

Introduction

With the arrival of a so-called Christian emperor, Constantine the Great, Christian leaders gained the long-awaited tolerance of the empire. Christianity's transition into the favored religious cult of the imperial household and Roman elite involved significant growing pains. The road to conformity was anything but smooth, as a series of controversial ecumenical councils demonstrated. In one effort to force bishops to conform, emperors used exile rather than capital punishment to compel episcopal leaders to produce a consensus on Christian practices and beliefs, a tactic that had adverse effects. As Richard Lim has noted, "By promoting the products of the conciliar process as reflecting a *consensus omnium gentium*, and by exiling opponents who refused to sign on, Constantine and his successors mistakenly believed they could forestall future ruptures."¹ As we now know, this approach incited more conflict than resolution.

At the height of this troubling period between the great councils of Nicaea (325) and Constantinople (381), Christian authors would continuously characterize episcopal exile as a new martyrdom. More often than not, stories of the recent imperial persecutions were invoked to discredit the efforts of an opposing party or a particularly troublesome emperor. Accusations of colluding heretics and imperial representatives were rampant. Competing bishops relied on this powerful legacy of imperial persecution even as they argued for the recognition of the Roman Empire. The bishop's ambivalent relationship with the empire dictated the terms of his own orthodox identity and how he interpreted his experience of exile. Clerical exile then became coterminous with orthodoxy in many complicated and fragile ways. As we

1. Richard Lim, "Christian Triumph and Controversy," in *Late Antiquity: A Guide to the Postclassical World* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1999), 200.

will come to see, how Christians defined the experience of exile and its relationship to persecution determined where they fell on the spectrum of orthodoxy.

THE DISCOURSE OF FLIGHT

The use of episcopal exile to impose religious conformity points to a consistent dilemma for historians of late antiquity. The mid- to late fourth century saw a significant change in how Christian bishops—the new, rising Roman elite—were dealt with by a post-Constantinian Roman Empire. In this new era, the all-too-frequent outcome of doctrinal disputes among competing clerics was banishment, not martyrdom. It is quite difficult to reconstruct why or even how a particular bishop is exiled, because it is not always clear who takes the initiative to expel ecclesial leaders.² In some cases, a group of bishops assemble a council with the intent of condemning a particular bishop for his position on a theological issue. In others, emperors are described as personally seeking out a particularly troublesome bishop. In still other cases, bishops take flight voluntarily. As a prime example, and one that will occupy us throughout this book, Athanasius of Alexandria appears to have fled into exile five times during his tenure as bishop, but it is not always clear why he was expelled or who enforced his expulsions.

If we follow the lead of the main source we have on his occasions of exile—Athanasius himself—we might conclude that his initial banishment from Alexandria was simply for his own safety. When reflecting on his first departure for Gaul, Athanasius stressed that the charges made against him carried no validity. He insisted throughout his career, as did his supporters, that the emperor Constantine knew this and affirmed Athanasius's authority. Yet, even after his initial return after Constantine's death, his episcopacy continued to be challenged until the death of the emperor Valens in 378. Athanasius's many exiles ought to cause the historian to pause and ask why the departed bishop could claim that he remained the only legitimate bishop throughout his career as an exile—a claim that will continue to go uncontested in pro-Nicene orthodox memory.

It is well known that the events surrounding Athanasius's multiple trips into exile bend to different interpretations, depending on the biographer, whether ancient or contemporary. T. D. Barnes, for example, notes that some primary materials set Athanasius's defensive stance on the topic of exile in the context of his relationship with emperors, while others set it in the context of conciliar politics.³ Yet even Barnes states why it is extremely difficult even to define what constitutes a trip into exile. For instance, Athanasius's first exile (335–337) is described in painstaking detail in

2. Jennifer Barry, "Heroic Bishops: Hilary of Poitiers's Exilic Discourse," *Vigiliae Christianae* 70, no. 2 (2016): 155–74.

3. T. D. Barnes, *Athanasius and Constantius: Theology and Politics in the Constantinian Empire* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1993), 46.

three of his apologetic texts: *Defense against the Arians* (349), *Defense before Constantius* (ca. 353–357), and *History of the Arians* (357). All three texts were composed well after the fact and deliberately misrepresent historical events to place Athanasius in a favorable light—despite the damning evidence, much of which Athanasius himself preserved and which we will explore in detail in the next chapter.

We learn from these texts that Athanasius's claim to the Alexandrian see was disputed from a very early stage. Not only was his election called into question, but a rival bishop was also put in place by a competing Christian faction in Alexandria. In order to further undermine his authority, his enemies accused him of multiple counts of misconduct. Athanasius was accused of four charges, which he related in his *Festal Letters*, *Defense against the Arians*, and *Index*: he extorted the Melitian community in Alexandria, his representative Macarius destroyed church property, he was elected well below the permissible canonical age, and he bribed an imperial official.⁴ Athanasius was eventually also accused of murder, but the alleged victim, Arsenius, was discovered alive.⁵

After these charges were brought before Constantine, the emperor initially ruled in favor of Athanasius.⁶ Nevertheless, his accusers continued their efforts to rid themselves of their rival, and Athanasius was condemned at the Council of Tyre and again at Antioch. Athanasius appealed to Constantine once again, this time to be accused of treasonous activity.⁷ He is said to have tampered with the grain trade to Constantinople, an act that posed a powerfully symbolic threat as well as a practical one, as Sarah Bond has recently pointed out.⁸ Subsequently, Constantine sent Athanasius to Trier.⁹

4. Athanasius, *Ep. fest.* 4.5; *Apol. sec.* 60.4; and *Index* 3.

5. Athanasius's biographers played up several jokes made at the expense of his accusers, who were said to have carried around a severed hand as evidence of the murder. It is unclear whose hand they had, because when Arsenius was found, all his limbs appeared to be intact. Socrates preserved this line from Athanasius at the trial: "Then addressing himself to those present, he said, 'Arsenius, as you see, is found to have two hands: let my accusers show the place whence the third was cut off'" (Socrates, *Eccl. Hist.* 1.24).

6. Athanasius, *Apol. sec.* 65.3.

7. Athanasius, *Apol. sec.* 86.2–12. Paul Peters also looks to Athanasius, as a well as Hilary of Poitiers, as a guide. See Peters, "Comment Saint Athanase s'enfuit de Tyr en 335," *Bulletin de l'Académie Royale de Belgique, Classe des Lettres* 30 (1994): 131–77. T. D. Barnes builds on his work in order to reconstruct the questionable interchange in Constantinople that eventually leads to Constantine's involvement in these ecclesiastical matters (Barnes, *Athanasius and Constantius*). Both Peters and Barnes cite Constantine's first dismissal of the charges laid against Athanasius after he appears before the emperor, although H. A. Drake contests the date of Constantine's interchange with Athanasius. See Drake, "Athanasius' First Exile," *Greek, Roman, and Byzantine Studies* 27 (1986): 193–204.

8. See discussion on the role of the baker's guild in the late Roman Empire in Sarah Bond, *Taboo and Trade: Sordid Professions in the Ancient Mediterranean* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2016), 25.

9. Athanasius, *Apol. sec.* 80; *H. Ar.* 50.2. Constantine is forced to intervene only in the *History of the Arians*. Presumably, it is during his time in Trier that Athanasius becomes acquainted with Constans,

Upon Constantine's death in 337, Athanasius returned to Alexandria after an imperial edict was made by Constantinus (also referred to as Constantine II) in the West.¹⁰ But his return home was short lived. For all intents and purposes, he was still a deposed bishop by the standards of an ecclesiastical council, a point reconfirmed at the Council of Antioch in 341, under the direction of Constantius II, the emperor in the East.¹¹ A rival bishop, Gregory of Cappadocia, was elected by the council and sent to Alexandria in 339 to reinforce this decision; he received the full support of Constantius.¹² Here the historian must make a judgment call. Is Athanasius the legitimate bishop of Alexandria? Or is his replacement, Gregory of Cappadocia, the rightful inheritor of the Alexandrian episcopal seat? Athanasius ultimately contested his deposition, going so far as to state that a countercouncil was convened in Alexandria that successfully cleared him of all wrongdoing, and he even denied the validity of the synods at both Tyre and Antioch.¹³

As this series of events quickly reveals, Athanasius was either right or wrong to take up his post as the bishop of Alexandria, depending on the position one takes. The historian is left to answer several questions: Was his time in Trier, in fact, a period of exile? If so, what constitutes exile at this period? Several councils insist he is a criminal (Tyre and Jerusalem), and more than one emperor appears to have affirmed this position (Constantine and Constantius). Another council denied these claims (Alexandria), and another emperor (Constantine II) appeared to favor his return even when a replacement had been found and was supported by the emperor in the East. The description of this first occasion of exile is symptomatic of how difficult it is to reconstruct episcopal exile as a social phenomenon in antiquity. Barnes alludes to this difficulty when he says, "The exile of Athanasius in 335 was not the normal exile imposed by an emperor on a bishop who had been condemned and deposed by a church council."¹⁴ Curiously, Barnes defines "normal exile" by appealing to another controversial bishop, Eusebius of Caesarea, who wrote: "He [Constantine] likewise added the sanction of his authority to the decisions of bishops passed at their synods, and forbade the provincial governors

whom he credits for securing his reprieve from his second trip into exile (Athanasius, *Apol. Const.* 4.2, edition: Hans-Georg Opitz [Lieferungen 1–7] and H. C. Brennecke et al. Lieferung 8: [2000] *Apologia ad Constantium*, pp. 279–304; translation in consultation with the Greek and *NPNF2* 4. *Apol. sec.* 3–19). T. D. Barnes cites Hilary of Poitiers (and Sulpicius Severus, who follows Hilary's lead), in whose works we find direct imperial involvement in Athanasius's expulsion. See Barnes, "Hilary of Poitiers on His Exile," *Vigiliae Christianae* 46, no. 2 (1992): 134.

10. Athanasius, *Apol. sec.* 87.4; *H. Ar.* 8.2.

11. The Council of Antioch reaffirms both Tyre and Jerusalem, condemning Athanasius's return to Alexandria. He is also faulted for a self-initiated return. We will return to this ambivalent legacy in chapter 4.

