THE EPISCOPACY OF JOHN
CHRYSTOSTOM: CONSTANTINOPLE

Early Years and the Episcopal Election of 397

John Chrysostom was born in Antioch in the middle of the fourth century, probably about 354.¹ Like many other bishops of the period, he was from a wealthy family. His father, Secundus, had been an important military officer in Syria and the family was able to provide for John's thorough education without using his inheritance.² Although he received an excellent classical training and had the renowned sophist Libanius as one of his teachers, John abandoned whatever plans he may have had for a secular career when he was about eighteen years old.³ Instead, he became a disciple of Miletius, the orthodox bishop of Antioch, and spent much of his time learning monastic "philosophy" from the famous ascetics Carterius and Diodorus.⁴ He became a monk and after three years was ordained a lector in the church of Antioch.⁵

Burning with the ardor of youth, however, he found the duties of a minor cleric in the city could not compete with the spiritual attractions of the ascetic life, and he went into the desert. There he lived in common with others for several years but, finding his spiritual strength growing, he "withdrew by himself into a cave, so as to be completely undisturbed and unknown. Here he lived for two years. . . . During this time he learned the New Testament entirely by heart, in order not to stagnate spiritually."⁶ He passed the night standing in prayer and often went without sleep for days at a time. Indeed, his biographer asserts that he spent this whole period of his life without lying down, either by day or night.

John's quest for the solitary life was, however, less than successful. As a notable "holy man," he appears to have been beset with visitors, presumably including both those seeking spiritual advice and those concerned with more secular advantages.⁷ Finally, the severity of his life and
the harshness of the climate weakened his health and he nearly died. As a result, John was persuaded to return to Antioch, but he never forgot his training in the desert, and he continued his ascetic practices amid the more active ecclesiastical life.

After his return to the city John served the church of Antioch for about five years as deacon. Owing to the nature of this office, which involved the distribution of much of the official charity of the church, he was fully exposed to the needs—and affections—of the urban poor, and it is not unreasonable to suppose that it was then that he developed his remarkable social conscience. In any case, we are told that the poor found contact with John a source of “sweetness amid the bitterness of life.” At the end of this service, probably in 386, John was ordained a priest, and he began to preach the sermons which brought him so much fame.

During this period, Chrysostom was witness to the notorious “riot of the statues,” and his sermons provide us with an insight into his ideas about the causes and results of such a disturbance. He made no attempt to conceal his disapproval of what had happened and of those whom he considered responsible for it:

A people (demos) so well-ordered and quiet... always obedient to its rulers (archontes) has now suddenly turned against us. I mourn and lament now, not because of the greatness of the approaching wrath, but because of the excess of the madness which was shown... Behold, the crimes were the work of a few, but the indictment is for all. Because of them we all fear and suffer the punishment for their deeds. But if we had seized them and had driven them from the city, and corrected them and healed the sick member, we should not have the present terror. I know the character of the city has always been noble, but certain strangers and men of mixed race, accursed and worthless, heedless of their own salvation, attempt reckless deeds. For this reason I have been crying out and bearing witness, “Let us punish the madness of the blasphemers.”

Chrysostom clearly blamed these blasphemers, “strangers and men of mixed race,” as the instigators of the violence. He even seems to imply that they had actually organized and led the demonstration. It is tempting to equate these persons with the partisans of the theatre and the hippodrome, and this identification is probably correct. Nevertheless, it is important to note that John stressed their blasphemy and disregard of salvation. Devotees of the “spectacles” might fit this description, but it is even more appropriate of heretics.

Earlier I told you, “Let us control their spirit and secure their salvation. Even if we should die in the attempt, the action would bring us great gain. Let us not overlook the insult done to our common lord. Ignoring such things will bring some great calamity to our city.” These things I foretold and they have come to pass and we are suffering from our inertia. You ignored the insult which was done to God and he has allowed the emperor to be insulted and a great danger to hang over us all as a penalty for our lack of action... Now, since we are
being chastened by our present calamity, let us finally restrain the disorderly
madness of these men.\textsuperscript{12}

In the last analysis, John was not primarily concerned with the his-
torical or political aspects of the disturbance, but rather with moral
questions. The people of Antioch had not listened to his advice to rid the
city of impious individuals who angered God by their sinful behavior or
beliefs. Accordingly, they had brought divine displeasure and vengeance
upon themselves. When we have occasion to investigate John's attitude
toward popular demonstrations, we should remember that in 387 his
reaction was largely that of a moralist who categorically deplored the
violence which had occurred. He did not even consider the possibility that
the demonstrators had some justification for their actions.\textsuperscript{13}

While John was performing his priestly duties in Antioch, events were
developing in Constantinople which were soon to change his life. Before
we consider these, however, it is necessary to examine briefly the
episcopacy of Nectarius, Chrysostom's predecessor, for this seriously
affected the election of 397 and the reception John was to receive in
Constantinople.

Nectarius became bishop in 381 when the Fathers of the Council of
Constantinople included his name on a list of candidates they presented
to the emperor to succeed Gregory of Nazianzus. To the surprise of all,
Theodosius selected Nectarius, even though he was as yet an unbaptized
layman.

Perhaps because of his lack of theological training, or because of a
genuine desire to avoid difficulties, Nectarius managed to spend sixteen
years on the episcopal throne of Constantinople without taking any active
role in the pressing ecclesiastical or political issues of his time. Arian
insurgents, for example, burned his palace, but when the emperor
requested him to prepare a defense against the heretics, he could do no
better than to ask the bishop of the Novatians for advice. He allowed
accused criminals to remain in ecclesiastical office, and he ignored the
request of St. Ambrose that he censure a runaway deacon who had
become a bishop in the East.\textsuperscript{14} Despite the bishop's inactivity in contro-
versial matters, the power of the see of Constantinople grew, and the
religious policy of the government continued successfully under the
direction of Theodosius, who may have been quite content to have a silent
bishop.\textsuperscript{15}

As a result, something approaching religious harmony existed in
Constantinople for the first time since the foundation of the city some
half-century before. Although the power and the number of the Arians
should not be underestimated, the orthodox hierarchy was able to make a
substantial recovery from the persecution of the Arian emperors.\textsuperscript{16}

The death of Nectarius on September 26, 397, was followed by a
particularly hotly contested election, the first to be held since the restoration of orthodoxy. The election of a bishop at any time under the later empire was an event of singular importance, comparable only to the selection of a new emperor, but the situation in 397 was especially volatile after years of Arianism and the weak administration of Nectarius. Furthermore, under Nectarius, we may suppose that a large number of higher clerics (the various officials of the episcopal administration) had been given wide latitude for action. These individuals had tasted episcopal power, and they undoubtedly felt they had demonstrated their executive ability. It is not surprising that many of them sought their own election to the vacant episcopal throne and that some of them confidently expected success in the undertaking.

The situation was further complicated by the growing jealousy of the bishops of Alexandria and their readiness to interfere in the internal affairs of their upstart rivals in Constantinople. The Alexandrian "popes" had been secure in their ecclesiastical leadership of the East so long as an Arian sat on the episcopal throne in Constantinople, but when Theodosius restored the churches to the orthodox and the Council of Constantinople increased the honor of the imperial see, the position of Alexandria was threatened. As early as 380, Peter, the bishop of Alexandria, had interfered in the election of a bishop of Constantinople, and when this stratagem failed, Peter's successor, Timothy, led the opposition which resulted in the bishop's resignation. Clearly, Alexandria would be a force to consider in the election of 397.

As soon as the death of Nectarius became known, men of every condition presented themselves as candidates to succeed him: "men who are not men [eunuchs], priests unworthy of their position, some trying to influence the imperial officials, others offering bribes, and still others kneeling in supplication before the people (demoi)." Theophilus, the bishop of Alexandria, intervened by nominating Isidore, a priest of his own church, as a candidate.

In the counsels of the emperor Arcadius, where the decision would ultimately be made, opinion was divided among the supporters of various candidates. Meanwhile, groups of people assembled outside the palace and importuned the emperor to select a man experienced in priestly duties. Obviously there was considerable sentiment that the choice be made for other than political reasons.

John had apparently not been under general consideration, but ultimately he was chosen, not it would seem by the emperor, but by the powerful eunuch Eutropius, who was at that time virtual regent for the young Arcadius. Palladius says that Eutropius had met John in Antioch and was impressed by his character and ability, but it is not difficult to read more secular motives into the choice. The eunuch naturally disliked the machinations of Theophilus, and he may have felt that a stranger who
had taken no part in the factional politics of the capital and who owed his election to himself might prove a more willing tool in his own manipulation of official matters.26

The government was aware of the popularity of John in Antioch, and special arrangements were made to bring him to Constantinople. According to Sozomen, the comes orientis who was responsible for this task feared popular uprisings (staseis) should the people of Antioch learn what was about to happen.27 Accordingly, the official devised a plan to convey the unsuspecting priest secretly from his native city to the capital, and on February 26, 398, he became bishop of Constantinople.28

Chrysostom as Bishop

Sozomen, who exalted the memory of John, claimed that the laity (laos) and the clergy of Constantinople were unanimous in their support of Chrysostom's candidacy and that the emperor only concurred in their preference.29 To the degree that the laity of Constantinople knew of John's reputation (which is very doubtful), they may have welcomed his election, since he was certainly a man "experienced in priestly duties." However, the intense feelings involved in the election cannot have been quickly suppressed, and no unanimity of support for John was likely, even after the decision of the court was announced.30 A large number of candidates had been disappointed, and they lacked even the satisfaction of knowing that the ultimate victor came from within their ranks. Instead, the new bishop was a "stranger" brought from the metropolis of Syria.31 Clearly, the clergy which faced John when he first arrived in Constantinople was already partly hostile to him. Not least of his enemies were the supporters of Theophilus of Alexandria, who cannot have accepted their defeat lightly.

John's first actions as bishop of Constantinople must have caused considerable alarm. Shortly after his consecration, he initiated a thorough reform of the administration of the see. He deprived several clerics of their positions for immoral or even criminal behavior, and he undertook a sweeping campaign against clerical avarice, injustice, and immorality; singled out for particular condemnation were the priests who kept women as "housekeepers" (συνείσακται).32 Further, he introduced new night vigils and other strenuous forms of public prayer.33 Naturally not all the clergy were pleased with these reforms, and their wrath was increased by Serapion, John's hotheaded archdeacon, whom many considered the instigator of the disagreeable measures. According to one account, Serapion advised John that "You can rule these people only if you chastize them all with the same whip." The rumor of this spread among the clergy, and Socrates says that much of the abuse earned by Serapion fell upon John.34
Further, John reformed the expenditure of the episcopal account. He stopped all spending on nonecclesiastical matters and drastically cut the budget of the episcopal residence, eliminating banquets and other lavish entertainments. He used the savings to build and staff hospitals for strangers in the city, but he earned a reputation for being cold and unfriendly toward his ecclesiastical colleagues.

John also found enemies outside the clergy of the city. He was an ardent opponent of heresy and paganism, and the enmity was presumably mutual. On a trip to Asia, he closed the churches belonging to the Quartodecimans and the Novatians, but the Arians were his principal adversaries, and his first sermon after becoming bishop was directed against them. When the Arians organized elaborate nocturnal processions designed to glorify God and to attract the believer through a direct appeal to the senses, John feared the effect on the orthodox, and he countered with processions of his own. He secured imperial assistance for these and, when the efforts of the orthodox surpassed those of the heretics in splendor and popular favor, the Arians reacted with violence. One can easily imagine the scene as the heretics attacked their opponents, and the incense and singing were dispersed by missiles and sticks. Several people were injured on both sides, including a eunuch of the empress who was struck in the head with a stone. As a result of this confrontation the emperor forbade the Arians to hold their nocturnal assemblies, but the processions of the orthodox were so successful that they continued as a regular part of the worship of the church of the capital. The people (demos) of Constantinople enjoyed the spectacle of the processions, full of light and music, and they attributed their institution to John. But the Arians, from this point at least, must have regarded the bishop as their bitter enemy, and they may have been ready to support the machinations of his enemies.

We know little of John's direct contact with pagans, but we can be sure that he created many enemies among the monastic community of the capital. Although he praised the monks who remained piously in their desert solitudes, he had nothing but harsh words for those who came to the cities to enjoy the pleasures and benefits of urban life. Naturally, some of the monks who had recently arrived in Constantinople resented this, and Isaac, the leader of the monastic community in the city, became one of the foremost of John's enemies.

