophilus. It turned out to be a successful choice: we do not think of John's deposition as an episode in the origenist controversy. It has helped that the johannite version of events dominates our sources. Even Socrates, who is less favourably disposed towards John Chrysostom, had little sympathy for Theophilus: Socrates himself was an origenist and therefore not inclined to revise the johannite character assassination of Theophilus.⁸⁹

Conclusions

Through a reconstruction of Theophilus' *Liber adversus Iohannem Chrysostomum*, this article has sought to understand the justification of his deposition as put forward by his enemies. Hitherto modern constructions were based on the polemical refutations of that deposition by the johannites and their accounts have been too rapidly accepted by modern biographers of John. Against johannite imputations of frivolity and sloppiness in procedure, we must accept that John's enemies followed correct legal procedure (even displaying clemency by inviting

⁸² ELM, *cit.*, 74.

⁸³ ELM, *cit.*, 74.

⁸⁴ ELM, *cit.*, 72-3.

⁸⁵ *Synod of the Oak* l. 90; See ELM, *cit.*, 72; KELLY, *cit.*, 223.

⁸⁶ LEROUX, *cit.*, 338.

⁸⁷ KATOS, *cit.*, 17-8.

⁸⁸ See VAN NUFFELEN, *art. cit.*

⁸⁹ VAN NUFFELEN, *op. cit.*, 27-30.

John a fourth time) and that the Synod of the Oak deposed John on substantial grounds and not for refusing to appear. Obviously, the Synod of the Oak was heavily biased against John but this is an additional ground to expect commitment to legality – one does not take on a high profile bishop unless one has a case that fulfills at least all the formal requirements. The second exile of John, on the ground that he had returned without his deposition having been abolished by an ecclesiastical synod, was indeed exceptional but legally sound⁹⁰: John was permitted to return from his first exile by the emperor (exile being a secular punishment), but his deposition had never been annulled by a synod. In fact, John's second exile arguably was the direct consequence of his defence strategy against the Synod of the Oak: as he did not recognise the synod, he did not feel he had to ask for a retrial. The decision was thus left standing and justified the new and final exile. Unsurprisingly, therefore, the johannite sources attack the Synod of the Oak more than the second exile, for it formed the basis for both exiles.

The accounts offered by Theophilus and the johannite sources are not objective: they are rhetorical constructs stemming from competitive strategies of dissemination.⁹¹ Theophilus embedded the accusations that the synod of the Oak had withheld in a character assassination, and he was repaid in kind by the johannites. Nevertheless, it is clear that Theophilus highlighted the five substantial grounds that formed the basis of the deposition decreed by the Synod of the Oak, including the allegation that John held irregular, origenist views about Christ. Doctrinal issues were clearly at stake and I would suggest that Theophilus' understood his conflict with John as part of his campaign against origenism. If silence is anything to go by, some of the accusations stuck. Pseudo-Martyrius only addresses one of the five accusations that were withheld against John (the vending of church property) and throws in some of the ones that were brought forward but not discussed.⁹² Palladius follows a similar tactic: he discusses the Ephesus affair at length and blames the reception of the origenists on others, but also discusses the ultimately irrelevant accusations about John's walk of life. The accusation of mishandling clergy is alluded to but not discussed in detail. The doctrinal accusation, clearly important for Theophilus, is entirely absent. This was, maybe, too tricky to handle for the johannites: at any rate, Palladius, himself an origenist, had reasons enough for avoiding the issue.

The cliché says that history is written by the winners. The peculiarity of the history of John Chrysostom lies in the fact that the losers, the johannites, turned out to be the winners. As much as the triumphant narratives of the winners, the tragic history of the losers needs to be contextualised, scrutinised, and, if need be, deconstructed.⁹³

Peter Van Nuffelen, Ghent University, Belgium
 Peter.vannuffelen@ugent.be

⁹⁰ PALLADIUS, *Dialogue* 9.57-72 and SOCRATES, *Historia ecclesiastica* 6.18.11 state that a new synod in 404 appealed to canon 9 of the council of Antioch, to justify John's renewed deposition for returning without annulment of an earlier condemnation. They note that the johannites retorted that the canon was issued by the Arian council of 341; the synod probably thought it was the council of Antioch of 325. See also PALLADIUS, *Dialogue* 19. PSEUDO-MARTYRIUS, *Epitaphios of John Chrysostom* 86-9 ignores this episode and blames the emperor for John's exile.

⁹¹ ELM, *cit.*, 73; RUSSELL, *cit.*, 34.

⁹² PSEUDO-MARTYRIUS, *Epitaphios of John Chrysostom* 73-77.

⁹³ I wish to thank E. Delacenserie for formatting the footnotes and F. Fatti and R. Alciati for the invitation to contribute to this special issue.