12. Athanasius, *Apol. sec.* 29; *Ep. Encyl.* 2.1.

13. Athanasius, *Apol. sec.* 3–19.

14. Barnes, *Athanasius and Constantius*, 24.

to annul any of their decrees: for he rated the priests of God at a higher value than any judge whatever.”¹⁵ Yet Eusebius’s interpretation presupposes that Constantine could easily identify which council to favor and determine which one was orthodox, a point with which Athanasius and his biographers ardently disagreed. Exile as a social phenomenon is extremely difficult to reconstruct. And yet it remains one of the most pressing topics for historians of antiquity.

EXPLORATIONS OF EXILE

Ernst Ludwig Grasmück’s work is the foundation for most scholarship on exile in antiquity.¹⁶ His most significant contribution is the seemingly simple observation that exile had a specific political function in antiquity: to offer an alternative to the death penalty. His study includes a close examination of the interplay between power and law in Roman, Greek, and Jewish legal practices. He concludes that exile, no matter how one defines it, is not only a social reality but also an important mediator of social politics. The conventional approach deemed it sufficient to look at the legal causes of exile, but Grasmück emphasizes that this is not enough.¹⁷ In order to explore how exile actually functioned in Roman politics, historians must also explore the political and sociocultural conditions that gave rise to instances of exile.

Gordon Kelly also attempted to identify how exile functioned as a social reality in Rome in the period between the Second Punic War and the death of Julius Caesar (220–44 BCE). In order to do so, he defined *exilium* as a voluntary act taken by a senatorial or an equestrian male to avoid legal proceedings.¹⁸ After the

15. Eusebius of Caesarea, *Life of Constantine* 4.27.2.

16. Ernst Ludwig Grasmück, *Exilium: Untersuchungen zur Verbannung in der Antike* (Paderborn: Schöningh, 1978).

17. Grasmück builds on the work of scholars such as Ferdinand Walter, *Geschichte des Römischen Rechts bis auf Justinian* (Bonn, Germany: Weber, 1861), and Theodore Mommsen, *Römisches Strafrecht* (Graz, Germany: Akademische Druck- und Verlagsanstalt, 1955). Specifically, Grasmück sought to correct the prevailing notion that saw exile as voluntary and self-imposed. This elite view of exile is also critiqued by Peter Garnsey, *Social Status and Legal Privilege in the Roman Empire* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1970), 275.

18. Gordon Kelly, *A History of Exile in the Roman Republic* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006) argues that, prior to the period between the Second Punic War and the death of Julius Caesar (220–44 BCE), the phenomenon of *exilium* is not mentioned aside from a suspect account of the banishment of Camillus in 392 BCE. See Kelly, *A History of Exile in the Roman Republic* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006). Frank Stini has also added to and expanded Kelly’s assessment in his expansive work, *Plenum exiliis mare: Untersuchungen zum Exil in der römischen Kaiserzeit* (Stuttgart, Germany: Franz Steiner Verlag, 2011). Stini provides a great deal of prosopographical details concerning the sheer numbers of exiles during this same period of time. There is also an extensive, and invaluable, index at the end of his book. His overall focus moves beyond this material alone and moves to a more ambitious project: to identify the motivation behind exile from an imperial and legal standpoint. This shift in focus helped to highlight the significant role individual imperial personalities would

exile departs, the decree *aquae et ignis interdictio*, “interdiction of fire and water,” is made by the *concilium plebis*, the plebeian assembly, in order to ensure his permanent banishment.¹⁹ Kelly concludes that the Roman Republic successfully used *exilium* as a safety valve or a gentleman’s agreement to stave off political unrest.

Peter Garnsey and Caroline Humfress note the similar role exile played in Roman politics well into the Principate.²⁰ Even though the definitions of Roman citizenship fluctuated over the course of the next few centuries, the penal act of exile was still reserved for the privileged social classes. Garnsey and Humfress trace how the extension of Roman citizenship to all freeborn men by Caracalla in 212 set in place new social structures that redefined the categories of “citizen” and “alien.” Citizenship was a prerequisite for any participation in the senatorial and equestrian orders. It also conferred upon these new Romans a juridical status that gave rise to legal recourse previously withheld. The extension of citizenship to all freeborn individuals allowed many who had previously been excluded to enter new brackets of social status, a historical shift that eventually worked to the advantage of ecclesiastical offices in a post-Constantinian context.

As more elite Romans adopted Christian practices after Constantine’s reign, both the empire and Christians had to contend with competing ideologies of citizenship, because the identity of citizen-insider remained a complex one in Christian memory. After Constantine’s rise to power and growing toleration of Christian practices, professed Jesus followers began to redefine Roman citizenship. Its positioning as an identity opposed to the alien created complex and contradictory identities for many late ancient Christian authors, so much so that Caracalla’s edict, which granted citizenship to all free inhabitants of the Roman Empire, was easily adopted into the Theodosian Code in 436. And by the time Justinian sought to revise the Roman law in the sixth century, Roman citizenship and pro-Nicene Christian identity could be seen as one and the same.²¹

Such a vision of the Christianization of Roman identity admittedly has its limitations. After Constantine demanded that Christians reach a consensus over

play in the displacement of Roman citizens. Exile is seen as a less extreme form of punishment and a substitute for capital punishment.

19. Richard Bauman also assesses the legal implementation of the interdiction of fire and water in his *Crime and Punishment in Ancient Rome* (New York: Routledge, 1996), 16–20. Exile is not his primary interest, but he discusses it as one of a variety of Roman legal practices present in the literature. Bauman notes that exile could be both voluntary and compulsory and insists that, although it was initially considered merely a custom, it was eventually brought into the legal system.

20. Peter Garnsey and Caroline Humfress, *The Evolution of the Late Antique World* (Cambridge: Orchard Academic, 2001), 143–52. This introductory text seeks to correct previous misrepresentations of the late Roman Empire espoused by historians such as Edward Gibbon. Rather than viewing the third through fifth centuries as a stagnant period, the authors insist that this period was dynamic and full of creative transformation.

21. *Ibid.*, 142.

faith and practice, political unrest continued, and all would not rest comfortably with this newfound citizenship. The theological controversies that dominated the fourth and fifth centuries reveal just how contested the citizen-insider identity truly was for the vast majority of Christians across the empire. As the term “Christian-insider” began to be associated with a pro-Nicene theological stance, tensions were raised. Christians continued (and still continue) to wrestle over how this identity should be defined and remembered. New threats to civic concord, such as interreligious conflicts, resulted in familiar responses from the empire. Although the pool of candidates for exile widened considerably by the fourth century, exile essentially served the same purpose: to create and enforce stability. Yet decisions about what constitutes an exile and who enforces those decisions remains a complicated issue, due in no small part to the terms associated with exile as a social phenomenon.

One of the principal difficulties historians then face is that ancient authors had a much more ambiguous interpretation of exile than modern interpreters. As Jan Felix Gaertner succinctly puts it, “ancient authors do not distinguish between exile and other forms of displacement.”²² The fluidity Gaertner emphasizes here is reflected in the variety of terms that are used to describe exile, such as the Greek *ekstasis*, “displacement,” *phygē*, “flight,” *ekōsma*, “banishment,” or Latin *fuga*, “flight,” *relegatio*, “relegation,” *peregrinatio*, “pilgrimage,” and *exilium*, “exile.” Classicists have noted this variation in the work of well-known exiles. Ovid (43 BCE–17 CE), exiled by Augustus in 8 CE, employed *exilium*, *fuga*, and *relegatio* interchangeably in his exilic works. He played with the vocabulary in order to describe his experience as a type of death, both physical and social: “When I lost my native land, then must you think that I perished; that was my earlier and harder death.”²³ Seneca the Younger (ca. 1 BCE–65 CE), exiled by the emperor Claudius, denied that exile even exists: “Inside the world there can be found no place of exile [*exilium*]; for nothing that is inside the world is foreign to mankind.”²⁴ And the exile Dio Chrysostom (ca. 40–120 CE) envisioned his status under the reign of Domitian as a privileged, even enviable state: “If I narrate the course of my exile [*phygein*], men will say, not that I am lamenting, but far rather that I am boasting.”²⁵

Like their classical counterparts, early Christian authors also manipulated terms to describe their exile in a variety of ways. Common terms associated with the concept of exile are the verbs “to hide” (*kryptein*) or, as we saw in the prologue

22. Jan Felix Gaertner, introduction to *Writing Exile: The Discourse of Displacement in Greco-Roman Antiquity and Beyond* (Leiden: Brill, 2007), 3.

23. Ovid, *Tr.* 3.3.53–54. See also *Tr.* 1.4.27–28: “Save yourself my weary life from cruel death, if only it were possible for one already dead not to die.” Edition and translation: LCL 151, xl–xli.

24. Seneca the Younger, *Helv.* 8.5. Edition and translation: LCL 254.

25. Dio Chrysostom, *Orat.* 45.1.

with Cyprian, “to flee” (*phygein*). Flight ties exile to other past experiences of compulsory retreat or preemptive acts taken to avoid violence and will remain central to our examination. For example, Athanasius explicitly states that he chose to hide for a time in order to avoid death: “It would neither have been becoming in me to surrender, and give myself up that my blood might be shed. . . . It was therefore better for me to hide [*krybēnai*] myself.”²⁶ Athanasius’s contemporary, Hilary of Poitiers, also justifies his occasion of exile by comparing Constantius II to one of the most infamous emperors in Christian history: “it is lawful for me to flee [*fugere*] under a Nero.”²⁷ He scathingly concludes that flight is certainly permissible if an irascible despot sits upon the throne.

Another common description of Christian exile includes exile as an ascetic discipline. As Daniel Caner convincingly argued, ascetics reinterpreted the practice of wandering as a self-exile (*xeniteia*).²⁸ Wandering monks saw themselves as the inheritors of a long-standing apostolic tradition and, by the fourth and fifth centuries, considered it a legitimate form of ascetic practice. This practice was by no means without its critics. Evagrius of Pontus (345–399) affirmed the state of alienation but put extraneous constraints upon and issued dire warnings for those who dared to wander beyond their desert cells.²⁹ Macarius the Great (ca. 300–391) also cautioned against such activity,³⁰ along with other critics, like Augustine (353–430), Jerome (ca. 340–420), and John Cassian (ca. 360–435), who all found it fodder for polemical debate.³¹

The activity of wandering nevertheless remained a prevalent topic for discussion among the ascetic fathers and mothers of the desert,³² so much so that exile as a type of ascetic wandering quickly became a favored topic in later western exilic

26. Athanasius, *Apol. Const.* 34–35.

27. *Contra Const.* 11. For a more detailed examination of Hilary’s treatment of these texts in relation to his exile, see Richard Flower, *Emperors and Bishops in Late Roman Invective* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015), 81–88, and Barry, “Heroic Bishops.”