In a recent important study, Gilbert Dagron has pointed out the peculiar nature of early Constantinopolitan monasticism. He argues that the movement there was particularly "urban" in form, and that the monks were more concerned with social and economic questions than were their brothers in the desert. Community life was more open, and the monks were used to considerable independence from episcopal authority. Dagron traces the origins of this phenomenon to the period of Arian...
domination in Constantinople, and he maintains that this form of monasticism remained strongly Macedonian in sentiment for years to come. Thus, John could expect only growing opposition from the monks of the city. They must have been irritated not only by his weak support of the monastic life, but also by his rigid orthodoxy and his desire to impose tight episcopal control over ecclesiastical institutions and charitable services previously administered independently by the monks themselves.

Thus, John had many enemies. But he also found many devoted admirers; indeed, the popular support which Chrysostom enjoyed is one of the most characteristic features of his episcopacy. In fact, as we shall see, the affection many people felt for the bishop outlasted his official condemnation and deposition and played an important role in the ultimate restoration of his memory.

It is not difficult to propose reasons for the remarkable popularity of the new bishop. In the first place, for all his ferocious morality, John appears to have been kind and understanding and easily accessible to the humble as well as the great. (Indeed, the refusal of John to devote all his time to personages of importance was the cause of much irritation and the source of some of the more serious charges against him.) Further, we should assume that the reforms in the administration of the bishopric—as much as they angered some—pleased many others who had been upset by the lax administration of Nectarius. Clearly, if we are to believe the sources, there had been popular sentiment for a bishop who would act in such a manner at the time of the election of 397.

The content of John's sermons, as well as their style, had an obvious appeal to many of the inhabitants of Constantinople, particularly the poor. He had, of course, been popular in Antioch, and the manner in which his sermons were received in Constantinople provides an interesting measure of his popularity there. When it was known that the bishop would be speaking, people flocked to the church in such numbers that they threatened to crush one another. In order to be heard and to ensure his own safety, John had to place himself in the bema. Loud applause frequently interrupted his sermons, and it is interesting that his sermon condemning this practice was itself periodically interrupted by applause. On one occasion, he disappointed the crowd by allowing a guest to preach instead of himself; everyone in the church cried out in disappointment, and many simply walked out of the building. John attracted not only the ordinarily pious members of society; he also found support among the more disreputable elements, and "even the lovers of the hippodrome and the theatre left the courtyards of the devil" and attended his sermons.

We should not assume that brilliant oratory appealed only to the highly educated. They alone might have appreciated an obscure classical reference or a subtle rhetorical maneuver, but this was an era in which
eloquence was generally respected and oratorical ability won praise of a more popular sort.\textsuperscript{47} We have already seen how the sermons of John attracted large and enthusiastic crowds, and Socrates specifically states that much of his popularity was a result of the people's \textit{(laos)} love of his oratory.

John gained the support of the people \textit{(plethos)} because he openly condemned wrongdoers in the church and complained strongly against the unjust, as though he himself had been injured. This was pleasing to the majority of the people \textit{(polloi)}, but it angered the wealthy and the powerful, who are in any case guilty of the greater part of the crimes committed.\textsuperscript{48}

Fortunately, the practice of transcribing the sermons of great ecclesiastical orators has preserved the texts of many of John's sermons, and we are able to read the passages which appealed to the crowds which packed the church whenever the bishop spoke. Some of these are deeply moving, and they provide a clear example of Chrysostom's social consciousness. Perhaps the most evocative of these was inspired by what the bishop saw on a cold winter morning. He began the sermon:

I come to you today as an ambassador from the poor of the city, not because of the decrees or speeches, but because I have seen their terrible sufferings . . . . It is right to speak of mercy at any time, but especially now, when such great cold prevails, when no one can find work, nor spend the night in the open . . . . Many people examine the poor man closely before giving him anything: where he comes from, how he lives . . . . why isn't he working even though he is strong enough . . . Thus, many of the poor mutilate themselves, hoping to melt your hard hearts. But some of you complain that the poor are only deserters, foreigners, and good-for-nothings, people who run away from their homes, and pour into the city. But it is an honor for us if all the poor people expect help and safety from us . . . . Whether they are worthy or not you will be rewarded just the same.\textsuperscript{49}

On another occasion, he discussed the different treatment which was, in fact, accorded the rich and the poor. He objected that such a distinction should not be made among Christians, all of whom were equal in the sight of God.

In the church I accept no vain striving for position, but preach to all alike . . . for He who calls all alike does not allow one to be puffed up by pride while another is crushed under foot\textsuperscript{50}

Finally, in the following words, one can feel John's outraged sense of justice as he thundered from the pulpit of the cathedral:

"Let the moth eat, but do not let the poor eat; let the worm devour, but do not clothe the naked; let all perish with time, but do not allow Christ to be fed when he lacks these things." "Who says this?" it will be asked. But it is terrible to relate that it is said with deeds rather than with words . . . And do you not fear that a thunderbolt from heaven will fall on you as a result of these words! Excuse me, for I am bursting with anger . . . . You demand a strict accounting
from the poor and miserable, who are nearly dead, but do you not fear the terrible tribunal of Christ?51

Beyond this thorough accusation and condemnation of the rich, Chrysostom’s sermons contained other attractions for the downtrodden among his audience. While he pointed out the injustices of this world, the bishop also promised the certainty of redress in the world to come. The poor inhabitants of Constantinople must certainly have found consolation in John’s frequent assertion that their future life would be as happy as their present life was wretched.52

Nevertheless, Chrysostom’s purpose was clearly not to encourage antagonism between the rich and the poor, but to promote moral reform. He was in no sense a revolutionary or demagogue, and the references to the crimes of the rich (which may have delighted the poor) were directed solely at the rich themselves in an attempt to produce a change in their behavior. They were not intended to produce a hatred of the wealthy. On the other hand, many of the things John said in his sermons cannot have pleased all of the poor. He continually complained, for example, that the people of Constantinople, while they were willing to fill the church to hear him speak, rarely put into practice the essentials of what he taught them. In particular, he complained that they paid little attention to his condemnation of the spectacles. These institutions—the hippodrome and the theatre which Chrysostom considered so detrimental to Christian morality—were, according to all sources, passionately supported by the inhabitants of all the great cities of the empire, the poor even more than the rich.53 Chrysostom’s attitude toward the spectacles may have alienated some of his potential supporters, especially those closely connected with the theatre or the racecourse (for example, factionarii, charioteers, actors), and one can only wonder at the power of John’s oratory that even some of these people found their way to the church to hear him speak!

We must, however, not ascribe John’s popularity only to the content and style of his sermons and his general concern for social justice. His manner of life also contributed to his reputation. As we have seen, John was an ascetic, and he brought his strict religious exercises with him to the episcopal residence of the capital. It was true that he was now a bishop and had many worldly concerns, but the severity of his past and present life set him apart from contemporaries. He was, in fact, a “holy man” in the midst of an urban setting.

We have already briefly examined the importance of the holy man in chapter 2. As a person with a special relationship to God, the holy man could be expected to intervene in any number of spiritual and secular concerns, and he became a patron with extraordinary powers. As a bishop, of course, Chrysostom could also act as a more traditional patron. His concern for charity and his control of the wealth of the
church, as well as his opportunity to approach the emperor and members of his court, made Chrysostom a man of considerable importance. Indeed, the fact that a bishop was an ascetic would only serve to increase his effectiveness as a traditional patron. Ascetics were often on familiar terms with the powerful of the world, and no one could think that an ascetic who owned little or no personal property would seek a favor for personal gain. This removal of the ascetic from the normal rules of society—which, it must be remembered, involved constant and severe personal mortification—further enhanced his efficaciousness as a negotiator among equals, since all could turn to him as a person removed from ordinary ties, and even from ordinary passions.54

As with so many other aspects of this study, I can never hope to give a definitive explanation of Chrysostom’s remarkable popularity among the inhabitants of Constantinople; each individual undoubtedly had his or her own personal attitude toward the bishop, and the sources only provide a dim reflection of these. Nevertheless, there were many aspects of Chrysostom’s life and personality which might reasonably have been attractive to many people, and the sources, even those hostile to him, are united in their description of the extraordinary affection with which the bishop was regarded. His enemies, who had never reconciled themselves to John’s election, would clearly have to take this popular support into consideration as they schemed against him.

In fact, Socrates reported that at an early date John’s opponents made some public accusations against him in hopes of diminishing his popular following. Unfortunately, we have few details of this maneuver; presumably they condemned his supposedly antisocial behavior in one or more sermons. “The faithful, however, applauded vehemently and loved the man [Chrysostom] because of what he had said in the church, and they paid little attention to those who had accused him.”55

The Council of the Oak and First Exile

Meanwhile as John continued to “correct the rich and teach them humility,” conflict developed between the bishop’s erstwhile patron Eutropius and the powerful barbarian general Gainas. The exact course of events is unclear, but Gainas ultimately secured the disgrace and death of the eunuch, and by the end of 399 he “was master of the government of the east.”56 Opposition to growing Germanic dominance of the city began to develop, however, and Gainas was forced to chance everything in a desperate attempt to seize the government by force. This was a failure, as a great tumult (thorybos) arose in the city, and all the inhabitants began to assail the barbarians with whatever weapons were at hand.57 Only
seven thousand Germans survived the onslaught, and these sought sanctuary in the church which had been provided for their worship. The emperor rejected their plea for mercy and sent soldiers to the church. They set fire to the building and burned the barbarians alive.  

Chrysostom played only a secondary role in these events, but his action revealed his ability to rise above the divisions of party or faction to appeal directly to men of different persuasions. Thus, when the fall of Eutropius was imminent and the eunuch fled to the church for sanctuary, John delivered two sermons at the unfortunate man's expense, pointing out the vanity and uselessness of riches and power. Ultimately he did, however, make an unsuccessful attempt to save Eutropius' life. Later, when Gainas demanded that the Arian Goths be given a church within the city, John persuaded Arcadius not to yield to the threats of the heretics. But he did provide for the worship of the orthodox Goths by giving them a church near the imperial palace and ordaining priests who were proficient in their language. Finally, when the barbarians were besieging the capital, John is reported to have gone, "by universal desire," to the camp of the Goths in an attempt to conciliate Gainas.

Throughout these difficult events, John maintained a position of strict morality and orthodoxy; politics or party feelings apparently played no part in his actions. However, what may most have impressed the people of Constantinople, both rich and poor alike, was John's opposition to Gainas and his Arian Goths. Clearly, there was considerable unanimity of feeling on this question, and John's actions are likely to have increased the esteem in which the bishop was held. As we have seen, the rich are unlikely to have been generally pleased by John's outspoken attacks on their greed and callousness. His action in opposing Gainas, and making a spectacle of Eutropius, however, may have won him some support among the wealthy and members of the court, who were the greatest enemies of both men.

From these complicated developments the empress, Eudoxia, emerged as the most important person in the palace. Unfortunately, John soon earned her enmity, probably through some undiplomatic reference to her greed and love of luxury. The animosity of the empress gave Theophilus of Alexandria the opportunity for which he had been waiting and John's reception of the so-called Tall Brothers, Egyptian monks accused of Origenism, provided an occasion to unite the bishop's enemies in an attempt to rid the church of his domination.

The main points of their plan are clear. Theophilus and his supporters in Constantinople maintained that Chrysostom had behaved arrogantly and even violently, especially toward church property and the clergy. By his reception and defense of the Tall Brothers, moreover, he had implicated himself in the heresy of Origen and interfered unlawfully in the
affairs of another bishop. This campaign was directed primarily toward important members of the court and the bishops who would eventually judge the case, and most of the individual accusations and the methods of persuasion demonstrate this design. Yet, we should remember that John’s opponents had earlier tried to discredit him in the eyes of the people of Constantinople, and the visit of Epiphanius to the capital shows that another attempt was made at this time.

Epiphanius, bishop of Salamis (in Cyprus), was a famous opponent of all heresy, especially Origenism. When the affair of the Tall Brothers began, Theophilus, although he had formerly defended Origen, took care to have the heresy condemned at an Alexandrian synod and encouraged other bishops to do the same. Epiphanius, pleased at his colleague’s change of heart, gladly complied and agreed to Theophilus’ suggestion that he go himself to Constantinople, since the bishop of that city had become tainted with heresy.

When Epiphanius arrived in Constantinople, he refused to have any dealings with John, implying that he already considered him guilty of heresy. Armed with earlier condemnations of Origenism, he assembled the bishops who happened to be in the city and inveighed against John, apparently without success. Finally, Chrysostom’s enemies decided that on the next Sunday, when all the people were assembled in the church of the Holy Apostles, Epiphanius would publicly condemn Origen and the Tall Brothers. They hoped that, by association, John would lose prestige with the crowd (οὕτως συγκρούσειν αὐτόν πρὸς τὸ πλῆθος). Obviously, this popular support was of some concern to Chrysostom’s enemies. John, however, learned of this plan and sent Serapion to intercept Epiphanius just as he was about to enter the church. The deacon advised the bishop not to carry out his plan, for he would surely be held responsible for any disturbance which resulted (εἰ ταραχῆς εν τῷ πλῆθει ἦ στάσεως κινηθείσης αὐτὸς κινδυνεύσει ὡς αἰτίος γεγονὼς). Whether this meant that the authorities would hold Epiphanius responsible for a division of opinion among the people and resulting violence, or that the people themselves would take offense and attack Epiphanius, we cannot be certain. In either case, it is clear that Serapion and (as it turned out) Epiphanius realized that the condemnation of the Tall Brothers would be regarded by the crowd (πλῆθος) as an attack on Chrysostom, and that this would lead to a riot, probably with violence.

We can only add that Epiphanius heeded the advice of Serapion; he made no further attacks on Chrysostom and soon left the city altogether.

Theophilus, of course, did not abandon his designs so easily. Soon after the departure of Epiphanius, he arrived in Constantinople, armed with bribes and fortified by a company of Egyptian bishops (even though the emperor had requested his presence alone). None of the clergy of the city...
was waiting for the Alexandrian “pope” when his ship landed, but a great
throng of Egyptian sailors enthusiastically greeted their bishop.70 From
the harbor, Theophilus went directly to his lodgings, deliberately ignoring
the customary visit to the great church and the episcopal residence of the
city.71 He spent the next three weeks preparing his case against John,
securing false accusations and bribing important people. Chrysostom tells
us that his adversary was so successful—or at least confident—that he
acted as though all the clergy were won over to his side and the church
were already without a bishop.72 Throughout this time, there is no evi-
dence that Theophilus again attempted to secure the support or even the
neutrality of John’s numerous nonclerical supporters.

Finally, early in 403, all was ready and Theophilus summoned a num-
ber of previously selected bishops to attend the gathering known as the
Council of the Oak.73 This synod assembled at the residence-monastery
of Rufinus, the former praetorian prefect, in the vicinity of Chalcedon.
The property belonged to the state, and its use by the enemies of
Chrysostom indicated that opinion at the court had turned against the
bishop.

Realizing what the outcome of the council would be, John refused to
answer the summons sent him. He replied that he would appear only
before a larger council which was not dominated by those openly plotting
his deposition. In Chrysostom’s absence, his enemies proceeded to accuse
him of various crimes, ranging from the illegal sale of church property to
gluttony. The abbot Isaac unwittingly provided evidence of the popular
mood during the council by charging that John “encouraged the faithful
to revolt against the synod” (τοΐς λαοΐς υποβάλλει στασιάζειν κατά τής
συνόδου).74 Nevertheless, no mention was made of the charge of heresy,
and Theophilus even went so far as a public reconciliation with the Tall
Brothers. The bishops unanimously declared John deposed from his
episcopal position—not for any of the crimes mentioned by his accusers,
but simply because he had failed to answer the summons of the council.
The bishops sent the emperor a notice of the deposition and added a plea
that John be declared guilty of treason as well (presumably for insulting
Eudoxia). Arcadius willingly agreed to this.75

What happened next might easily have been predicted. John’s popu-
larity was well-known, as the incident involving Epiphanius clearly
showed, and his supporters were obviously upset by the proceedings of
the council, the only explanation which would give any credence to Isaac’s
charges that the bishop had stirred up the people to revolt. As Sozomen
described the scene:

When the people (plethos) of Constantinople learned of these things it was
toward evening; they immediately rose up in sedition (stasis). At day-break
they assembled hurriedly at the church [Hagia Sophia] and, among other
things, they shouted that a greater council should be called to judge him. The emperor sent men to carry John away into exile, but the crowd would not let them pass.

There was a standoff and violence seemed likely, but the confrontation was avoided by the action of John himself, for he feared that another accusation might be made against him—either that he disobeyed the command of the emperor or that he incited the people (demos) to riot. Accordingly, on the third day after his deposition, at about noon, he slipped out of the church, eluding the distraught people.76

The account of Palladius contains a letter supposedly written by John to Pope Innocent describing, among other things, the events surrounding his first exile.77 In detail, this letter differs considerably from the account of Sozomen, but it agrees that there was grave concern among John's supporters as soon as the sentence of deposition was known and that some of these supporters expressed their concern with action:

Late at night, when all the people (demos) were following me, I was seized by the urban curiosus in the middle of the city. I was led away by force to the harbor, put in a boat, and we set sail that night; and all this while I was in the process of calling a synod for a just trial.78

If the condemnation of Chrysostom led to popular demonstrations in his favor, the bishop's exile led to even more serious disturbances:

When he had gone into exile, the faithful rose in violent revolt (χαλεπώς λαός έστασίζε). And they heaped abuse on the emperor, the synod, and especially on Theophilus and Severianus, whom they regarded as the instigators of the plot.79

Severianus, the bishop of Gabala, who had been one of Theophilus's most important allies, happened to be giving a sermon at the time of the disturbance. He took the occasion to praise the sentence against John, saying that at least he was guilty of the sin of pride. This set off the final episode. In the account of Sozomen:

These words angered the people (plethos) and the disturbance became completely uncontrollable. They could not be kept quiet in the churches and market places, and they carried their lamentation and complaint for the return of John even to the palace of the emperor.

There the supporters of John finally received some satisfaction:

Yielding to the petitions of the people (eιξασα ταΐς ίκεσίαις του δήμου), the empress persuaded her husband to agree. Quickly she sent her trusted eunuch to bring John back... maintaining that she had taken no part in the machinations against him.80

Socrates added to this account the information that "many" (polloi)—
he does not identify them further—who had previously called for John’s
deposition now considered him wronged and joined the others in de­
manding his return. He says also that the anger of the crowd intensified
when it learned that Theophilus had abandoned the charge of Origenism
and had been reconciled with the Tall Brothers. Socrates agreed with
Sozomen that the petitions of the people brought about the recall of
John, but he claimed that it was the emperor who was persuaded, rather
than the empress.81

Theodoret, on the other hand, reported that an earthquake shook the
palace during the night of John’s exile. Eudoxia regarded this as a sign
of God’s displeasure and, fearing worse calamities, recalled the bishop
as soon as morning arrived.82 Palladius wrote only that “a certain
disturbance (θραΰσιν) occurred in the bedroom,” and that this caused so
much alarm in the palace that messages were dispatched a few days later
to return John to the capital.83 What this “disturbance” may have been is
difficult to say; the term could be used to describe an earthquake, and it
could conceivably refer to the empress’ reaction to the demonstration out­
side the palace. Baur, however, suggested that Eudoxia suffered a mis­
carriage.84 It is possible, of course, that two or more events combined to
change the minds of the court. Eudoxia may have suffered a miscarriage,
but in such a case the petitions of the turbulent crowd outside her window
must have contributed to her distress.

In fact, the emperor and the empress may not have been firmly com­
mitted to John’s disgrace. It is possible that they sent him only a short
distance from Constantinople in order to test the immediate reaction to
his exile—either on the part of God or the people of the city. When this
was ascertained, they quickly dispatched messages to recall the bishop.

According to the sources we have examined, those involved in the
disturbances following John’s deposition understood the situation, and
they articulated their demands clearly. They placed the blame for the
bishop’s exile squarely on the shoulders of those they thought responsible,
and they made clear to the emperor and the empress that they would be
satisfied only by his return. We hear of no leaders among the crowd, and
the sources imply that the demonstrations developed spontaneously;
nevertheless, the clarity of the petitions presented to the emperor suggest
some kind of leadership. Furthermore, it is interesting to find that the
crowd demanded that a greater council should be called to judge the case,
something echoed in John’s own letter to Pope Innocent. Finally, we are
not told how the crowd presented its petitions, but we should suspect
some kind of chanting or coordinated shouting: otherwise the points
would have been lost in the general confusion of different voices.85
Unfortunately, the sources tell us nothing about the social composition of
the crowds or about their numbers. If we accept the account of Sozomen,
however, we must assume that the active supporters of John were fairly numerous, for they were able to withstand for three days the efforts of the emperor to remove John from the church by force.

It would seem that the demonstrations which immediately followed the exile of Chrysostom were serious and noisy, but that no violence or the destruction of property actually resulted. In part this was because the emperor's men—presumably soldiers—who were sent to carry out the sentence apparently did not attack the crowd. The sudden disappearance of John, however, and, most importantly, the willingness of the court to acquiesce in the demand of the demonstrators were undoubtedly crucial in calming the situation.

Considerable time elapsed between the decision to recall the bishop and his actual return to the city. In large measure, this was because of John's own hesitation about taking up his episcopal duties while he was, formally at least, still deposed. During this time, tension grew in the city and tempers occasionally flared. A particularly striking example of this is provided by Zosimus. After telling of John's voluntary exile, he added that

\[\text{the people (plethos) were disturbed by this [his exile], for the man was a great leader of the unreasonable mob (ἡν γὰρ ὁ ἄνθρωπος ἄλογον ἄχλος ὄπασαγέσθαι δεινός), and the city was filled with disturbances. The church of the Christians [Hagia Sophia] was seized by those who are called monks. . . . Laying hold of the churches, these men prevented the people (plethe) from entering for their accustomed prayers. This angered both the people (πληθος) and the soldiers, and together they demanded authority to put an end to the audacity of the monks. On a given signal they attacked without restraint and continued the slaughter until the church was full of corpses. Those who ran away were pursued and anyone who happened to be wearing dark clothing was cut down.}^{87}\]

The situation can easily be imagined. The monks of Constantinople, under the leadership of Isaac, dismayed by the decision to restore the bishop, seized the churches and prevented the followers of Chrysostom (whom Zosimus identifies as \(\text{ta plethe}\)) from meeting for prayer. The latter, undoubtedly exhilarated by their recent success, finally became impatient and joined with the soldiers—sent by a court temporarily friendly toward them—in the attack on the monks.\(^88\)

These events show how far enmity had developed between the supporters of John and the monastic community. They also reveal how fine the line might be between a peaceful demonstration and acts of violence and even bloodshed. Moreover, once a beginning of violence had been made, it might be difficult to contain. We should perhaps connect another incident with this attack on the church.

After the decision had been made to restore Chrysostom, Theophilus wished to prepare a counterstroke. He did not dare to attack the bishop
openly fearing a court which was then favorable to John. Instead, the Egyptian chose to discredit Chrysostom by making accusations against Heraclides, his former deacon who was then bishop of Ephesus. A dispute arose over the legality of Theophilus' charges, since Heraclides was not present to defend himself, and the two parties quickly came to blows:

Becoming very angry, the company of those Alexandrians and Egyptians who remained [in the city] and the faithful of Constantinople attacked one another, so that many were wounded and some killed.

Apparently the people of Constantinople had rather the better of the battle, for the bishops who had opposed John became fearful and fled the city. Theophilus, too, took ship for Alexandria, accompanied by Isaac, the leader of the monastic community. Palladius summed up this incident simply and added a graphic detail saying that "Theophilus and the Egyptians sought safety in flight, for the populace (polis) wished to drown him in the sea!"

In the account of the battle between the Egyptians and the people of Constantinople, it is perhaps natural to assume that the Egyptians were the bishops who had accompanied Theophilus to the Council of the Oak. In this case, however, one would have expected Sozomen to remark on the spectacle of bishops giving and receiving wounds. In any case, the bishops of Egypt, regardless of how many of them had come along, would hardly have been a match for the populace of Constantinople. Although Theophilus and his colleagues obviously did not consider themselves exempt from bodily harm, it is probable that the bulk of the actual fighting was carried on by less exalted personages. To judge by the practice of his successors, it is likely that Theophilus brought a band of roughnecks with him to Constantinople. Further, we know that at just this time large numbers of Egyptian sailors were in Constantinople, and they had already on another occasion demonstrated their support of Theophilus. As the events showed, even these willing allies of the bishop of Alexandria were not able to prevent the recall of Chrysostom, but we should not forget that behind the scenes, on the docks and in the streets and churches of Constantinople itself, the agents of Alexandria were constantly at work.