28. Daniel Caner expands on this observation by developing the topic of wandering and begging monks in late antiquity in his *Wandering, Begging Monks: Spiritual Authority in Late Antiquity* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2002).

29. For a detailed discussion on Evagrius’s interpretation and use of the concept of *xeniteia*, see Robyn Darling Young, “Xeniteia According to Evagrius of Pontus,” in *Ascetic Culture: Essays in Honor of Philip Rousseau*, ed. Blake Leyerle and Robin Darling Young, 229–52 (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 2013).

30. Evagrius, *Ant.* 1.37; and G. Macarius, *Aeg.* 2. Evagrius in particular combines the theme of the *xenos* with the physical act of wandering.

31. The topic of wandering monks and the ills of this practice are discussed in Augustine, *Op. mon.*; Jerome, *Epist.* 22; and John Cassian, *Conlat.*

32. Expanding further east, we find similar itinerant monastics in Syriac Christianity as well. Caner specifically notes the similarities of the Messalian community described in the *Book of Steps*. Alexander the Sleepless is used as a case study to support his point. See Caner, *Wandering, Begging Monks*, 126–57.

discourses, when understood as a type of pilgrimage.³³ In this vein, Augustine even used *peregrinatio* (a sojourn or a pilgrimage) as a synonym for exile (*exilium*, *fuga*, etc.) in order to describe the state of the *civitas dei* on earth.³⁴ Isidore of Seville (560–636) consistently defined the *peregrinus* as someone who is outside of his own country, while Boethius (ca. 480–525) integrated the concept of *peregrinatio* with exilic consolatory themes from Ovid’s poetry in order to capture the condition of the everyman as a *homo viator*, “pilgrim man.” And Adomnan of Iona (ca. 627–704) refers to Columba’s ministry to Iona as *peregrinatio* in his *Life of St. Columba*.

What seems to be most important for the scope of this book is not how these terms are translated in what we might consider a technical fashion but how they are used by Christian authors as a way to represent a larger social reality. It is the flexibility of these terms that reveals how the discourse of exile adapts to political and theological Christian arguments that arise in this tumultuous period.

EPISCOPAL EXILE

The transition from a faith targeted by the empire to a faith that wielded political force was by no means a smooth one. This shift becomes all the more evident when we look at the different ways exiled bishops used exile as a means of shaping identity. Exile played a significant role in how Christian leaders, as the new Roman elite, interpreted the Christian past in their present moment. According to Eric Fournier, the rise of this new Roman elite redefined the quality and the meaning of exile in late antiquity. The new status of the bishop, in particular, forced imperial authorities to rethink how bishops who broke public laws ought to be punished. Fournier points to the inconsistent use of exile by the empire as a way to quell political unrest and explores how exile helped to shape an identity of persecution particularly in the Latin West.³⁵ And, like Grasmück, he contends that exile

33. At the 2002 International Medieval Congress at the University of Leeds, scholars examined the different forms exile took during the Middle Ages from ca. 900 to ca. 1300 in western Europe, and the proceedings were published in Laura Napran and Elizabeth van Houts, eds., *Exile in the Middle Ages* (Turnhout, Belgium: International Medieval Research, 2004). The second half of the volume focuses on exile in an ecclesiastical context as it is linked to new interpretations of Christian identity. And while this book will not focus on the western evolution of the exile to pilgrim, it remains a pertinent topic that will arise in our focus on the Eastern Roman Empire.

34. Augustine, *Civ.* 11.28 and 14.9. Manuela Brito-Martins links the verb *peregrinor* to the Greek verb *apodēmeō*, a term used by Plato, *Apol.*, 61e1 and 67c1. She also points to the verb *ekpēdaō*, from which is derived *exsiliare*, *lactus exsiliendi*, “flight.” See Brito-Martins, “The Concept of *Peregrinatio* in Saint Augustine and Its Influences,” in *Exile in the Middle Ages*, ed. Laura Napran and Elizabeth van Houts, 83–94 (Turnhout: International Medieval Research, 2004), 84n9.

35. Eric Fournier, “Exiled Bishops in the Christian Empire: Victims of Imperial Violence?” in *Violence in Late Antiquity. Perceptions and Practices*, ed. H. A. Drake, 157–66 (Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2006); “Victor of Vita and the Vandal ‘Persecution’: Interpreting Exile in Late Antiquity” (PhD diss.,

functioned as a mechanism to alleviate social pressures but that the process was neither consistent nor well defined.

Daniel Washburn has also provided a detailed examination of Roman law and the practice of exile.³⁶ He showed how exile functioned as a rehabilitative and restorative legal process negotiated between the exiler and the exiled within the Roman Empire from the Principate to the early fifth century. This process was intended to highlight the political superiority of the ruling authority. Christian authors thus relied upon a variety of literary depictions of banishment to negotiate their circumstances. Washburn concludes that the motivation for exile was to “transform the heterodox into the orthodox.”³⁷ This last statement reveals a great deal about the powerful nature of exilic discourse and how early Christians used it to identify orthodoxy and its links to persecution.

Like Fournier, Julia Hillner has also examined the rhetoric of persecution and how it shaped Christian imagination and the experience of exile, drawing particular attention to the martyrization of exile and the presence of a productive literary link between exile and Christian confinement.³⁸ Hillner also edited, along with Jörg Ulrich, and Jakob Engberg, a volume that lays out the many complexities involved in efforts to trace episcopal exile in late antiquity.³⁹ This volume touches

University of California, Santa Barbara, 2008); and, “Constantine and Episcopal Banishment: Continuity and Change in the Settlement of Christian Disputes,” in Hillner, Ulrich, and Engberg, *Late Antique Clerics in Exile* *Late Antique Clerics in Exile*, 47–66. For another text that focuses on the Latin West and deploys the use of prosopographical data, see Jonathan Conant, *Staying Roman: Conquest and Identity in Africa and the Mediterranean, 439–700* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012). In his chapter, “Flight and Communications,” Conant mines his sources for data that traces social movements between East and West at a later period than explored here. He then uses this data to trace particular exiled figures in the West. See Conant, *Staying Roman*, 67–129.

36. Daniel Washburn, *Banishment in the Later Roman Empire, 284–476 C.E.* (New York: Routledge, 2013). This revised dissertation (“Banishment in the Later Roman Empire: The Rhetoric and Realities of a Disciplinary Institution” [PhD diss., Stanford University, 2007]) notes the complicated overlay between what he terms sacred (Christian) and secular (Roman) politics. He attempts to draw parallels between the two institutions but falls into an argument that presupposes that an orthodoxy already realized. For example, he states, “After all, a bishop could have maintained perfect orthodoxy but still commit a banishment-worthy violation of Roman civil law” (Washburn, *Banishment*, 42). He also emphasizes that the exile of episcopal leaders could not have taken place without the direct involvement of secular resources.

37. Washburn, *Banishment*, 47.

38. Julia Hillner also invokes Washburn’s concept of the Christian identity crisis. See Hillner, *Prison, Punishment, and Penance* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015), 253n44. I also make note of this development in Barry, “Heroic Bishops.”

39. Julia Hillner, Jörg Ulrich, and Jakob Engberg, eds., *Late Antique Clerics in Exile* (New York: Peter Lang, 2016). This volume is the product of a prearranged workshop held at the Seventeenth International Conference on Patristic Studies in August 2015 and provides ample data that support the prevalence of forced movement of clerics across the late Roman landscape. In her introduction to that volume, Hillner assesses the various methods used by late ancient historians and theologians to reconstruct this trend. See Hillner, introduction to Hillner, Ulrich, and Engberg, *Late Antique Clerics*

on the complicated social networks at play in any given assessment of Christian exile. Clerical exile, in particular, was “a community event, in the sense that it was a real or metaphorical mechanism of inclusion and exclusion, which both created relationships and drew the boundaries of late antique Christian society.”⁴⁰ The experience of exile was hardly a solitary phenomenon, and its study is equally reliant on interdisciplinary approaches and methods.

The book builds on those interventions and conversations and turns to consider more narrowly how episcopal exiles created new pressures and possibilities for the discourse of orthodoxy and heresy. Here it will be argued that the discourse of exile served as a new rhetorical and discursive mode in heresiological discourse—and a notably fluid and flexible one at that, as Christians looked to earlier literary sources to help them to understand and articulate their own experiences.

MODELS OF EXILE

To reiterate, exile in antiquity was not just a concrete sociopolitical phenomenon; it also functioned as a discursive performance or an act of rhetorical self-representation. The reality of exile, in all its diverse forms, helped to shape ancient imaginative processes. Sarah Cohen demonstrates how the theme of exile was a powerful discursive resource for Cicero (106–43 BCE), who made full use of exilic paradoxes to comment on the *res publica* and to define his own position within the aristocracy in 47 BCE.⁴¹ After his return from Greece, Cicero composed his *Post reditum ad populum*, in which he compared his exile to the departure of the *res publica* from Rome. Building on his discourse on the legitimacy of the state found in *On the Commonwealth*, Cicero concluded that since there was not a state to be exiled from, he was never actually exiled. In a contemporaneous work, *Stoic Paradoxes*, he used the same logic to shame Clodius, his chief rival and the principal instigator behind his departure from Rome. He made use of irony to turn the logic of exile on its head: “Clodius is presented as doubly a fool: not only did he mistakenly believe that he had exiled Cicero, but he himself was the one who made

in Exile. Sections from chapter 4 of this book, below, appear in my own contribution to that volume; see Jennifer Barry, “Receptions of Exile: Athanasius of Alexandria’s Legacy,” in Hillner, Ulrich, and Engberg, *Late Antique Clerics in Exile*. An additional invaluable resource organized by many of the participants, including the principal investigator, Julia Hillner, is the digital humanities project titled *The Migration of Faith: Clerical Exile in Late Antiquity*, www.dhi.ac.uk/sites/clericalexile. Among many of its vast array of resources, the site includes an extensive database of exiled clerics and various visualization options that are free and open to the public.