As John slowly made his way back to the city, the sea was filled with boats carrying great numbers of the faithful who had come, bearing lighted torches, to welcome their bishop's return. A party of thirty bishops—supposedly loyal to Chrysostom—headed the jubilant party, which landed at Marinanae, a village just outside Constantinople. There John stopped, refusing to go farther until another council should annul the sentence against him. But "the faithful (laos) were annoyed by this and when they began to insult the court he was forced to enter [the city]. The people (demos) then came to greet him and, singing psalms and bearing lighted candles, they led him to the church." Here again John hesitated, but "they
forced him to give the greeting of peace to the faithful and sit upon the episcopal throne.\textsuperscript{96}

Chrysostom then delivered an extemporaneous sermon which began with a comparison between Theophilus and his Pharaonic predecessors:

Those things happened then to Abraham, but today they happened to the church: pharaoh had his shieldbearers, while Theophilus had his spearbearers.\textsuperscript{97}

The main theme of the sermon was, however, the loyalty of the people of Constantinople: “We prayed and they fled; you have stood firm as a rock.” Significantly, John felt that the support of the people had caused the empress to change her mind and order his recall: “You have secured the cooperation of the empress. . . . As someone concerned for her child, she went about everywhere, not of course in person, but through her personal bodyguard.” “But what shall I call you: sheep or shepherds? governors or soldiers and generals?” The people had clearly taken the initiative and provided the moral leadership which had been lacking. But John was careful in his praise for the actions of the crowd. He had earlier in the sermon condemned Theophilus for violence, and he did not want the same charge to apply to his own followers.\textsuperscript{98} “I say these things not to lead you into insurrection; for theirs is the insurrection, while yours is zeal.” According to both Socrates and Sozomen, the sermon was well received by the people, who continuously interrupted it with loud applause.\textsuperscript{99}

\textit{Second Exile and Schism}

After his return from exile, John was even more popular with the faithful.\textsuperscript{100} Sixty bishops assembled in Constantinople and annulled the decrees of the Council of the Oak.\textsuperscript{101} The old enemies of John were still powerful, however, and they soon began to win the support of the court, again probably because of John’s undiplomatic remarks about the activities of the empress.\textsuperscript{102} Seemingly at a loss as to how to proceed against the bishop, these men once again turned to Theophilus, telling him that he could advise them from a distance if he feared the people of Constantinople. Remembering his recent hasty departure (εἰδὼς δὲ ἔφυγεν), Theophilus answered that he would indeed rather remain in Egypt. He did send along, however, three of his own bishops and suggested that John’s enemies refer to a canon which forbade the appeal of an ecclesiastical sentence to the secular power—which, they could claim, John had done.\textsuperscript{103}

The events of the next few months are extremely difficult to reconstruct, and even their chronological sequence is far from certain. Only the broad outlines may be described with confidence. This whole period, from Chrysostom’s return to Constantinople to his second exile, was characterized by a curious conflict and lack of resolution within the court.
itself. On the one side was the uncompromising hostility of John's enemies—apparently including the empress herself—who would accept nothing less than the final deposition and exile of the bishop. On the other hand there was fear lest this act again be followed by catastrophe, perhaps in the form of popular sedition. The emperor himself hesitated, and he was persuaded to agree to the condemnation of John only by degrees.

Within a month or two after John's return, another council assembled in an attempt to declare Chrysostom deposed by virtue of the canon mentioned above. But this synod was unable to achieve its purpose because of the strength of John's episcopal supporters and the uncertainty of the emperor and his court. Around Christmas of 403, Leontius of Ancyra and Acacius of Beroea, who had fled the city after the Council of the Oak, felt safe enough to return to Constantinople. Their encouragement of the emperor was not without effect, and Arcadius refused to hold further communion with John. The stalemate continued through a tense Lent; the clergy hostile to John continued to strengthen the resolve of the court, and Chrysostom met with some forty-two bishops who supported him. Throughout these difficulties, we are told, the faithful (laos) continued to enjoy his sermons.

Finally, not long before Easter of 404, John's enemies further gained the confidence of Arcadius. They appear to have done this by suggesting that the bishop be encouraged to leave the city voluntarily. This was a compromise which would suit the weak emperor: neither John's followers nor God could be angry with the emperor, and there would be no dispute concerning his successor's election. Any further reluctance to act on the part of the emperor was overcome by the assertion that John was already regarded as a heretic by the populace of the city; almost no one supported him, his adversaries claimed.

The approaching feast of Easter was suggested as the best time to force John to "resign" from his position. Arcadius wrote simply to the bishop "Leave the church!" (ἐξελθε ἐκ της εκκλησίας). But John refused, saying that he would not go voluntarily. Accordingly, an official was dispatched to remove John to the episcopal residence and confine him there. This was probably done in an attempt to intimidate John into resigning, but it reminds one of the other half-measures taken by the court in the affair. The imprisonment of the bishop would test popular reaction and determine whether another exile would incur the wrath of God.

As Holy Week drew to a close, Arcadius sent John another message, again demanding that he leave the church—here obviously meaning that he should leave the city. John refused, as before, and the emperor was thrown into confusion; he wished John to be out of the city by Easter, but he did not want to defile the holiday with violence, and the city was already in turmoil as a result of John's imprisonment. Hurriedly, Arcadius consulted with Antiochus of Ptolemais and others who opposed
John. They reassured the emperor and comforted his conscience by offering to take all the responsibility for John's deposition upon themselves. Matters had clearly come to a head, and all the city awaited the violence which seemed certain to follow. Forty of John's followers approached the empress and begged that the holy festival not be dishonored by bloodshed.\textsuperscript{111}

Throughout this period, Chrysostom's enemies continued their attempt to convince the court that John had lost his popular support, although they apparently did nothing to reduce that popularity. Thus, just before Easter they closed the churches to all of John's clerical supporters, hoping that the faithful would assemble as usual, even though the clergy they found in the churches would be universally hostile to John. Instead of this, however, John's followers, under the leadership of the clergy loyal to him, gathered to celebrate the Resurrection in the Baths of Constantius.\textsuperscript{112}

The enemies of John had been watchful, however, and by means of their spies they learned of this assembly. A group of bishops begged the \textit{magister officiorum} to disperse the gathering lest the emperor find the church empty and learn of John's popularity.\textsuperscript{113} The magistrate refused at first, saying that it was night; because of the size of the crowd, something unexpected might happen. Finally, he unwillingly ordered a certain Lucius, reputed to be a pagan, to go to the Baths.\textsuperscript{114} He was to command the faithful to disperse and proceed to the church, but he was not to resort to violence. The supporters of John refused to obey his command, and Lucius returned to the bishops—not, significantly, to the \textit{magister officiorum}. They persuaded Lucius, by holding out the promise of promotion, to agree to use whatever force was necessary to prevent the festival from being celebrated outside the church.

He set off immediately, in the second watch of the night, accompanied by the clergy of the party of Acacius... He had with him four hundred newly-enlisted Thracian swordsmen, completely reckless individuals. With them and with the clergy as guides, he eagerly attacked the crowd (\textit{ochloi}). With his flashing sword he cut his way through to the blessed waters. He prevented the celebration of the Savior's resurrection and, seizing the deacons, he poured out the sacramental elements. Priests, already advanced in age, he beat about the head with clubs, and the font was stained with blood... Women ran away naked at the sides of their husbands, forgetting their shame in fear of murder or dishonor. Here a man flees, crying and with a wounded hand, there another drags off a virgin, tearing off her clothes as he goes. They are all carrying away the booty they have collected.\textsuperscript{115}

The supporters of John apparently made no attempt to resist the uncontrolled violence of the soldiers. They were unprepared for the attack, and they could only flee in disarray. The choice of Lucius by the \textit{magister officiorum} may have been purely arbitrary or necessitated by his rank as tribune, but it was perhaps not accidental that a pagan held such a
position in a city torn by feuds among Christians. Further, the soldiers used in the attack were undoubtedly also pagans who enjoyed the discomfiture of Christians: they were from outside Constantinople and thus had no ties or loyalties to individuals or groups within the city. Perhaps many of the soldiers who had been stationed in and around Constantinople for some time had become supporters of Chrysostom, and their use in this particular mission would not have been practical.

The clergy seized during the attack were imprisoned and the officers among the faithful (ἀξιωματικοί τοῦ λαοῦ) expelled from the city.\textsuperscript{116} As news of the incident spread throughout the city, many people joined in the lamentation; even heretics, Jews, and pagans are said to have sympathized with the injured.\textsuperscript{117}

The next day the supporters of John—who from this time were called Johannites—assembled outside the city in the area called the Pempton, there to celebrate Easter Sunday. The emperor, on an early morning ride, chanced upon them and was amazed by the large number of newly baptized, supposedly about 3,000. John's enemies, who were accompanying the emperor, were quick to assure him that they were heretics and sent the most reckless of their company to disperse the assembly. The newly baptized, "instructed in peace by John," did not resist, and many of the clergy and laity were arrested, including the wives of distinguished men (ἀνδρῶν ἐπισήμων).\textsuperscript{118}

In all this confusion and violence, the attempt to remove John from his see had failed, although he remained a virtual prisoner in the episcopal residence, and his followers had openly broken with the other ecclesiastical authorities. A new stalemate had been reached, but tension was in the air, and the dispute spread beyond Constantinople.\textsuperscript{119} Further, at least two attempts were made on John's life. A voluntary guard formed to protect the bishop thwarted these, but two passers-by were killed in the melee. The officials, meanwhile, took no measures to protect the life of John until forced to do so by the public outcry against his continual harrassment.\textsuperscript{120}

For two months, Chrysostom remained in the episcopal palace, and during this time the emperor must surely have become aware of the support which he continued to enjoy among the inhabitants of the city. Nevertheless, just after Pentecost, John's enemies again approached Arcadius and reiterated their willingness to take full responsibility for the bishop's expulsion. At this time, they also advanced the argument which was at last to end the indecision of the emperor. They claimed that John was the cause of the popular unrest which had been disturbing the city. This would not end, they argued, unless John were expelled from the city.\textsuperscript{121}

Persuaded by this, the emperor sent a notarius with a message to John
telling him again to prepare to leave. Meanwhile a “certain pious influential man”—that is, a friend of John’s at court— informed the bishop that Lucius, the tribune, was with his soldiers at the public bath—perhaps the Baths of Zeuxippos—waiting to drag him from the church by force. He further advised John to slip away unnoticed so that the people (demoi) would not come into conflict with the soldiers. John realized that the long period of uncertainty had ended, and he made his preparations. He bade farewell to the deaconesses and had them hidden from the crowds outside—who were still guarding him from violence—so that their discomfiture would not betray his departure. He then escaped the notice of the crowd and went voluntarily into exile.122

Profiting from their earlier experience, John’s enemies realized the danger of the hostile popular mood, and they made the first move against his supporters, probably even before it was generally known that John had departed the city. Palladius reported that as soon as John left the church, soldiers rushed upon it and, amid the cheers of Jews and pagans, they cruelly beat many people.123 Sozomen, moreover, says specifically that John’s enemies feared that the faithful (laos) would “go forward and try to bring John back again by force.”124 Accordingly, they locked the doors of Hagia Sophia, where many of John’s supporters were kept immobilized.

When John’s departure was discovered, the news spread quickly throughout the city. Everywhere people feared that a general persecution of the Johannites would follow. A great panic seized the populace, and many tried to reach the sea and flee the city in boats. Meanwhile, those inside Hagia Sophia were at first unable to force their way out of the building, since they all rushed toward the exits and threw themselves against the doors, which opened inward. Finally some of the stone work around the doors broke loose, and those within escaped. But just at this time, the church suddenly broke into flame.125

The conflagration raged the whole of the night following John’s expulsion, and it was extinguished the next day only after it had completely destroyed the great church of Constantinople, the Senate house, and many nearby buildings. In the view of Palladius, the fire was an act of God, divine retribution against the enemies of Chrysostom.126 Some of the Johannites, however, accused their enemies of setting the fire in an attempt to burn them at the same time.127 It is not impossible that the opponents of the Johannites thought of such an expedient; the supporters of John were trapped in the church, and a similar example had occurred only four years earlier in the burning of the Gothic church.

Nevertheless, the weight of the ancient testimony suggests that it was the Johannites themselves who started the fire. According to Zosimus, the purpose of the Johannites was not simply to burn the church, but to destroy the city as a whole:
Disturbed at this [John's exile] and resolved that no one would succeed him as bishop of the city, they decided to destroy the city by fire. In this way they secretly set fire to the church at night.  

These are the feelings of desperate men: if John was not bishop, there would be no more church and no more city! One is reminded of the actions of certain heretical groups when faced with condemnation and the destruction or conversion of their churches: they gathered solemnly in their religious buildings, set fire to them, and burned themselves to death. In this connection, we should remember that the fire began just as, or possibly before the doors of Hagia Sophia were forced. Perhaps the more extreme among the Johannites planned their own martyrdom.

After describing the exile of John, the Paschal Chronicle reports that:

Suddenly the great church burned, together with the Senate house. The fire was set by the so-called Xylokerketes, who had seized it. . . .