40. Hillner, introduction to Hillner, Ulrich, and Engberg, *Late Antique Clerics in Exile*, 24.

41. Sarah Cohen, “Cicero’s Roman Exile,” in *Writing Exile: The Discourse of Displacement in Greco-Roman Antiquity and Beyond*, ed. Jan Felix Gaertner, 109–28 (Leiden: Brill, 2007).

Cicero's exile impossible by destroying the legitimate state."⁴² Cicero could not be exiled from that which did not exist.

Cohen goes on to compare the exilic metaphor found in *Stoic Paradoxes* with its use in a series of letters written by Cicero around the same time. These letters are concerned primarily with the recall of Marcus Claudius Marcellus, Caesar's staunchest political opponent. Marcellus's refusal to return after Caesar's rise to power prompted Cicero to state that the legitimate *res publica* remained in exile alongside Marcellus. To justify his own return, however, Cicero argued that he was obliged to work for the return of *res publica* to Rome itself, which included trying to persuade Marcellus and a host of other former followers of Pompey, Caesar's primary opponent in the Civil War, to return. Cicero concluded that one's exile is not dependent upon a physical location but derives from one's distance from the true *res publica*. Instead of attempting to reconstruct a historical reality (which she neither defends nor contests), Cohen focuses on Cicero's use of the theme of exile to create a rhetoric of political legitimacy, a theme we will see replicated by Christian authors.

Standard exilic motifs were just as common in the composition of exilic poetry. Gaertner looks at the use of conventional themes in two works composed by Ovid, *Lamentations* and *Letters from Pontus*. While previous scholars concluded that Ovid's exilic poetry is somehow remarkably different due to his experience of exile, Gaertner argues that certain philological continuities easily refute such claims.⁴³ He supports this argument by exploring the literary conventions used throughout the two cited works. For example, the themes of suicide, evident in Cicero's reflections, and exile as a social death are prevalent throughout these two works. The consolatory tradition proves to be particularly useful for Ovid, who "was well acquainted with the tradition of consolatory treatises on exile, and this very tradition offers precedents not only for Ovid's stereotypical descriptions of his surroundings in Tomis, but also for the repeated comparisons between the poet's plight and the wanderings of mythical characters such as Odysseus and Aeneas and the exile of historical persons such as Themistocles or Aristides."⁴⁴ Ovid, Gaertner stresses, is hardly novel.⁴⁵

The marked similarities connect Ovid's exilic poetry to his earlier works, such as *Amours*, *Art of Love*, *Remedy of Love*, *Metamorphoses*, and *The Book of Days*. Ultimately, Gaertner wants to refute the charge that Ovid's work declined in its

42. *Ibid.*, 116. The mistaken fool is a theme that Athanasius and other Christian exiles will use to lambast their persecutors.

43. Jan Felix Gaertner, "Ovid and the 'Poetics of Exile': How Exilic Is Ovid's Exile Poetry," in Gaertner, *Writing Exile*, 155–72.

44. *Ibid.*, 158.

45. Later authors such as John Chrysostom will also deploy similar themes, which I will explore in greater detail in chapter 3.

technical sophistication due to the hardships of his exile. Here he corrects a trend in scholarship that attempts to psychoanalyze the poet by stating that such claims are dubious and easily undermined with careful philological study.⁴⁶ Although Ovid does make use of prosaic and colloquial phrases, his metrical features actually reveal a link to Horace's *Epistles*. Gaertner insists that there is no credible evidence pointing to an intellectual decline; tracing the literary heritage makes clear that Ovid is creatively reproducing a standard form of exilic poetics. As we will see in later chapters, similar accusations are made against John Chrysostom as he writes to his supporters while in exile. The epistolary themes in both collections of letters point to a shared literary discourse and suggest that historians ought to temper any claims of decline based on overly zealous psychoanalysis of our writers.

Familiar exilic themes were also used by authors to challenge the political norm, which will be of chief importance for this study. For example, Tim Whitmarsh has examined how Dio Chrysostom actively took on the Roman ideologies of citizenship and imperial power through exilic tropes.⁴⁷ In *On Exile*, Dio clearly relied on Socrates's moment of enlightenment in the *Apology* as a philosophical model. During his exile under Domitian, Dio recalled a clandestine meeting with an oracle who encouraged him to embrace his identity as a perpetual exile. Dio self-consciously employs Socratic irony as a way to position himself firmly within the philosophical tradition. His time in exile served as a defining moment in his philosophical journey, which continued even after he was permitted to return to Rome. As the ambassador to the emperor rather than as an enemy, Dio was forced to mediate a difficult position: although he had recovered his status as a legitimate citizen of the empire, he insisted on retaining his outsider status. Whitmarsh concludes that this identity helps Dio express his ambivalence as both a Greek ethical idealist and a Roman political agent.

46. Gaertner, "Ovid," 155. The most influential example is found in E. Doblhofer, *Exil und Emigration: Zum Erlebnis der Heimatferne in der römischen Literatur* (Darmstadt, Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1987). Doblhofer argues that there is a traceable universal psychological condition of exile that emerges out of Roman exilic literature. He highlights what he sees as an isomorphism of human experience, a condition that develops out of the ancient experience and translates across the centuries. He supports this argument by describing exile as a sickness, or *Exilkrankheit*—a psychological sickness inherent in all exilic experiences and stresses that the literary expression of *Heimatfern*, "homesickness," is the primary connecting feature within the larger body of exilic literature producing an identifiable nosography. Building on Doblhofer's observations, Jo-Marie Claassen examines more closely the development of the psychological phenomenon of *Exilkrankheit* in antiquity in her *Displaced Persons: The Literature of Exile from Cicero to Boethius* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1999). Claassen agrees that this condition is clearly evident in the literature of exile—or those texts that express the emotional aspects of the experience of exile. For her more developed argument on the condition of exile, see Claassen, *Ovid Revisited: The Poet in Exile* (London: Duckworth, 2008).

47. Timothy Whitmarsh, "'Greece in the World': Exile and Identity in the Second Sophistic," in *Being Greek under Rome: Cultural Identity, the Second Sophistic and the Development of Empire*, ed. Simon Goldhill, 269–305 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007).

Dio invoked the literary model of Odysseus to support this dual role: “I reflected that Odysseus after all his wanderings did not hesitate to roam once more. . . . Should I not follow his example if god so summons? So after exhorting myself in this way to neither fear nor be ashamed of my action, and putting on humble attire and chastening myself, I proceeded to roam everywhere.”⁴⁸ He relied on this countercultural hero to strike a balance. Like Odysseus, exile “serves as a self-constructed aetiology for Dio’s reputation as a brave and outspoken purveyor of Greek ideals in the face of Roman authority.”⁴⁹ Dio Chrysostom then advises the Romans:

I would tell them that they needed a better and more carefully planned education, if they were ever to be happy in truth and reality and not merely in the opinion of the majority, as was now the case; that if anyone should win them to this view and take them in charge and teach them that not a single one of those things is a good to which they devoted themselves and which they strove, with all their zeal to acquire, in the belief that, the more they acquired, the better and happier their life would be; but that if they wholeheartedly practiced temperance, manliness, and justice, and took them into their souls, securing from somewhere teachers who taught these things and all the other things too, not caring whether the men were Greeks or Romans. . . . “For only then,” I continued, “will your city be great and strong and truly imperial, since at present its greatness arouses distrust and is not very secure.” (*Exil.* 13.31–34)⁵⁰

Such classical examples further emphasize that the status of citizen insider/outside and its relationship to the condition of exile is a powerful discourse that bends to the rhetorical needs of the author. As will be argued throughout this book, Christian leaders also had to strike a balance as they attempted to straddle new roles as agents of the empire and mediators of Christian orthodoxy. This was an ongoing battle for Christian authors, who had to compete with a past that continuously threatened to undermine any or all allegiances to a once hostile empire. The identities of Christian and Roman citizens frequently came into conflict, as we will come to see. Once martyrologies became popular, this identity became all the more fraught and infused with cultural meaning.

The estranged or marginalized figure is by no means a new critical angle from which to examine ancient Christian texts. Unfortunately, the position of alterity in early Christian texts has more often than not been conflated with a singular vision of Christian identity: to be a Christian is to be an alien. Benjamin Dunning complicates this vision by arguing that the figure of the *xenos*, “alien,” in the pre-Constantinian period is much more fluid than it is commonly perceived to be.⁵¹ Unlike other scholars before him, Dunning shows how the identity of the

48. Dio Chrysostom, *Orat.* 13.10–11.

49. Whitmarsh, “Greece in the World,” 290.

50. Edition and translation: LCL 339.

51. To make this point, Benjamin Dunning closely examines the cultural continuum this identity spans in early Christianity by paying particular attention to five different texts: 1 Peter; Hebrews; Epistle

alien contains a host of generative possibilities that produce competing, even contradictory, Christian identities. Rather than reinforce one vision of Christian alterity, early Christian texts reveal multiple sites of contestation. In the *Epistle to Diognetus*, for instance, the status of the alien is valorized as a marginal identity while simultaneously understood to reaffirm traditional cultural norms. Dunning remarks, “Having become resident aliens by virtue of conforming to Roman norms even better than the Romans do, Christians in fact prove to be of absolutely vital importance for the social order.”⁵² By way of contrast, the *Apocryphon of James* rejects the valorization of alien identity: “The text invokes the category of the stranger [exile] not to exploit its valorized possibilities but rather to conjure up the specter of the ‘un-citizen’ with all its potentially negative valences.”⁵³ Thus the trope of the alien in the larger cultural milieu takes on new interpretive meanings by blurring the distinction between civic and what Dunning deems “ethnoracial” categories of status and identity within Graeco-Roman literature. Its overlap with the trope of exile demonstrates how the Christian alien stands as the other to the most prominent insider identity: that of the citizen. This parasitic relationship highlights the instability of Roman boundaries, most especially those borders that constitute Roman identity in particular places in the empire.

In the first two centuries of the common era, Greek and Roman authors often appealed to exilic themes to construct a powerful identity to counter that of citizen-insider. For instance, both Plutarch and Philo easily adopted the language of exile in order to describe the state of the human soul as it sojourns on earth.⁵⁴ Exile from the polis enacts a certain social death: it is easily and immediately

to Diognetus; Shepherd of Hermas, Similitude 1; and Apocryphon of James. Each of these texts contains a different answer to Dunning’s driving question: why did the first Christians speak about themselves as resident aliens? In addition to the term *xenos*, Dunning also looks at *paroikos*, *parepidēmos*, and *allotrios*. See Dunning, *Aliens and Sojourners: Self as Other in Ancient Christianity* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2009).

52. *Ibid.*, 76.

53. *Ibid.*, 99. The Apocryphon of John, notably, is placed among a collection of so-called gnostic texts. Dunning successfully incorporates this text back into an expansive collection of diverse Christian texts rather than relegating it to the margins of this period as the majority of biblical scholarship has tended to do; see in particular his explanation and justification of its use (*ibid.*, 7–8, 91–102) and his brief examination of the text itself, as well as justification for its inclusion in the survey (*ibid.*, 92–94).

54. This body of literature created a flexible identity that Greek and Roman writers invoked to articulate the function of exile in a given text. Dunning also includes the reflections of Jews in the Graeco-Roman world: “The stories of exile and diaspora to be found in the biblical texts provided powerful narrative resources for Jews in the project of maintaining Jewish identity in complex multicultural scenarios” (*ibid.*, 74). James M. Scott highlights in this earlier work the alienation of Jewish diaspora from conversations on exile or displacement of Christian authors within biblical studies, not to mention a neglect of the overlap with Graeco-Roman texts during the Second Temple period. See Scott, “Exile and the Self-Understanding of Diaspora Jews in the Greco-Roman Period,” in *Exile: Old Testament, Jewish, and Christian Conceptions*, ed. James M. Scott, 173–218 (Leiden: Brill, 1997).

perceived as either a lamentable state or a praiseworthy occurrence. When early Christians adopted the topos of the alien “as a resource for articulating the shape and meaning of their own identities, they did so as participants in an already complex conversation.”⁵⁵ This powerful theme of citizen-outsider—more specifically, of exile—extended well into the fourth and fifth centuries, resuscitated by Christian authors of late antiquity who looked to the past in order to interpret their present.

A rich literary corpus on the state and condition of exile thus yields a flexible and powerful trope and identity. The formation of exilic identities in late antiquity continuously draws from and mimics discursive formulas found in earlier Greek and Roman exilic literature. Late ancient Christian authors looked to their literary predecessors as a guide for talking about and defining exile. Christian authors also appealed to popular narratives to reimagine themselves as famous classical exiles such as Cadmus, Heracles, Jason, and Patroclus. Odysseus is a particular favorite among late antique biographers, as Patricia Cox Miller has observed.⁵⁶

In addition to these classical characters, Christian authors alluded to biblical exemplars in order to fashion flexible exilic identities. Each author examined in this study appealed to specific biblical figures in flight: Athanasius likened his experiences to those of Jacob, Moses, Elijah, and all those other men who flee into the desert to avoid persecution. John Chrysostom, in order to stress the fortitude that comes from facing hardship, contrasted those Jews resting comfortably in their homeland after their return from Babylon with those noble children in the book of Daniel who win their glory as exiles. What stands out in these interpretive strategies is the connection between alienation and objective truth. And like Paul, the exile as the outsider brings with him Christian truth—that is, until its objectivity is undermined by its very own alienation.⁵⁷

55. Dunning, *Aliens and Sojourners*, 44.

56. Patricia Cox Miller, *Biography in Late Antiquity: A Quest for the Holy Man* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1983), 121. The motif of Odysseus is repeated in both early and late ancient Christian literature as well as non-Christian literature. Miller also references Porphyry’s use of the Odysseus image as “an exploration of the true self” (*ibid.*, 122).

57. Timothy Luckritz Marquis has also convincingly shown how Paul deployed exilic identities in several of his works. His identity as a wanderer was tied to exilic themes. These themes, such as the wandering practitioner and the cosmopolitan philosopher, were particularly important to later Christian writers who would look to Paul as an example of an orthodox Christian in flight. This positioning was not merely a reception of exilic rhetorical motifs, but, as Luckritz Marquis convincingly claims, Paul creatively used classical motifs to fashion himself as a wandering preacher and a despised foreigner to emphasize his message of truth. See Timothy Luckritz Marquis, *Transient Apostle: Paul, Travel, and the Rhetoric of Empire* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2013). Luckritz Marquis focuses principally on Romans and 2 Corinthians to zero in on Paul’s use of exilic themes. He creatively examines how travel was paramount to Paul’s message, as the apostle styled himself as an itinerant preacher. His appearance as an outsider bringing with him teachings of a foreign cult had to be explained and justified to those who were suspicious of his intentions and message.

Literary study of the theme of exile opens up new ways of reading late ancient texts and will be the principal approach of this book. We will trace the development of the various discursive techniques used by bishops and their biographers to interpret the experience of exile. By paying attention to the way exile functions in different texts, we begin to see how exile is employed by heresiological discourse. And as we will come to see, the theological debates that ensued in the aftermath of Nicaea shaped the Christian imagination. Exile then served as a flexible discourse that allowed authors to think through the boundaries and limits of orthodoxy.

HERESIOLOGY AND EXILE

By examining the discourse of exile in addition to exile as a social phenomenon, we are able to revisit some important historiographical interventions made by scholars in the last two decades as they relate to orthodoxy and heresy.⁵⁸ As Teresa Shaw summarizes, “recent studies have challenged scholars to ‘rethink’ previous understandings of ‘heretical’ individuals and groups, understandings that in many ways relied on ancient genealogies and labels developed in the agonistic context of theological dispute and its aftermath.”⁵⁹ So, too, when the language of orthodoxy and heresy is invoked in the context of exilic discourse, the historian must remember that episcopal exiles during the fourth and fifth centuries were thoroughly embroiled in theological disputes.⁶⁰ While interreligious disputes were by

58. A resurging interest during the 1990s in the concept of orthodoxy and its twin, heresy, in the history of Christianity culminated in two overlapping schools of thought. In 1996 the *Journal of Early Christian Studies* (vol. 4, no. 4, winter 1996) published a collection of essays on heresy in late antiquity presented at the University of British Columbia’s Twenty-Fourth Medieval Workshop (1994). Then, in 1998, a group of scholars gathered at the École française de Rome and also published a collection of essays that includes the Middle Ages and modernity (Susanna Elm, Eric Rebillard, and Antonella Romano, eds., *Orthodoxie, Christianisme, Histoire: Orthodoxy, Christianity, History*, CÉFR 270 (Rome: École française de Rome, 2000). Both collections stress the theoretical shift in the field of Christian history focusing on the discourse, both ancient and contemporary, of orthodoxy and heresy. Other representative works include Elizabeth Clark, *The Origenist Controversy: The Cultural Construction of an Early Christian Debate* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1992); Virginia Burrus, *The Making of a Heretic: Gender, Authority, and the Priscillianist Controversy* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1995); Rebecca Lyman, “A Topography of Heresy: Mapping the Rhetorical Creation of Arianism,” in *Arianism after Arius: Essays on the Development of the Fourth Century Trinitarian Conflicts*, ed. Michel R. Barnes and Daniel H. Williams, 45–62 (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 2000); and Teresa Shaw, “Ascetic Practice and the Genealogy of Heresy: Problems in Modern Scholarship and Ancient Textual Representation,” in Miller and Martin, *Cultural Turn*, 213–36.

59. Shaw, “Ascetic Practice,” 213.

60. Patricia Cox Miller and Dale Martin, eds., *The Cultural Turn in Late Ancient Studies* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2005). See, in particular, Dale Martin’s introduction (1–24), Averil Cameron’s “How to Read Heresiology” (193–212), and Teresa Shaw’s “Ascetic Practice and the Genealogy of Heresy: Problems in Modern Scholarship and Ancient Textual Representation” (213–36). And, most

no means a new phenomenon in this period, the difference was in how disputes were handled. As previously discussed, the imperial recognition of Christianity allowed for new (imperial) mechanisms to enforce right belief. One such tool was exile. Subsequently, the discursive tactics used to create a defensive orthodoxy were almost always informed by these new polemical realities. Thus, one arena in which the construction of competing orthodox identities works itself out is the literary imaginations of exiled bishops and those who remembered them.

The discourse of exile constructs, contests, and preserves orthodox identity in both ancient and contemporary works.⁶¹ Until very recently, the vast majority of scholarship on episcopal exile has taken one of two causal positions: a bishop is exiled either for theological or for political reasons.⁶² We see this most clearly demonstrated in debates over Athanasius's exiles as we started to explore above. Another example that draws together many of the points we have explored surrounding the academic study of clerical exile is evident in recent research on Hilary of Poitiers.⁶³

The scholarly consensus is that Hilary was condemned at the Council of Beziers in 356. He was subsequently sent to Phrygia but traveled extensively for the duration of his short exile. Like Athanasius's first exile, the cause of Hilary's exile remains hotly debated. The traditional argument holds that Hilary was exiled for theological reasons, presumably related to his adherence to a pro-Nicene orthodoxy and his failure to condemn Athanasius at the councils held in Arles in 353 and Milan in 355.⁶⁴ This explanation is often espoused by Hilary's modern biographers,

recently, see Todd Berzon, *Classifying Christians: Ethnography, Heresiology, and the Limits of Knowledge in Late Antiquity* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2016).

61. I follow usage of the term *discourse* in Michel Foucault, *The Archaeology of Knowledge: And the Discourse on Knowledge* (New York: Psychology Press, 2002). He theorizes that our world is structured through linguistic practices that define the terms in which we understand the constructed world. There are social rules of exclusion and conditions by which dominant discourses articulate processes of constructing language and understanding. Discourse means more than simply speech or language. A discourse is a system of speech, thought, and action that informs and constitutes understanding, and all discourses presuppose a series of inherent relations of power. In other words, discourses are the categories of human experience that govern our thought world. Averil Cameron pointed to the usefulness of discourse analysis in early Christian studies in this influential work. See Cameron, *Christianity and the Rhetoric of Empire: The Development of Christian Discourse*, Sather Lectures 55 (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1991).

62. The *Migrations of Faith Project* (www.hrionline.ac.uk/sites/clericalexile) is the noted exception. The scholars involved in this project, including myself and Hillner, are starting to challenge previous studies that look for the causes behind individual exiles or the theological reasoning behind the persecution of individual bishops.