Fortunately, we can identify these mysterious Xylokerketes, or “wooden circus people,” since the followers of Chrysostom, after they had been driven from the Baths of Constantius, assembled in the area of the old wooden hippodrome built by Constantine outside the walls of the city. Thus, from this evidence, we are once again to assume that the Johannites—or at least a part of them—were responsible for the fire. Indeed, there is some reason to think that the fire was set by a small group of the Johannites, perhaps carrying out a coordinated plan. In explaining his story of the supernatural origin of the fire, Palladius stated that the blaze broke out in the Senate house on the side away from the church, while Socrates said that the fire started in that building because there was a strong wind from the east. If we accept the testimony of Palladius, it is difficult to see how a windborne fire could have sprung up on the far side of the building. Further, no modern reconstruction of this area places the Senate house to the west of Hagia Sophia; if the wind were coming from the east the flames would have spread inland toward the center of the city and away from the Senate. The conclusion seems to be that the fire was set simultaneously at several different points.

Later, when the confusion had subsided, Optatus, the praefectus urbi and a pagan who delighted in the difficulties of the Christians, accused some of the leaders of the Johannites of setting the fire. Nevertheless, despite his frequent resort to violent means, he was unable to secure a single confession or conviction. Finally the attempt was abandoned, and an imperial edict ordered the inquiry closed. The failure of the investigation might suggest that the Johannites were innocent of any crime in the matter of the fire, but it may just as well show that the emperor’s men simply questioned the wrong individuals. If those who set the fire comprised a small, possibly even separate group—perhaps the Xylokerketes as opposed to the Johannites as a whole—they might all
have perished in the conflagration. In any case, we may assume that the peace-loving clerics who led the Johannites probably told the truth when they answered that they knew nothing about the origin of the fire.

The Aftermath

Immediately after John's second expulsion, his enemies made a concerted attempt to divide his supporters and to induce them to accept new leadership. Many of the clergy loyal to John were arrested and exiled, and the methods used in the investigation of the fire served to deplete the number of John's most loyal supporters. Further, only five days after John left the city, Arsacius, the aged brother of Chrysostom's predecessor Nectarius, was consecrated bishop of Constantinople. The Johannites, however,

refused to hold communion with him or even pray with him since he associated with the enemies of John. When they continued to... assemble in the farthest part of the city, he [Arsacius] consulted with the emperor about the matter. A tribune was ordered to attack those gathered together and, by means of stones and clubs, he soon put the multitude (plethos) to flight. The most distinguished and most ardent in their support of John (νοού δὲ ἐπισημότερον καὶ προθυμότερον τὰ Ιωάννου ζηλούντας) were imprisoned.

The soldiers, "as they often do," exceeded their orders and began to rob the women of their jewelry. "The city was full of turmoil and lamentation (ταραχή καὶ οἰμωγή), but still they did not abandon their love for John."[36]

Some months later, an extraordinary hailstorm, followed four days later by the sudden death of the empress Eudoxia, strengthened the resolve of the Johannites. Quite naturally, they regarded these events as proof of God's displeasure with the empress' part in the exile of John and a confirmation of the justice of their own schism.[37]

As for John himself, he first crossed the straits to Chalcedon, then proceeded to Cucusa, in Armenia, where he spent most of his exile, writing warm and comforting letters to many of his friends. At length, the court decided to make his residence more remote still, and he was ordered to Pityus, on the Black Sea. During the long and difficult journey he died, on September 17, 407.[38]

Several laws directed against the Johannites provide us with valuable information about the state of affairs in Constantinople and elsewhere during the months immediately following the second and definitive exile of the bishop. The first of these shows that the dispute spread outside the capital and that groups of Johannites sprang up as far afield as Egypt.[39] As in Constantinople, these provincial Johannites were characterized by their refusal to assemble in the churches controlled by the officially recognized hierarchy. Although the emperor admitted that the Johannites
were orthodox, he ordered the provincial governors to forbid their gatherings.

Another law ordered the prosecution of those in Constantinople who sheltered clericos nova ac tumultuosa conventicula extra ecclesiam celebrantes. It further required all “foreign” (perigrini) clerics and bishops to be expelled from the city, lest there be a seditio. Yet another law warned masters not to allow their slaves, and guilds (corpora) not to allow their members, to participate in “tumultuous gatherings” (tumultuosa conventicula), threatening each group with heavy fines in gold for disobedience. Baur has used these latter two laws as evidence for his hypothesis that the Johannites turned to violence after the expulsion of their bishop. These tumultuosa conventicula, however, were simply the religious assemblies of the Johannites, held, as one law states, outside the city and “in the farthest part of the city.” There is no need to assume that tumultuosus suggested any violence, since the term might have a political or moral, as well as a more literal, significance. The emperor and his court did not like the religious services of the Johannites; therefore, they were tumultuosa. In addition, of course, the very existence of these dissident gatherings was a disturbance to the official church. The seditio mentioned in one of the laws would seem to refer more directly to violence, but instead of providing evidence that the Johannites had resorted to violence, the text shows clearly that, as of the date of the law, a seditio had not yet occurred: the clerics and bishops were to be expelled so that such an event would not take place.

Sozomen, as we have seen, noted that the city was filled with tarache. But again, this does not seem to mean that the Johannites engaged in violence, for taken in context the word must refer either to what the soldiers did to the Johannites or to the fear and uncertainty experienced by the latter in such circumstances. In sum, apart from the incident of the burning of Hagia Sophia, which was isolated and unique, there is no evidence of any violence committed by the Johannites in the period after the second exile of the bishop. Clearly, the emperor feared violence from the supporters of John, but the Johannites do not appear even to have presented their desires openly to the court. Their attitude was one of passive resistance characterized by a firm refusal to participate in the worship of the official church.

As time went on, the government continued to issue edicts against the Johannites, ordering them to hold communion with the regular hierarchy. It enforced these demands with periodic persecution, so that “many (polloi) feared to frequent the market place and the baths.” Some even considered flight from the city in order to save their lives. Despite these difficulties, the Johannites flourished. When Atticus succeeded Arsacius as bishop, sometime in 406, he complained that none of the faithful of the city would hold communion with him. Yet, during all this time, there is
no indication that the Johannites met for other than religious purposes. Regardless of the persecution, their meetings did not turn into violent protests against the religious policy of the state.

Atticus was an astute ecclesiastical politician, and he undoubtedly took measures to restore the Johannites to communion; but they remained firm in their loyalty to Chrysostom. Ultimately, probably about 415, Atticus admitted defeat and restored John's name to the diptychs of Constantinople. In a letter to Cyril of Alexandria, he excused himself by saying that he was forced to act by the insistence of the emperor and the people. Almost certainly, in light of the intransigence of the Johannites, he saw this as the only way to heal the schism. Further, John was already dead and the restoration of his memory was not a threat to Atticus; indeed, it would only add to his reputation. Veneration of Chrysostom continued to be popular after the restoration, and in 428 Nestorius introduced a feast in honor of his predecessor in Constantinople. Finally, ten years later, Theodosius II had John's remains brought to the capital amid popular rejoicing that impressed contemporaries and posterity alike.

Several distinctions may be made between the disturbances which characterized the first exile of Chrysostom and the events which accompanied his final expulsion. In the first instance, John's enemies appear originally to have attempted to alienate the bishop's popular support: Theophilus tried to discredit John by accusing him of defending the errors of Origenism. When this failed, all plans to separate John from his popular support appear, strangely, to have been abandoned. Perhaps the enemies of the bishop underestimated the affection with which John was regarded, and the reaction to his exile seems to have taken the court completely by surprise. The authorities made little or no attempt to stop or even control the demonstrations, and the officials sent to seize John and carry him into exile were not able to complete their mission. In the face of unified and resolute popular opinion, the court found itself unable to maintain its decision, and John was recalled from exile. The demonstration in John's behalf, while not the only factor involved, was probably the most important consideration leading to the reversal of imperial policy. Victorious after the capitulation of the emperor, John's supporters engaged in violent confrontations with the monks and Egyptians, and they greeted the bishop's return en masse by forcing him immediately to resume his episcopal duties.

The second series of events was significantly different. It may even be doubted that the Johannites took the initiative in protesting the second exile. The difference stemmed from the determination of John's enemies to prevent a repetition of the earlier disturbances, which had had an unfortunate (from their point of view) effect on the emperor. Instead of trying to separate John from his popular support, they planned simply to
neutralize any demonstration by an overwhelming use of force. When violence came, it was directed by John’s enemies, and the supporters of the bishop had no opportunity to organize themselves or even resist. When John went into exile, they were shut up in the church; and when they reassembled later, they were attacked by soldiers and their leaders were arrested. The only active protest which the Johannites managed was a desperate one: the fire which destroyed Hagia Sophia and an important part of the city.

It is unlikely that the enthusiasm of John’s followers had weakened significantly between the two events; in the second they were simply powerless to effect their wishes. Moreover, the personality and moral philosophy of John himself must have affected the popular response to his deposition. As we have already seen, John was an opponent of violence, and he took every opportunity to avoid involving his followers in a confrontation with the state. In the first case, events moved swiftly and John was out of the city (and hence his direct influence with the crowd reduced) within a relatively short time—at most three days. Thus, his followers gave way to their own feelings, and ultimately resorted to violence and even bloodshed in his behalf. In the second case, the open confrontation began well before John left the city, and there is ample evidence to show that he used his authority with the crowd to restrain their anger and opposition to the policy of the court. Thus, by the time John went into exile for the second time, his supporters had been cowed by the soldiers, and the moment for resistance, or even protest, had been lost. In such a situation, the Johannites could hardly dare more than the passive resistance which they offered. This hopelessness, however, led to despair among a few of the faithful, and they set the fire which destroyed Hagia Sophia.

The poor of Constantinople were among the most ardent of John’s followers; to them the bishop’s social and moral philosophy appealed most directly. His support for their needs, his condemnation of the rich, and his willingness to stand against the powerful of the world—as John the Baptist stood against the court of Herod—must have appealed powerfully to simple men. But his oratory, strict morality, and asceticism were attributes that were appreciated not only by the poor; many people of more elevated status supported Chrysostom.

Thus, the Codex mentions slaves as potential Johannites, but it also points to other supporters whom we would perhaps place in the middle of society: members of the guilds and government bureaucrats. In addition, men and women of the highest situation were attracted by the teaching and the personality of John. These were the officers and distinguished men, as well as the bishops who remained loyal to John and who provided leadership for the Johannites after Chrysostom went into exile. Among these people were Nicarete, a woman from an illustrious
family in Bithynia, and the deaconness Olympiadae. The former was noted for her charity toward the poor and her knowledge of medicine, while the latter proved to be an intellectual match for the prefect Optatus who supported John in his exile from her own funds.151

This social and economic mixture among John’s supporters suggests that there were no “hidden” social or economic motives involved in these events. Despite the fondness of the poor for Chrysostom, we cannot, except in the most restricted sense, regard the outburst of popular fervor in his behalf as socially or economically oriented. The followers of John expressed their anger at his deposition simply because they actually supported their bishop, not because they wished to use the opportunity to strike at the rich or express any other secular concern.

As is normally the case, it is impossible to say much about the numbers of those who openly displayed their opposition to the two condemnations of Chrysostom. Obviously, we should not take the sources literally when they imply that all the people of Constantinople rose to support their bishop. Yet, we know of absolutely no popular opposition to John’s episcopacy and the one figure we have gives the number of newly baptized Johannites in 404 as 3,000! His enemies, on the other hand, included members of the court, monks, Egyptian sailors, and a handful of ecclesiastics from within and outside Constantinople. From all we can tell, popular sentiment in the capital was overwhelmingly in favor of the bishop, to the point that he could, on occasion, count on the sympathy if not the support of pagans, heretics, and Jews.

Aside from his apparent holiness, the most important factor in explaining John’s popularity was his ability to appeal to a wide body of public opinion. As we have seen, he remained above politics and followed a course of strict and outspoken morality. Those chastized by the moralizing bishop became his implacable enemies, but even they could not deny the basis on which the charges were made, while a more objective observer might feel that John had acted correctly, if perhaps unwisely, since honest morality is rarely good politics.152 Support for John was thus a very simple matter: to many people he was a kind and saintly bishop who was persecuted for having dared to speak the truth about the powerful of the world.

John’s enemies made a serious miscalculation when they decided to ignore his popular support. In particular, they missed an opportunity by failing to sustain a charge of heresy. Only by following such a course are they likely to have confused the issues sufficiently and brought people to question the desirability of supporting his cause. The government, as we have seen, found it had to consider public opinion. It could, when properly prepared, expel John from the city and overwhelm his supporters with superior force, but the moral position of the Johannites was unassailable, and they remained an embarrassment to the church and
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proof that the emperor had failed in his responsibility to preserve the unity of orthodox Christianity.