63. For a more developed discussion on Hilary's exilic discourse, see Barry, "Heroic Bishops."

64. This is also the most common interpretive framework used to view Athanasius's exiles. Khaled Anatolios, for example, uses Athanasius's exiles to frame the progressive development and coherence of his theological contribution to the larger Trinitarian controversies of the fourth century. See Anatolios, *Athanasius: The Coherence of His Thought* (New York: Routledge, 1998) and *Athanasius* (New York: Routledge, 2004). Ultimately, Anatolios places Athanasius firmly within a historical trajectory

such as J. H. Reinkens and Paul Burns.⁶⁵ The evidence used to support this position follows Sulpicius Severus's report of an imperial edict that states that all who did not agree to Athanasius's condemnation also ought to be banished: *Edictum ab imperatore proponitur, ut qui in damnationem Athanasii non subscriberent in exilium pellerentur*.⁶⁶ John Cassian, in his work *On the Incarnation*, and Gregory of Tours, in the *History of the Franks*, also cite Hilary's staunch defense of orthodoxy as the principal reason for his exile.⁶⁷

All are not persuaded by theological arguments, however. A second position holds that Hilary was deposed for political reasons, possibly due to treasonous acts. For example, he may have been linked to the brief revolt instigated by Silvanus in Gaul in 355, as was first posited by Alfred Feder in 1912⁶⁸ and then accepted by Henry Chadwick in his 1959 encyclopedia entry.⁶⁹ Hilary's possible treasonous activities were again described by Hanns Christof Brennecke⁷⁰ and further explored by D. H. Williams in the 1980s and 1990s.⁷¹ These claims are linked to a vague reference made by Hilary in his letter to Constantius. He states that both

that reaffirms Nicene terminology and contemporary reflections on its ongoing theological significance. A similar approach can be found in J. W. C. Wand, *The Greek and Latin Doctors*, ed. John H. Morgan (Bristol, ID: Wyndham Hall, 1990); M. E. Molloy, *Champion of Truth: The Life of Saint Athanasius* (New York: Alba House, 2003); Lewis Ayres, *Nicaea and Its Legacy: An Approach to Fourth-Century Trinitarian Theology* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004); and George Dion Dragas, *Saint Athanasius of Alexandria: Original Research and New Perspectives* (Rollingsford, NH: Orthodox Research Institute, 2005).

65. J. H. Reinkens, *Hilarius von Poitiers* (Schaffhausen: Hurter, 1864). Many years later, Paul Burns made a similar argument in his *The Christology in Hilary of Poitiers' "Commentary on Matthew"* (Rome: Augustinian Patristic Institute, 1981), and then later built on it in his "Hilary of Poitiers' Road to Beziers: Politics or Religion?" *Journal of Early Christian Studies* 2, no. 3 (1994): 273–89.

66. Sulpicius Severus, *Chron.* 2.39.2.

67. John Cassian, *De Incarn.* 7.24; and Gregory of Tours, *Greg. Hist.* prol. 3.

68. Alfred Feder, *Studien zu Hilarius von Poitiers III* (Vienna: Hölder, 1912).

69. Henry Chadwick, "Hilarius von Poitiers," in *Die Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart*, ed. Kurt Galling and Wilfrid Werbeck (Tübingen: Mohr, 1959), 317.

70. Hanns Christof Brennecke made the strongest argument for a link to treason, although many of Hilary's critics argue that his political importance prior to his exile is almost impossible to ascertain. See Brennecke, *Hilarius von Poitiers und die Bischofsopposition gegen Konstantius II. Untersuchungen zur dritten Phase des arianischen Streites (337–361)*, PTS 26 (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1984).

71. D. H. Williams tempers the loose connection of Brennecke, *Hilarius* to Silvanus in Hilary of Poitiers, *Contra Const.*, (see note 69) and points instead to passages in Hilary of Poitiers, *De Syn.*, that address Hilary's misgivings about his episcopal network back in Gaul as well as explicate further what the false charges mentioned in *Against Constantius* might reveal. See Williams, "A Reassessment of the Early Career and Exile of Hilary of Poitiers," *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 42, no. 2 (1991): 202–17. He affirms the argument that Hilary's support of Athanasius and failure to condemn the pro-Nicene supporter could not have been these charges, ruling out a theological connection, and concludes that Hilary must have been exiled for political reasons linked to his contentious relationship with Saturninus, his chief opponent at Beziers: "As a Western traditionalist, Hilary may have posed an obstruction to the attempts of Saturninus to create a common front among the Gallic bishops in support of the new religious policies of Constantius" (*ibid.*, 212).

the emperor and his Caesar, Julian, have been duped by false accusations made against the innocent bishop.⁷² What these false accusations are remains unclear. After reassessing the debate after the publication of Williams's article, Barnes concludes that the cause of Hilary's exile must ultimately "remain a mystery."⁷³

Scholars do agree that Hilary remained in exile for only a short time (356–360) and that he returned to Gaul sometime soon after Julian was hailed Augustus of the West in 360. Again, it is unclear why Hilary returned. He may have received an imperial pardon, or he may have returned on his own volition. His ancient biographers provide little detail on the topic. Sulpicius Severus boasted that Hilary returned after he forced the emperor to repent, and Jerome simply writes that he returned after a short period in Constantinople.⁷⁴ Unfortunately, his contemporary biographers are just as perplexed or misguided. Y.-M. Duval argues that many scholars erroneously reference Hilary's statement *fugere mihi sub Nerone licuit* as proof of the reason behind his return, which they understand to be a desire to avoid the emperor's insatiable desire to persecute orthodox Christians.⁷⁵ This revealing detail highlights how exiles are easily cast as persecuted, and therefore orthodox, figures by modern scholars who envision a past in which orthodoxy is already assumed.

These observations bring us to another important intervention made throughout this book: The manner in which scholars treat available sources reveals contemporary historical biases. Reconstructions of John Chrysostom's exile, in particular, have resulted in reinstating historical narratives of Christian triumph that overshadow a counter-narrative that viewed John as a heretic. Part of the problem appears to be the number of sources available to the historian. Unlike the paucity of texts concerning Hilary's exile and return, there is a plethora of material on the events surrounding John's exile.

Both Wendy Mayer and Geoffrey Dunn have convincingly argued that the surplus of evidence demonstrates a struggle between Johanite and anti-Johanite camps in Constantinople soon after John's departure and for a few years after his death.⁷⁶

72. At the beginning of his brief letter, Hilary states, "Yet I am exiled not by an offense, but by a faction and by a synod's false messengers to you, devout Emperor, impeached, as I am, by impious men with no knowledge of guilty acts on my part. I have a witness of no light weight to my complaint in my religious lord Julian, your Caesar, who has endured through my exile more of calumny from the malicious than I of injustice; indeed, your Piety's letters are here at hand. But all the falsehoods of those who procured them for my exile are evident. . . . Let me rely on that state of my knowledge and disclose that you, Augustus, have been cheated and your Caesar deceived" (Hilary of Poitiers, *Contra Const.* 2).

73. Barnes nevertheless briefly concedes that Hilary must have been deposed for theological reasons in Barnes, "Hilary of Poitiers," 129.

74. Sulpicius Severus, *St. Martin* 6.7; and Jerome, *Chron.*

75. Y.-M. Duval, "Vrais et faux problèmes concernant le retour d'exil d'Hilaire de Poitiers et son action en Italie en 360–363," *Athenaeum* 48 (1970): 253–66.

76. The Johanite controversy was relatively short-lived: John's name was restored to the dispatches in 418 CE, and his body was returned to Constantinople in 438; see Wendy Mayer, "Media Manipulation as a Tool in Religious Conflict: Controlling the Narrative Surrounding the Deposition

The material that survives contains both positions. In addition to biographical accounts and ecclesiastical histories, a host of sermons circulated under John's name right before his second exile and soon thereafter.⁷⁷ These pro-Johanite materials constitute a series of texts that take great pains to construct John as both a martyr and a saint.⁷⁸ Yet dissenting voices are also preserved, although sparingly. These voices surface roughly twenty-five to thirty years after John's exile, primarily in Socrates's *Ecclesiastical History*.⁷⁹ Mayer cites a relatively recent attempt to discredit Socrates's account. Scholars blatantly favor the interpretation of Sozomen in his *Ecclesiastical History* over the narrative offered by Socrates.⁸⁰ This trend is problematic for two reasons: Sozomen's account is written even later than that of Socrates, and Sozomen preserves a staunchly pro-Johanite slant. Mayer concludes that Socrates is so often dismissed in large part because he preserves a tradition that presents John in a less favorable light, and not without cause. Mayer writes:

Socrates' primary concern, in devoting an entire book to the events associated with John, is to document the most recent and most devastating schism within the church and to frame the individual at the centre of the schism, John, as a schismatic. Like Palladius he does not adopt a chronological approach, but rather present events in such a way that the causal factor behind the schism are brought to the front. It should be said at this point that for Socrates John is not the only person responsible for the schism . . . but the difference between his account and those of Palladius and ps.-Martyrius lies in the degree of personal responsibility he attributes to John, something which the Johanite sources are at pains to avoid.⁸¹

It is not only his ancient biographers who are at pains to avoid calling into question John's orthodox legacy. Each biographer, ancient and contemporary,

of John Chrysostom," in *Religious Conflict from Early Christianity to Early Islam*, ed. W. Mayer and B. Neil, *Arbeiten zur Kirchengeschichte* 121, 151–68 (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2013). See also Geoffrey Dunn, "The Date of Innocent I's *Epistula* 12 and the Second Exile of John Chrysostom," *Greek, Roman, and Byzantine Studies* 45 (2005): 155–70, for a debate on the dating of the letter and significance of the pro-Johanite materials.

77. For a full review of the documents circulating under John's name, see Mayer, "Media Manipulation," 156–57. These sermons include psychosystemic material, such as the collection of thirty-eight Latin homilies and Augustine, *C. Jul. op. imp.* (CPL 35). Mayer notes the sermon *On Holy Pentecost*, which contains a combination of both authentic and inauthentic material circulating under John's name. Forty-six homilies assessed by Sever Voicu are also among this suspect group (CPG 4536). In particular, Wendy Mayer provides useful references regarding the scholarly conversation on this material in Mayer, "Media Manipulation," 156nn22–23.

78. Wendy Mayer, "The Making of a Saint: John Chrysostom in Early Historiography," in *Chrysostomosbilder in 1600 Jahren: Facetten der Wirkungsgeschichte eines Kirchenvaters*, ed. M. Wallraff and R. Brändle, *Arbeiten zur Kirchengeschichte* 105, 39–60 (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2008).