1. The best sources for the life of John Chrysostom are, of course, his own works, found scattered throughout PG. They must be supplemented by the Dialogus of Palladius (Palladii Dialogus de Vita S. Johannis Chrysostomi, ed. P. R. Coleman-Norton [Cambridge, 1928], which is almost contemporary but was written for the purpose of redeeming the memory of the deposed bishop, and the ecclesiastical historians, particularly Socrates (PG 67) and Sozomen (GCS 50). The most important secondary source is Chrysostomus Baur, Der heilige Johannes Chrysostomus und seine Zeit (hereafter cited as HJC), 2 vols. (Munich, 1929–30), translated as John Chrysostom and His Time by M. Gonzaga, 2 vols. (Westminster, Md., 1959), which has an extensive bibliography and discussion of sources. See also Louis Duchesne, Early History of the Christian Church, trans. Claude Jenkins, vol. 3 (London, 1924), pp. 40-75. On the date of John’s birth, see Baur, HJC, vol. 1, pp. 3–4.

Palladius says that Chrysostom’s father was stratelates of Syria (Dialogus, p. 28). It is not certain what the rank of stratelates signified. John himself states that the stratelates ranked third in the province (Hom. 3.3 in Act. Ap. PG 60, 37–38). Socrates called Gainas stratelates after he became the supreme commander of the eastern army. Thus, it might mean anything from dux to magister militum. Little consistency apparently attended the use of the term. See O. Hirschfeld, “Die Rangtitel der römischen Kaiserzeit,” in his Kleine Schriften (Berlin, 1913), pp. 646–81. On John’s inheritance, see his De Sacerdotio 1.5 (PG 48, 624).

3. Socrates says that John had planned to become a lawyer, but that he found this calling unsuitable to his spiritual temperament (Hist. Eccl. 6.3) and while Socrates says merely that it was expected that John would become a lawyer (Hist. Eccl. 8.2), Palladius indicates that John had always intended to devote himself to the service of God (Dialogus, p. 28). Chrysostom himself is also contradictory: cf. De Sacerdotio 1.4 (PG 48, 624) and 1.1 (PG 48, 623). Baur, (HJC, vol. 1, pp. 60–61) makes a good point when he says that John displayed no knowledge of legal procedure in his writings, but he presses the evidence far more than it will bear in maintaining that he never considered a secular career. On the relationship between Chrysostom and Libanius see Socrates Hist. Eccl. 7.3; Sozomen Hist. Eccl. 8.2. But cf. P. Petit, Essai sur la vie et la correspondance du Sophiste Libanius (Paris, 1955), pp. 131–23, and P. Mass, “Libanios und Johannes Chrysostomus,” Sitzungsberichte der preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 2 (1912), 1123–26.

4. Socrates Hist. Eccl. 6.3; Sozomen Hist. Eccl. 8.2. A study of Scripture and theology may have occupied some of Chrysostom’s time (see Baur, HJC, vol. 1, pp. 69–81), but if Socrates is to be believed, training in the ascetic life was the primary concern of Caraterius and Diodorus. On this see Franz Dölger, Byzanz und die europäische Staatenwelt (Ettal, 1953), pp. 197–208. It is interesting that two other members of this asketerion were Theodore of Mopsuestia and Nestorius!

5. Palladius Dialogus, p. 28.

6. Ibid. The first four years of his desert life were spent under the direction of a certain old man named Syrus.


Sozomen says that it was levied to pay for protracted war. Its affect on the city population might at first suggest the *collatio lustralis*, but it disturbed so many *viri illustres* that it might have been the *aurum coronarium*, which would have affected many rich landowners living in the city. See Browning, “The Riot of A.D. 387?,” pp. 12–15. The date of the riot is also controversial; Theodoret and Zosimus place it in 392, but see Baur, *HJC*, vol. 1, pp. 279–80.


13. See *Hom. 6 de Statuis ad Pop. Ant.* (PG 49, 82), where Chrysostom used the event to stress the necessity of obedience to duly constituted authority.


20. Palladius *Dialogus*, p. 29.

21. Sozomen *Hist. Eccl.* 7.2; *Socrates Hist. Eccl.* 6.2. Isidore had been a monk in the Nitrian desert and in 397 he was in charge of strangers and the poor for the Alexandrian church. Sozomen says that Theophilus nominated Isidore out of gratitude for some earlier service and only after John arrived in Constantinople and was ready for consecration. Although it seems that Theophilus himself came to the city only at this time, it is most unlikely that he kept his candidate unknown until then. Cf. Baur, *HJC*, vol. 2, pp. 10–11.


23. Palladius *Dialogus*, p. 29.

24. Eutropius had carried out a similarly surprising plan in marrying Arcadius to Eudoxia, a daughter of a Frankish general, just a short time earlier. On Eutropius and the situation at the court during this period see Alan Cameron, *Claudian: Poetry and Propaganda at the Court of Honorius* (Oxford, 1970), pp. 124–55.

25. Palladius *Dialogus*, p. 29. Baur, *HJC*, vol. 2, p. 13, suggests the influence of Caesarius, one of the ambassadors from the court to Antioch in 387. He had been appointed consul for 397 and his religious concern is suggested by his foundation of a church to St. Thyrso in Constantinople (Sozomen *Hist. Eccl.* 9.2); Theodoret says (*Hist. Eccl.* 5.27) that the emperor chose John. Arcadius certainly agreed with the selection, but considering all we know about the relations among the members of the imperial court at this time, it is much


27. Sozomen *Hist. Eccl.* 8.2; Palladius *Dialogus*, pp. 29-30; Theodore of Trimithus (*PG* 47, 62). The title and name of the officer differ in the sources, but all agree on the secrecy of the mission and the reason for it.

28. Socrates *Hist. Eccl.* 6.2. The *synaxaria*, however, give December 15, 397. The discrepancy may be resolved by assuming that the earlier date refers to his arrival in the city, the latter to his actual enthronement. See Baur, *HJC*, vol. 2, pp. 19-20.


30. Rarely were defeated candidates for an episcopal election content with the decision. Such men were always a threat to a bishop. Cf. Sozomen *Hist. Eccl.* 7.11; Socrates *Hist. Eccl.* 7.40; Palladius *Dialogus*, p. 64.

31. For a discussion of the problem of the "stranger" as bishop, see below, chapter 4.

32. Sozomen *Hist. Eccl.* 8.3; Theodoret *Hist. Eccl.* 5.28; Socrates *Hist. Eccl.* 6.4; Palladius *Dialogus*, pp. 31-32. It is probable, as we have indicated above, that much laxity had developed during the administration of Nectarius.

33. Palladius *Dialogus*, pp. 31-33.

34. Socrates *Hist. Eccl.* 6.4. That these stories about John continued to circulate into the mid-fifth century shows that a tradition hostile to him must have existed (even though it could be turned to the bishop's own advantage by Sozomen). Part of this may have stemmed from the pagan Eunapius who was openly antagonistic toward Chrysostom, but there may have been a hostile Christian source as well.

35. As is well known, Chrysostom ate alone; this was later to be one of the charges brought against him. In eliminating episcopal entertainment he offended the many who had come to expect it (Palladius *Dialogus*, pp. 79-80), and he undoubtedly earned the displeasure of the cooks, grocers, butchers, entertainers, etc. who had become the clients of the bishop and depended on the lavish outlays that were frequent during the time of Nectarius.

Apparently there was already one hospital in Constantinople and Chrysostom founded others. Palladius *Dialogus*, pp. 33; 69-71. He may have been influenced in this by the example of his friend St. Basil (cf. Basil, *Ep.* 94, *PG* 32, 448). About 400 a certain Florentius (or Florus) built a hospice in Constantinople and later a whole series of hospitals opened. See Baur, *HJC*, vol. 2, pp. 55-56. Cf. C. Th. 12.3.8 (370), which established a public physician for all but two of the regions of Rome. There must have been a similar institution in Alexandria, of which Isidore may have been the director. J. Pargorie, "Les débuts de monachisme à Constantinople," *Revue des questions historique* 65 (1899), 92; Ad. d.-Aès, "L'Hospitalité chrétienne aux IVe et Ve siècle," *Études* 189 (1926), 75-76; A. Philipsborn, "Der Fortschritt in der Entwicklung des byzantinischen Krankhauswesens," *BZ* 54 (1961), 338-65. Cf. G. Dagron, "Les moines et la ville," *Travaux et Mémoires*, 4 (1970), 229-76.


37. *Horn 11 contra Anomoeos* (*PG* 48, 796-98). Even though Arianism was not to be a serious threat to the East after 381, there were still many Arians in Constantinople. They obviously still felt strong enough and devoted enough to engage in violence with the orthodox on several occasions. As late as 415 the government had to threaten the Eunomian clergy with the confiscation of their property if they continued to use their house in Constantinople for heretical worship: C. Th. 16.5.58 (415).

38. Socrates *Hist. Eccl.* 6.8; Sozomen *Hist. Eccl.* 8.8. The Arians probably sang short additions to or parodies of orthodox hymns (such as the Monophysites' addition to the Trisagion)—e.g., their mocking rhetorical question: "Where are those who say the three have one power?" The importance of songs and slogans as vehicles of religious propaganda should not be underestimated and we will have occasion to discuss them again. During the period of Arian ascendancy similar practices developed in Antioch (Sozomen *Hist. Eccl.* 4, 28). An earlier attempt to express theological opinion in popular songs was the *Thalia* of...
Arius, a collection which was "loose and dissolute, similar in style and metres to the songs of Sotades" (Socrates Hist. Eccl. 1.9). The sources do not say how the violence in Constantinople ended: whether one side "won" or if official force had to be used to restore peace.

39. Sozomen (Hist. Eccl. 8.5) says generally that he converted many pagans (perhaps Goths?) and Theodoret (Hist. Eccl. 5.29) reports that he had various temples destroyed in Phocinia; further, he supported as best he could the petition of Porphyry against the pagans in Gaza (Marcus Diaconus Vita Porphyrii 37, ed. H. Grégoire and M. A. Kugener, p. 32). It is unlikely that many pagans would have liked such a fiercely Christian bishop (cf. Zosimus' attitude), but none of Chrysostom's recorded confrontations with pagans were of an extraordinary nature and it is not certain that any of them took place in Constantinople.

40. The monks regarded him as "difficult and passionate, crude and arrogant" (Sozomen Hist. Eccl. 8.9). On the early history of Constantinopolitan monasticism see E. Marin, Les moines de Constantinople depuis la foundation de la ville jusqu'à la mort de Photius, 330–898 (Paris, 1897), which must be seriously modified by the studies of J. Pargoire, "Les Débuts du monachisme," and more recently Gilbert Dagron, "Les moines et la ville."

41. De Compunctione 2.2 (PG 47, 413); De Sacerdotio, 6.6-8 (PG 48, 682-85); De Virginitate 4 (PG 48, 536); Hom. 44.1 in Matt. (PG 57, 463ff.); Hom. 21, 6 in Gen. (PG 53, 182–83); Hom. 7, 4 in Heb. (PG 63, 67–68); cf. Quasten, Patrology, vol. 3 (Utrecht, 1960), pp. 463–64.

42. There is, to my knowledge, no really satisfactory modern treatment of St. Isaac. He was a Syrian monk who came to Constantinople late in the fourth century. He is now generally considered the "founder" of Constantinopolitan monasticism. According to Callinicus, the author of the Vita S. Hypatii (ed. and trans. G. J. M. Bartelink, Paris, 1971, p. 74) there was in 384, when Hypatius came to Constantinople, only one monastery in the city, that of Isaac. Pargoire ("Les Débuts du monachisme") shows that there were no permanent monastic establishments in Constantinople before the time of Isaac. A holy man named Isaac accosted the emperor Valens and requested that he return the churches to the orthodox. When he refused, Isaac predicted his approaching death. The emperor then rode off to Adrianople (Sozomen Hist. Eccl. 6. 40). It is possible that this was the same Isaac. It is much more difficult to be sure that the Isaac who opposed Chrysostom and left for Alexandria with Theophilus (see below) was the same person as the founder of monasticism in Constantinople. The chief difficulty lies in the fact that the vita of St. Isaac (AASS, 30 May, vol. 7, pp. 246ff.) indicates that he died during the reign of Theodosius the Great. Pargoire ("Les Débuts du monachisme," pp. 122-24) identifies the two Isaacs and discounts the evidence of the vita by citing the nearly contemporary vita of St. Hypatius, which indicates that Isaac was still alive in 406. See also J. Pargoire, "Date de la morte de St. Isaac," Échos d'Orient 2 (1898–99), 138–45. That Isaac was not fondly remembered—and thus may have opposed Chrysostom—may be suggested by the fact that his monastery was not named after him but after his successor Dalmatius. This monastery—ta Dalmatou—was located just outside the Constantinian walls near the Xerolophos and the porta Satorninou (Janin, Constantinople byzantine, 2nd ed., pp. 86–89).

43. Dagron, "Les moines et la ville."

44. Socrates Hist. Eccl. 8.5.


46. Sozomen Hist. Eccl. 8.5.


48. Socrates Hist. Eccl. 6.5; Palladius Dialogus, p. 33.

49. Sermo de Eleemosyna (PG 51, 251–72). In the 90 sermons on the Gospel of St. Matthew, Baur counts 40 sermons on the theme of almsgiving. John himself admitted that it was a favorite topic: "Perhaps someone will object that day after day I preach on almsgiving and love of one's neighbor. Of course! And I will continue to speak about it. For if you were perfect in this virtue, even then I would not dare stop for fear of making you negligent."
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Horn. 88.3 in Mathh., PG 58, 779. Bury says (History of the Later Roman Empire, 2nd ed., vol. 1 of 2 vols. [London, 1923], p. 139) that Chrysostom was “almost a socialist.” Even in exile in remote Armenia John was popular and loved by all around him, not only because of the money he dispensed, but also because of his kind words and advice (Sozomen Hist. Eccl. 8.27).

50. The Biblical text upon which this was based is Ecclesiasticus 13.27-28; Chrysostom Expositio in Psalmum 48 (PG 55, 221).

51. Hom. 21 in Epist. I ad Cor. (PG 61, 176-77). This sermon is particularly interesting. In it John blamed the rich for the existence of robbers, traitors, informers, and tramps. Ordinary people, he claimed, had fallen to such positions because the rich had made them covetous by constantly making a show of their wealth in the sight of the poor. The poor, then, without any other means to attain wealth, turned to crime. He advised the rich to make no show of their wealth and to bestow gifts freely on the poor before they arrived at such terrible expedients.

52. Hom. 9 in Epist. II ad Cor. (PG 61, 461-64). John says on many occasions that the poor were happier in this life than the rich. This, however, was probably meant for the consideration of the rich rather than the poor. Cf. Hom. 1 and 2 de Status ad Pop. Ant. (PG 49, 15-48).

53. Horn. 14 and 15 ad Pop. Ant. (PG 49, 153 and 159); Hom. 3. 1 de Diablo Tent. (PG 49, 263-64); Hom. 3. 1-2 de David et Saul (PG 54, 695-97); Hom. contra Ludus et Theatros (PG 56, 263-70). For the popularity of the spectacles, see Ammianus Marcellinus Res Gestae 14. 6, 25; 28. 4, 29; Ludwig Friedlaender, Darstellungen aus der Sittengeschichte Roms, 10th ed., vol. 2 (Leipzig, 1922), pp. 1-20; and Alan Cameron, Porphyrius the Charioteer (Oxford, 1973).


56. Bury, Later Roman Empire, vol. 1, p. 133; Stein, Histoire, vol. 1, pp. 235-37; Synesius de providentia seu Aegyptus (PG 66, 1209-82); Alan Cameron, Claudian, pp. 124-55; Claudian in Eutropium: C. Th. 9.40, 17 (399); Philostorgius Historia Ecclesiastica 9.6; Socrates Hist. Eccl. 5.6; Sozomen Historia Eccl. 8.7; Zosimus Historia Nova 5.12-18. Socrates says that the city was full of barbarians and that the citizens felt as they they were captives.

57 Zosimus Historia Nova 5.19, ed. Mendelsohn. Manojlovic (“Le peuple de Constantinople”) interpreted this event as one of the first examples of the use of the Διώκται as a militia to defend the city, but cf. Cameron, Circus Factiones, pp. 105-125.

58. Sozomen Hist. Eccl. 8.4; Chron. Pasch., ed. Bonn, p. 567; Socrates Hist. Eccl. 6.6; Zosimus Historia Nova 5.19, pp. 238-39; Theodoret Hist. Eccl. 5.32-35; Marcellinus Comes Chronicon, ed. Mommsen, p. 66. According to Sozomen the soldiers of the emperor set fire to the church “so that they could not flee because the gates (πυλαι) were closed.” What gates were closed? The context would appear to suggest the gates of the city, but they might be the doors of the church. The Paschal Chronicle dates this to July 12, 400 and says that a large number of Christians (i.e., presumably orthodox Romans) were burned also. If this were the case, we should have to interpret the effect of this incident somewhat differently. Zosimus reports that a large number of Christians were disturbed by the burning of the barbarians, presumably because their murder in a church— in the center of the city at that—was a sacrilege. It is unlikely, however, that Chrysostom was implicated in any way with the death of the Goths in the church.

59. This was one of the primary characteristics of John’s personality, as the sources time and again reveal. He was not a politician but a moralist who could be honest with all conditions of people. This earned for him powerful enemies and devoted followers from various factions and segments of society. Cf. Socrates Hist. Eccl. 6.3.

60. Chrysostom In Eutropium and De Capto Eutropio (PG 52, 391-414).

61. Theodoret Hist. Eccl. 5.32-33, is the only mention of the embassy to Gainas. For Chrysostom's opposition to Gainas, see Theodoret Hist. Eccl. 5.32-35; Socrates Hist. Eccl. 6.5; Sozomen Hist. Eccl. 8.4.
62. Socrates Hist. Eccl. 6.15; Sozomen Hist. Eccl. 8.16; Zosimus Historia Nova 5.23; Palladius Dialogus, p. 45. Eudoxia was certainly not ill-disposed toward John from the beginning. For example, she aided him in the campaign against the Arian processions.

63. The reasons given for the quarrel between the monks and their bishop are extremely interesting and valuable as information on ecclesiastical relationships in Egypt. See Palladius Dialogus, pp. 34–39; Socrates Hist. Eccl. 6.7; Sozomen Hist. Eccl. 8.11. Sozomen says that certain Egyptian monks thought of God as a corporeal being and when Theophilus condemned them for this "they rose in revolt (ἐστασίζον) and they wanted to kill Theophilus as impious. The patriarch confronted the insurgents simply by reversing his former position. He condemned Origen and so pacified the monks. Theophilus then accused certain monks, whom he disliked for other reasons, of Origenism. One of the monks, when he learned the Theophilus had denied the idea that God had a body (arms, legs, and all) just as a man, cried out, "They have taken away my God!"


66. Sozomen Hist. Eccl. 8.14. The technique of claiming that a person is a heretic by comparing or associating him with a known heretic was a common one and we will meet it again. What is significant in the present instance is that the attempt was unsuccessful.


68. Socrates says that Serapion also advised Epiphanius that his actions were in violation of canons which forbade the interference of one bishop in the affairs of another.


70. Sozomen Hist. Eccl. 8.15–16; Socrates Hist. Eccl. 6.15–16. Cf. Sozomen Hist. Eccl. 8.17: "the fleet of the Alexandrians, those who happened to be present, both from the other ships but especially from the grain ships, gathered together and praising him enthusiastically they received him." By the sixth century at least the bishops of Alexandria had a very close relationship with the Egyptian fleets, especially the grain fleet, and this text suggests that the Egyptian sailors could be relied upon as strong supporters of the bishop at an earlier date. See the Vita Johannis Eleemosynarii, Anal. Bolland. 45 (1927), 19–73, and George R. Monks, "The Church of Alexandria," pp. 349–62.

71. Sozomen Hist. Eccl. 8.17; Socrates Hist. Eccl. 6.15. Theophilus probably stayed at an imperial palace, identified by Socrates as τα Πλακίδιας. There were at least two palaces of this name, one in the first region, the other in the tenth region, in the northwest area of the city toward the Constantinian walls: Janin, Constantinople byzantine, 2nd ed., pp. 135-36. John "himself" says that Theophilus stayed outside the city (Palladius Dialogus, pp. 8–9). This reference, like many others, is from a letter included in Palladius' Dialogus and supposedly written by John to Pepe Innocent, explaining the situation up to the time of his second exile. This letter is probably authentic, for Sozomen has a copy of Innocent's reply. But it was almost certainly edited by Palladius, even though he has allowed some inconsistencies between the letter and the rest of his narrative to slip by. See note 112 below and the Introduction to Coleman-Norton's edition of the Dialogus, where this problem is discussed. See also J. F. D'Alton, Selections from St. John Chrysostom (London, 1940), pp. 289–312, which contains a text and commentary of this passage. D'Alton maintains that this letter is authentic because it is so different in style from Palladius (p. 295).

72. Palladius Dialogus, pp. 9. 44.


74. Photius Bibliotheca 59, vol. 2, p. 56. A similar situation had occurred in 342 when Constantius II ordered the general Hermogenes to expel Paul from his episcopal throne. This disturbed the populace and they burned the house of Hermogenes, dragged the helpless
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general through the streets, and murdered him! Constantius had to come from Antioch himself to quell the riot, and he punished the people by cutting the bread ration in half (Socrates Hist. Eccl. 2.13).

75. Palladius Dialogus, p. 51.

76. Sozomen Hist. Eccl. 8.18. On these events see also my comments in "Zosimus 5.23," pp. 61–83.

77. There is some difficulty here: neither Palladius himself (p. 51) nor John's letter preserved in Palladius refer to disturbances at this time. Furthermore, their account of the time and manner in which John left the city differs from what Sozomen says. Naturally, since the Dialogus was written near the time of the events described and both Palladius and John were participants in these events (see Coleman-Norton, lx–lxiii), their silence would count heavily against the account of Sozomen. Perhaps Sozomen confused the disturbances which happened in 404 with those events a year earlier. Yet, Sozomen's account of the episcopacy of Chrysostom is carefully done, and both it and the report of Socrates (who supports Sozomen on these points) may be based independently on the contemporary Christian History of Philip of Side. (See "Zosimus 5.23," pp. 63–64.) Moreover, the only positive contradiction in the sources is that Palladius says John was taken at night and by force, while Sozomen says that he went at noon and willingly. The account of Sozomen is supported by Zosimus, an unlikely ally of the church historian, who says that after John learned of the sentence of deposition he left Constantinople willingly (ἐξελώθη). (Zosimus Historia Nova 5.23.)

78. Palladius Dialogus, p. 11.


80. Sozomen Hist. Eccl. 8.18. Later he says that those at court were moved by the petition of the people (δήμος) (8.19).

81. Socrates Hist. Eccl. 6.16.

82. Theodoret Hist. Eccl. 5.34.

83. Palladius Dialogus, p. 51.


85. This assumes that the sources understood the demands of the demonstrators and reported them accurately. It is always possible that the sources attributed motives to the demonstrators which they never had and secular motives may have been at work here. Nevertheless, at least three separate historiographical traditions bear on this question (including that represented by the pagan Zosimus) and none of them know anything of secular motivation.


87. Zosimus Historia Nova 5.23 (pp. 244–45).

88. For a more detailed analysis of this event see my "Zosimus 5.23."


90. John's letter to Innocent (Palladius Dialogus, p. 11) and Sozomen (Hist. Eccl. 8.19) place this event before his return, while Palladius (Dialogus, p. 51) and Socrates (Hist. Eccl. 6.17) place it afterwards. The latter even dates the departure of Theophilus to the winter of 403. How this is to be related to the investigation of Heraclides by the Council of the Oak is not certain.

In 401 John had openly interfered in the affairs of the see of Ephesus and he even made a personal trip there to settle matters to his own satisfaction. According to Socrates Hist. Eccl. 6.11, John was delayed in Ephesus when the people of the city refused to accept Heraclides and rioted. This is the only incident I know in which John was the target of popular demonstrations. This, however, may easily be explained. The inhabitants of Ephesus did not have the opportunity to observe the qualities for which John was admired by the people of Constantinople, and, of course, they had reason to dislike the interference of any bishop of Constantinople. Before 381 the see of Ephesus, as the capital of Asia, was on at least an equal rank with Constantinople. But the council of Constantinople had raised the bishop of
the capital above all the other eastern bishops. Perhaps the people of Ephesus felt that the "upstart" Constantinople should not precede their own city and that the bishop of Constantinople had no right to interfere in their own ecclesiastical affairs. Cf. Baur, HJC, vol. 2, pp. 119-34.


92. Palladius Dialogus, p. 51.

93. See note 70 above; Evagrius Historia Ecclesiastica, ed. J. Bidez and L. Parmentier (London, 1898), 2.4. (All subsequent references to Evagrius will cite this edition.)

94. Theodoret Hist. Eccl. 5.34.

95. Palladius Dialogus, p. 11. We do not know the identity of these bishops. They may have included some of those who had condemned him a little earlier, although there is every reason to believe a substantial number of bishops did remain loyal to Chrysostom throughout all these difficulties.