79. Socrates, *Ecl. Hist.* 6.1–21. Mayer, "Making of a Saint," 52–59, provides a chart that carefully describes the overlap and differences in details preserved by John's biographers.

80. Here Mayer, "Making of a Saint," 40n3.

81. *Ibid.*, 40–41.

appears to have a particular stake in the way John's exile is described, so each dismisses traditions that call into question John's legacy. The discursive politics involved in this battle over the correct reception of John's exile points to a larger historiographical dilemma: Episcopal exile appears to go hand in hand with the orthodox project.

As the figures of Hilary and John demonstrate, exile as a social phenomenon is difficult to disentangle from the highly polemical texts available to us. Instead of trying to delineate hard and fast rules to define whether or not an experience counts as an orthodox exile, here we will turn to the theological and political polemics at work in defining exile one way or the other. To be clear, this book is not chiefly concerned with issues of causation, although debates surrounding cause and effect are at times discussed. Instead, we will trace the development of exilic discourses through various literary texts. The contradictions and gaps in the sources become evident when we begin to see how the process of orthodoxy became so reliant on exilic discourse.

Pointing to the discursive nature of exile also makes us aware of the theological discourse used by Christian authors and the rhetoric of orthodoxy and heresy they deploy. This becomes most clear when we see how exilic discourse shifts once it is adopted into the biographical/hagiographical accounts. In the very moments at which exilic identities are sealed as orthodox, they also reveal the instability of the discourse. As discussed in the prologue, it appears almost simple for Tertullian to condemn flight in times of persecution as cowardly and contrary to one's identity as a Christian in the third century, and yet, by the early fifth century, exile is presented as evidence of one's access to truth—and, according to some biographers, a requirement for legitimacy. What is erased, however, is the fact that the orthodox were not the only ones to find themselves in exile. As we will explore in greater detail later, some of the most infamous heretics in Christian history—such as Meletius of Antioch and Eusebius of Nicomedia—also found themselves expelled from their communities. Exile is equally a symptom of heresy as it is a symptom of orthodoxy. In addition to discourse analysis, readers will encounter in this book alternative methods to study episcopal exile as a preventative measure to avoid reifying orthodoxy.

EPISCOPAL EXILE AND DISPLACEMENT

We will come across several theoretical concepts of displacement over the course of this book. These theories map the late ancient Roman Empire in inventive ways that draw tighter connections between the fleeing bishops examined here. The places to which bishops actually flee or into which they are imaginatively placed in retrospect create links between competitive topographical narratives. For example, Nicene narratives of utopian urban spaces such as Alexandria and Constantinople come into direct conflict when heretical bishops invade those borders.

Likewise, the cities from which these bishops flee become a significant part of the story in how the bishops themselves are remembered. Exile, by its very nature, is a displacement. The exiled individual is removed from particular places: homelands, cities, episcopal sees, or imagined spaces of authority. The exile of bishops is therefore a productive place to apply space/place theory where relevant.

Current space/place theorists, especially human geographers, make a careful distinction between space and place.⁸² For instance, the modern concept of place is linked more directly to specific geographical locations than is the modern concept of space. While the ancients were equally fixated on space and on place, they moved between the abstract and the particular indiscriminately. In this book, space/place theory identifies topographical themes that link the imaginative process of the ancient concept of displacement. When we pay attention to the relationality, movement, and constructedness of displacement in the ancient world, it becomes clear that the social nature of space and place acts as an imaginative exercise for these ancient thinkers. For example, Alexandria and Constantinople are frequently imagined alongside one another to establish the boundaries of orthodox space over against Nicomedia. For these writers, place was not just a location—such as a geographical coordinate on a map—but was infused with meaning through the creative process of exilic discourse. The authors examined in this book created new topographical meanings for their exile as they moved across the ancient Mediterranean landscape. These places and spaces were then used as a polemical strategy to articulate an individual exile's own displacement, as well as the displacements of other exiles.

Recent spatial theories are therefore helpful for our examination of the past, as has been successfully demonstrated by Christine Shepardson in her work on the city of Antioch.⁸³ Theorists consider, for instance, the ways in which spatial classification relies upon moments of transgression. These crossings are then used to reinforce identifiable boundaries. Homelessness, for example, creates a sense of out-of-placeness that troubles accepted meanings and practices about spaces.⁸⁴

82. For a thorough assessment of the debates about space and place in various theoretical circles, especially during the 1970s, see Phil Hubbard, Rob Kitchin, and Gill Valentine, introduction to *Key Thinkers on Space and Place* (London: SAGE, 2004), 1–15.

83. Christine Shepardson, *Controlling Contested Places: Late Antique Antioch and the Spatial Politics of Religious Controversy* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2014). For an overview of space/place theory in late ancient studies, see, in particular, her introduction, 1–30.

84. Tim Cresswell, in *In Place/Out of Place: Geography, Ideology, and Transgression* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1996), cites as examples Mary Douglas, *Purity and Danger: An Analysis of Concepts of Pollution and Taboo* (New York: Praeger, 1966); A. R. Veness, "Home and Homelessness in the United States: Changing Ideals and Realities," *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 10, no. 4 (1992): 445–68; and L. Malkki, "National Geographic: The Rooting of Peoples and the Territorialization of National Identity among Scholars and Refugees," *Cultural Anthropology* 71, no. 1 (1992): 24–44.

In a similar way, the refugee today creates a sense of panic as large numbers of foreigners (those who are not from *this* place) cross the carefully preserved and policed nation-state boundaries. The alien or outsider thus threatens preconceived notions of belonging. In an ancient context, then, authors relied on a similar distinction between outsiders and insiders to determine who had the authority to control strategic cities such as Alexandria, Antioch, Nicomedia, and Constantinople.

Conversely, the alien status of an exiled bishop could also work to a bishop's advantage. While the alien is often presented in a modern context as a source of anxiety, as Tim Cresswell has stressed, this status was infused with positive attributes in the ancient world. By challenging accepted social norms as an outsider, exiles were often identified as both aliens and persecuted victims. This connection between alienation and persecution allowed the exile to invoke all the cultural authority of the martyr tradition. Displacement, then, became a malleable concept that reinforced claims to orthodoxy at the very moments when it was most under threat.

Space and place theory will, therefore, help us to read and deconstruct the various forms of displacement we will encounter.⁸⁵ As Juliette Day, Raimo Hakola, Maijastina Kahlos, and Ulla Tervahauta aptly surmise, "Places and spaces are not approached as neutral categories but as key factors in how individuals and groups construct their identities."⁸⁶ Athanasius's construction of an Alexandrian orthodox city waylaid by heretics—men described as outsiders—helps him to reaffirm his own ownership over that space, even while absent from it. Athanasius's biographers will also resurrect this spatial concept in their narration of the past. When this strategy falls short during his own lifetime, Athanasius changes his approach and creates counterspaces, or heterotopias, that mirror the urban space he is incapable of inhabiting.

John Chrysostom's construction of the city of Constantinople as a Christian utopia also prepares us for the catastrophe that begins once its bishop flees from its borders.⁸⁷ John and Palladius both ground their respective defenses of John's

85. Equally important for this study is how theory works to the advantage of the historian of late antiquity. Here I take seriously the observations made by Elizabeth Clark, who notes that late ancient historians "do not possess the type of documents on which social historians of modernity work, but high literary/philosophical texts that lend themselves well to theoretical analysis." See Clark, *History Theory Text: Historians and the Linguistic Turn* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2004), 159. As Bruno Estel remarks, "modernity was infatuated with questions concerning time and history whereas the post-modern obsession appears to be with questions pertaining to space and to geography." See Estel, "Nonplaces: An Anecdoted Topography of Contemporary French Theory," *Diacritics* 33, nos. 3–4 (2003): 117–39. Estel maps the so-called spatial turn in French theory through a critical lens of nonplace first espoused by Marc Augé.

86. Juliette Day, Raimo Hakola, Maijastina Kahlos, and Ulla Tervahauta, introduction to *Spaces in Late Antiquity—Cultural, Theological and Archaeological Perspectives* (New York: Routledge, 2016), 2.

87. The term *utopia*, coined by Thomas More, has its roots in classical literature. Fatima Vieira states that More's neologism stems from a compound of the Greek words *ouk*, "not," and *topos*, "place." It is both an affirmation and a denial of place, thus, a nonplace. The neologism also collapses "utopia"

flight from Constantinople by contrasting the utopian vision of the city with the inevitable dystopia that takes place once John is expelled. As soon as the bishop is exiled, that perfected society breaks down. The catastrophe that sets in is the direct result of the bishop's departure and provides John and his biographers with a spatial rhetoric that capitalizes on apocalyptic images of torture and destruction. The subsequent upsurge of episcopal exiles in the surrounding episcopacies only reinforces John's condition as the most heinous of crimes enacted on the church. It is a bleak picture indeed.

A shift in perspective—and one that allows for a historiographical engagement open to the theoretical—allows us to encounter these ancient texts as literary production. Many of the texts assessed, for an example, are letters. In an effort to show the fluidity of exilic discourse, the genre of epistolography, in both Greek and Latin texts, serves as the primary medium through which this discourse of displacement is transmitted, although the larger literary genres out of which letters develop certainly vary. Put simply, the majority of the texts studied here are addressed to someone and sent somewhere else. Whether these letters actually reached their addressed recipients—whether the emperor Constantius II ever saw the letters Athanasius addressed to him, for instance—is a historical argument I do not intend to address here. What is of interest is how these letters constitute a shared cultural space that moves across the empire that can be used as evidence of a Nicene orthodoxy under persecution from its very inception by later ecclesiastical historians.

Moreover, epistolography is a favored genre used by authors to create imaginative spaces that are social and extremely productive, as well as to house descriptions of charged spaces of contestation. Additionally, authors took already theologically charged spaces like Nicaea or Rome and inserted their spatial authority into new spaces, such as Constantinople or Alexandria, in order shore up their boundaries. Displacement alongside the study of exile thus reveals how the process of making meaning *moved* across the ancient landscape as it carried the stories of fleeing bishops into different territories. This process becomes all the clearer when we see how orthodox spaces differ from heretical spaces.