96. Socrates Hist. Eccl. 6.16. The location of Marianae is unknown, although it must obviously have lain along the coast of the Bosporus. Sozomen says it was near Anaplous, which is simply the right side of the strait, as one sails south (Janin, Constantinople byzantine, 2nd ed., pp. 468, 515).

97. Hom. Post Reditum ab Exilio (PG 52, 443-48). The authenticity of this sermon is not unquestioned, but the evidence cited here, at least, agrees with what we know about the situation from other sources.

98. Recall Chrysostom's reaction to the riot of 387 and his fear (Sozomen Hist. Eccl. 8.18) that he would be accused of provoking the people to riot.


101. Arcadius ordered Theophilus to attend this council, but he refused, "giving as his excuse the revolt of the people (στάσιν τοῦ δῆμου), and the untimely zeal of those who were opposed to him there, even though this same demos had been full of insults against him before the [arrival of] the imperial letters" (Palladius Dialogus, p. 12). It is uncertain whether the demos here refers to that of Constantinople or Alexandria.


104. Palladius Dialogus, pp. 53-53, ascribed the victory to Elpidius, a friend of John's, but it is clear from this passage and from later events that imperial policy was vacillating. Palladius says that the emperor was not to blame, "but others were changing what had already been wisely established."


106. Palladius Dialogus, p. 54: "the faithful (laoi) enjoyed his teaching with considerable enthusiasm." Cf. C. Th. 16.4. 4 (29 January 404), which forbade members of the various officia from attending the meetings of John's supporters, under penalty of loss of office and confiscation.

107. Palladius Dialogus, p. 54, says that Antiochus and his party persuaded the emperor. Sozomen Hist. Eccl. 8.20, and Socrates Hist. Eccl. 6.18, claim that a council actually condemned John a second time; Palladius knows nothing of this. Throughout all these events one cannot help being amazed at the ignorance of the emperor. This is perhaps one of the worst examples of the evil effects of the isolation of the emperor in the early Byzantine period. He relied on the word of his advisers and it was possible to lead him astray.

108. It is not clear why John's enemies wanted John out of the city by Easter. Perhaps they felt that another important holiday during which the emperor would hold communion with the bishop could not pass with things undecided. Another reason might be that they feared that the great crowds which would gather for the holiday would
demonstrate John’s popularity to Arcadius. Herbert Moore (in his translation of the *Dialogus* [London, 1921], p. 78) suggests that less opposition might be encountered with the people in a holiday mood. This seems to me unconvincing. Bearing in mind the events which followed the first exile, one would think the last thing the plotters would want was the presence of large, idle crowds ready to object again to the exile of their bishop.


110. Palladius *Dialogus*, pp. 55–56: “the tumult (κλόνον), of the city.” MS “G” adds “and of the faithful (laos).”

111. Palladius *Dialogus*, p. 59.

112. It is, unfortunately, all but impossible to untangle the sources at this important point. Socrates (Hist. Eccl. 6.18) says merely that they celebrated the festival in the baths, and Palladius (*Dialogus*, pp. 56–57) says essentially the same thing. In his letter to Innocent (Palladius *Dialogus*, pp. 12–13), however, John says that the assembly took place “in the churches” and implies that he was there at the time (which would be quite possible, if the celebration took place in a church near the episcopelion, where he was confined e.g. Hagia Sophia or St. Irene). That he really means that the assembly was in a church building seems to be indicated by his mention of πάντα τά ἐνδον, which are almost certainly the sacred articles of the church. Finally, Sozomen (Hist. Eccl. 8.21) confuses things completely by mentioning two attacks: one in the church on Easter Eve and another in the baths the next day. His description of the attack in the church parallels the three other accounts, while his mention of the attack in the baths is limited to an observation that people were forced out of the baths and had to go outside of the walls for their assembly.

See Coleman–Norton, pp. 152–53, where the various scholarly opinions on this matter are discussed. If the letter of Chrysostom is authentic, its evidence should probably be given the most weight, since it was written just after the events described. But, as we have seen, there is considerable doubt about that. I must agree with Coleman–Norton, against the majority opinion, that a reconstruction involving just one attack seems preferable, but it is a difficult choice. One might reject Palladius’ explanation of the cause of the attack (that the bishops hostile to John wished to drive the people into the church) and suppose that the soldiers were sent only to disperse the gathering of the Johannites. A second attack could then be explained—as John’s enemies would certainly not tolerate another gathering, even outside the church. Another possible interpretation would be to reject the idea that Chrysostom claimed to have been present and that he meant to indicate that the assembly had been held outside the regular churches (by making another interpretation of πάντα τά ἐνδον).

Although the sources disagree about the site of the first (or only) attack, all of them seem to be describing the same event: the disturbance of the baptismal rites, the flight of the unclothed women, the beating of the clergy. There is, however, no uniformity of terminology so it is impossible to say if there was a common source for all the extant accounts. It appears that all of the accounts we have were derived from separate (oral?) traditions. All but Chrysostom agree that something happened in the baths of Constantius and it would be rash to ignore this evidence.

If the soldiers were trying to drive John’s supporters into the church for the “proper” celebration of Easter—as seems most likely—we should probably postulate a single attack which took place in the baths. In this case there would be no need to attack a gathering in the church such an assembly was exactly what the opponents of John wanted. *Hai Konstantianai* takes its name from the large public bath begun in 345, but often attributed to Constantine the Great. The name was later applied to a large area of the city just to the south of the church of the Holy Apostles, including a palace, churches, and monasteries. But the sources here probably have in mind the more immediate area of the bath. This was not completed until 427 (*Chron. Pasch.*, pp. 580–81) and so the area was still under construction in 404—a suitable place for the semi-secret meeting and the confusion described by the sources. The proximity of the church of the Holy Apostles makes one wonder if this church played any part in this event. Perhaps this was the church used by many of the supporters of John. It will be remembered that Epiphanius had planned to preach his sermon against John in this church. Cf. Janin, *Constantinople byzantine*, 2nd ed., pp. 219–20, 372–73; and Gunter Prinzing and Paul Speck, “Fünf Lokalitäten in Konstantinopel,” in *Studien zur Frühgeschichte Konstantinopels*, ed. H.–G Beck, pp. 179–227.
The officer is simply called *magistros*, but this almost certainly is a reference to the *magister officiorum*, who theoretically commanded the *scholae*. Although the *magister* rarely exercised direct control over the *scholae*—this was usually done by the emperor—under a ruler like Arcadius and in the unusual situation, this would not be impossible. Further, the officer in question acted as though he was not quite sure of his position. If the officer was the *magister officiorum*, his name was Anthemius, who held office from January 29 to July 30, 404 (C. Th. 6.27, 14; 10.22, 5; 16.4, 4).

Lucius, who is otherwise unknown, may have been *tribunus Scutariorum* (probably the *syntagmatarches* of Sozomen Hist. Eccl. 8.23). If the troops he commanded were the *scutarii*, the quality of the recruits had seriously deteriorated since the time of Diocletian. At the time of Justinian each regiment of the *scholae* had 500 men. See Jones, Later Roman Empire, pp. 54, 613-14; Seek's Geschichte des Untergangs, vol. 5, pp. 583-84.

Palladius *Dialogus*, pp. 12-13 (John's letter) and 57-58; Sozomen Hist. Eccl. 8.21. As mentioned above, all the accounts agree in detail as to what happened, although they disagree as to time and place.

Palladius *Dialogus*, p. 58.

Palladius *Dialogus*, p. 13 (from John's letter).

Palladius *Dialogus*, pp. 58-59; Sozomen Hist. Eccl. 8.21; Socrates Hist. Eccl. 6.18. The Pempton was an area just outside the Constantinian walls (five miles from the center of the city, hence its name) to the northwest of the city, probably along the right bank of the Lyceus. Janin, Constantinople byzantine, 2nd ed., p. 454.


Sozomen Hist. Eccl. 8.22.


Palladius *Dialogus*, pp. 60-61; Sozomen Hist. Eccl. 8.22; Socrates Hist. Eccl. 6.18; Theodoret Hist. Eccl. 5.34. Seeck, Geschichte des Untergangs, vol. 5, pp. 336-37, criticizes John for having left his see voluntarily. But, as we have seen, John tried to avoid violence wherever possible and he obviously did not feel justified in taking advantage of the power which the support of the masses gave him. It is interesting that Palladius uses the plural—*demoi*—to refer to the supporters of John. I cannot think that he means the circus factions.

Palladius *Dialogus*, pp. 61-62. The authenticity of this passage has been questioned. See Coleman-Norton, pp. 172-73. Part of the passage is drawn from Philo (Legatio ad Gaium 46) and part from Chrysostom himself (Hom. post Reditum ab Exsilio Suo, PG 52, 444), referring to his first exile. The passage may be suspect because of this apparent plagiarism and because there is no other source for this attack. Yet, it agrees rather well with the account of Sozomen, and we cannot reject the validity of such a passage simply because an author has used someone else's words.

Sozomen Hist. Eccl. 8.22. John himself may even have been in the church when the emperor's message reached him, although there is great difficulty on this point.

Sozomen Hist. Eccl. 8.22.


Sozomen Hist. Eccl. 8.22.

Zosimus Historia Nova 5.24. Socrates Hist. Eccl. 6.18, agrees that the Johannites were responsible.

For example, the Arians when threatened with the confiscation of their churches during the episcopacy of Nestorius (Socrates Hist. Eccl. 7.29) and the Montanists when forcefully converted by Leo III in the eighth century (Theophanes, Chronographia A.M. 6214 [ed. de Boor], p. 401).


Ibid.; Sozomen Hist. Eccl. 8.21. On the Xylokerkos, see Janin, Constantinople byzantine, 2nd ed., pp. 195, 440. Note that Palladius (Dialogus, pp. 58-59) says that the Johannites assembled in the Pempton, which is considerably to the north of the Xylokerkos. This may suggest that the two groups were in some way distinct.

133. Sozomen *Hist. Eccl.* 8.14; Palladius *Dialogus*, p. 63; Socrates *Hist. Eccl.* 6.18. Optatus did not become prefect until 405 and he may have begun the inquiry in another capacity.


135. Among others arrested, the lector Eutropius was tortured in an attempt to learn who had set the fire, but he was able to tell the authorities nothing, although he ultimately died from the treatment he received.


137. Socrates *Hist. Eccl.* 6.19, and Sozomen *Hist. Eccl.* 8.17, both assert that the Johannites viewed these events in such a light.


139. *C. Th.* 16.4, 6 (November 18, 404). Palladius seems to place this edict in 406 under Atticus.

140. *C. Th.* 16.2, 37 (August 29, 404). This is the law mentioned above which ordered the inquiry concerning the fire to be closed.

141. *C. Th.* 16.4, 5 (September 11, 404).


144. Palladius *Dialogus*, pp. 64–65. Optatus tried persuasion, as well as violence in his attempt to reunite the Johannites, and he had some success (Sozomen *Hist. Eccl.* 8.24).

145. Socrates *Hist. Eccl.* 7.25; Theodoret *Hist. Eccl.* 5.34; Cyril *Epist.* 75 (*PG* 77, 348–52). Cyril, on the other hand, complained that the restoration of Chrysostom was unnecessary, since he had been successful in winning converts from the Johannites (*Ep.* 76 [*PG* 77, 352–60]).

146. Socrates and Theophanes (A.M. 5912, pp. 83–84) say specifically that Atticus acted to heal the schism, Theophanes adding that he was moved to this by the sight of the Johannites assembling outside the churches of the orthodox.

147. Marcellinus Comes *Chronicon*, p. 77.

148. Socrates *Hist. Eccl.* 7.45; Marcellinus Comes *Chronicon*, p. 77; Theophanes A.M. 5930 (pp. 93–93). Theophanes indicates that the schism had continued after the restoration of John and was not completely healed until the removal of the remains to Constantinople.

149. *C. Th.* 16.4, 5.

150. *C. Th.* 16.4, 4; 5.

151. Sozomen *Hist. Eccl.* 8.23; 24; 27. At the time of one of the attacks on the Johannites the soldiers seized jewelry and golden girdles from the faithful, certainly an indication of wealth (Sozomen *Hist. Eccl.* 8.23).

152. In this regard John and the Johannites remind one of the Novatians, who were distinguished from the official church primarily by their uncompromising morality. They, too, were accorded considerable respect, even by their enemies, although the Novatians were, theoretically at least, heretics as well as schismatics and John was no lover of their theology of forgiveness. It is interesting to note, however, that the Novatian bishop Sisinius took the lead in honoring the Johannite martyr Eutropius.