(no place) into “eutopia” (the good place), which has the effect of idealizing nonspace. Vieira states, “by creating two neologisms which are so close in their composition and meaning—More created a tension that has persisted over time and has been the basis for the perennial duality of meaning of utopia as the place that is simultaneously a non-place (utopia) and a good place (eutopia).” See Vieira, “The Concept of Utopia,” in *The Cambridge Companion to Utopian Literature*, ed. Gregory Claeys (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010), 4.

OUTLINE OF BOOK

This book focuses on two bishops who are initially cast as heretics and sent into exile but who live on as champions of orthodoxy in both the Eastern and Western Roman Empire: Athanasius of Alexandria and John Chrysostom. I consider not only how these two bishops reflected on their own exiles but also how others represented them. In particular, I analyze the biographical reflections in the works of such figures as Gregory of Nazianzus, Palladius of Helenopolis, and the so-called Ps.-Martyrius. In order to construct a defensible orthodox identity, exiled bishops and their biographers invoke rhetorical formulas of suffering and alienation familiar from Christian martyrologies as well as Greek and Roman exilic literature.⁸⁸ These strategies are so effective that biographical accounts, written soon after the death of these two figures, remember an orthodoxy already decided, however controversially.

For this reason, in chapter 1, we begin with an exploration of Athanasius's career outside of the city of Alexandria, in exile. It is in alternative spaces that he formulated a powerful exilic discourse that guaranteed not only Nicaea's legacy but also his own. By tracing the evolution of Athanasius's desert *askesis*, we are able to see how his version of Christian flight became a powerfully transient tale.⁸⁹ So powerful that it was read and reread in several texts and spaces as Athanasius's fame—and his version of Christian orthodoxy—spread to cities across the Roman Empire and became central to the Nicene legacy in Constantinople.

In this first chapter, we explore Athanasius's reliance on and resistance to the empire. Athanasius's contentious relationship with Constantius II would link his experience to a past of imperial persecution. In a post-Constantinian period, however, empire was an effective tool used by all varieties of Christians to advance their causes. An ongoing, ambivalent relationship between Christian and imperial leaders was the subject of much debate among early Christian writers. In his early apologetic works, Athanasius displayed a certain level of deference to Constantius's authority. Once he was safely hidden in the desert and no longer under the emperor's gaze, however, Athanasius became much more critical of imperial meddling in ecclesiastical affairs.

Athanasius's interpretation of episcopal flight was soon picked up by Gregory of Nazianzus, who played a key role in ensuring the Athanasian legacy as an unquestionably orthodox one and who solidified the link between orthodoxy and exile. Chapter 2 examines how Gregory used the theme of Christian flight in two

88. Flower, *Emperors and Bishops*, 2–3, also makes this connection in his summary of the *Dispute between Heraclianus and Germinius* (*Altercatio Heracliani cum Germinio*) in which the bishop of Sirmium's public persecution of three pro-Nicene martyrs mimics the trials in the *Acts of the Scillitan Martyrs*.

89. I here refer to desert *askesis* as way to capture the progression of Athanasius's understanding of the ascetic life during his time in the desert. For a more detailed description, see the following chapter.

orations to help rehabilitate his own failed career as the bishop of Constantinople. In these two works, Gregory constructs the orthodox bishop as a man forged in the fires of exile. Much like Cyprian, in his call for withdrawal, Gregory will rely on the temporary nature of Christian flight to promote the legacy of his heroes. Exile is only ever a temporary position for the truly orthodox. Gregory thus reaffirmed ecclesiastical authority within the civic centers of the Roman Empire and emphasized victory in those settings.

Constantinople, or the second Rome, would continue to play a major role in the growing battle over Nicene orthodoxy that remained tied to Alexandria in many complicated ways. John Chrysostom's troubles in Constantinople were due in no small part to his tense relationship with another Alexandrian bishop. As we will come to see in chapter 3, John will align Constantinople with Rome. He stresses that these two holy cities—and the bishops who appropriately reside within—are at risk when outsiders threaten to invade and undermine their authority. John describes what he sees as an assault. He focuses on the activities of his nemesis bishop, Theophilus of Alexandria, who unlawfully interfered in Constantinopolitan politics. Due to this invading bishop's heinous activity, John argues, the very sanctity of Constantinople—and possibly of other holy Roman cities—is under threat.

Familiar appeals to themes of persecution and tacit charges of episcopal malfeasance will initially frame his defense of his exile. When his appeals to Rome fail to secure a permanent return, John expands his epistolary efforts, although his exilic identities forged in his extensive letter collection produced between 404 and 407 would change significantly. The letters are modeled after classical themes and include references to long suffering, indifference, and even descriptions of luxurious retreat. As we will explore, the aim in this second phase of his defense is to produce an authorial position that justified his ongoing status as an exile. John's epistolary efforts perform what Owen Hodkinson has identified as a "macro-unit of composition" and what he sees as "a kind of literature in which the author can experiment with miniature correspondences, personas, chronological and thematic relations and intratextual allusion."⁹⁰

John was a masterful craftsman and appealed to a variety of literary models and themes to fashion his exilic self, but his efforts failed to secure his ultimate objective. He remained a bishop in exile with no end in sight. This outcome is seen most clearly in the two theological treatises composed for his most intimate correspondent, Olympias, in which he argues that exile is the natural state of all humanity. His experience in exile might appear at first sight different, and maybe even suspicious. Quite to the contrary, he concludes: *all* Christians are in exile.

90. Owen Hodkinson, "Better Than Speech: Some Advantages of the Letter in the Second Sophistic," in *Letters: Classical and Late Antique Epistolography*, ed. Ruth Morello and A. D. Morrison (Cambridge: Oxford University Press, 2007), 287.

Yet John's final assessment of his two trips into exile was not tied to any one enemy or place but looked to classical examples of the long-suffering wanderer. As a perpetual exile, he would not have the satisfaction of a triumphant return, like Athanasius. Instead, he was resigned to wander outside of Constantinople and eventually died as an exile. John's biographers were thus faced with a particular challenge when reviving the memory of their failed hero. Chapter 4 looks at how John Chrysostom's biographers made use of alternate exilic themes to construct a localized exilic discourse that would eventually reinstate his memory as an orthodox one. Ps.-Martyrius, for example, insisted that Constantinople was only as holy as the bishop who resided in its space. The moment the bishop leaves the city, orthodoxy also takes flight. John's second biographer, Palladius of Helenopolis, went on to argue that the destruction of the city in the aftermath of John's removal proves the authenticity of its ousted bishop. In both instances, Ps.-Martyrius and Palladius argue that the bishop's memory must be defended and his body returned in order to restore the integrity of the city. This was no easy task, evident from Gregory's insistence on a triumphal return. It is only after both biographers align John's experience with Athanasius's exiles that his orthodoxy is eventually revived.

Ps.-Martyrius's *Funerary Speech for John Chrysostom* and Palladius's *Dialogue on the Life of John Chrysostom* are important not just for what they say but also for what they appear to mask. The rhetorical strategies used by those sympathetic to John's cause emphasize the important role administrative conduct plays in these texts, so much so that overt doctrinal positions are (or appear to be) absent from these texts. As Susanna Elm concluded, the overwhelming silence was due in no small part to the powerful influence these cities held in the empire, as well as the power asserted by their patriarchs.⁹¹ The bishop of Alexandria and the bishop of Constantinople may appear to operate in a doctrine-free zone, but by no means do they operate free of heresiological discourse. As Ps.-Martyrius's efforts reveal, orthodoxy and heresy are difficult to identify when exile becomes the marker of guilt. It therefore takes a discerning eye to truly distinguish a heretical flight from an orthodox one. Palladius must also argue that all was not as it appeared to be. Unlike Ps.-Martyrius, Palladius relies on a legacy of Christian flight that sees the triumphant return as the ultimate goal. Both men, however, will turn back to the city of Constantinople to finish their tale of Christian triumph. All true exiles must return to the city of truth—if only in death.

91. Susanna Elm, "The Dog That Did Not Bark: Doctrine and Patriarchal Authority in the Conflict between Theophilus of Alexandria and John Chrysostom of Constantinople," in *Christian Origins: Theology, Rhetoric and Community*, ed. Lewis Ayres and Gareth Jones, 68–93 (London: Routledge, 1998). She states, "Leaving modern scholarship aside for the moment, the issue at hand is precisely the ancient sources' treatment of the doctrinal aspects of the conflict: the moment Theophilus and John Chrysostom, the two protagonists, enter the scene, none of the sources closest to the events mentions doctrinal positions, as if Theophilus and John were operating in a 'doctrine-free zone'" (69).

As John Chrysostom's failure will reveal, episcopal exile was not a clear indicator of orthodoxy. Christian flight remained a slippery category that continuously threatened to unmask episcopal cowards rather than prop up orthodox heroes. In chapters 5 and 6, two counter-cases demonstrate why this might be. Like their so-called orthodox counterparts, Eusebius of Nicomedia and Meletius of Antioch were also exiled. Unlike Athanasius and John, these two exiled bishops did not live on as stalwarts of orthodoxy. Eusebius's exile is remembered as a just punishment for his support of Arian theology. Yet it is evident that Eusebius returns from his exile with even more power and influence. Meletius's exile, on the other hand, is marred by his controversial election by a so-called Arian community in and around Antioch. Unlike Eusebius, ecclesiastical historians often excuse Meletius for his earlier heretical leanings, which is due in no small part to his role in John Chrysostom's conversion. John must be remembered as orthodox, and so must all his mentors. The two powerful episcopal sees of Alexandria and Antioch remained at odds, and their struggle determined the parameters of the battle over orthodoxy. Antiochene politics were often in direct conflict with Alexandria, and that legacy of conflict appears to have traveled with John to Constantinople.⁹² Like the men we will explore here, the cities they flee to and from will also have a significant afterlife. As we will come to see, the space and place of exile will reveal a great deal about the making of a recognizably orthodox landscape.

The displacement and replacement of contested figures was not lost on ancient authors set on remembering particular places as orthodox and others as heterodox. We thus end this book with an evaluation of how the ecclesiastical historians became invested in shifting their reader's focus to the politics of the Eastern Roman Empire as the Christological controversies took off. Those champions of Nicaea—and its ultimate champion, Athanasius—were then resurrected in recognizable spaces of orthodoxy.

The exilic discourses explored here relied upon the both the subject of Christian flight and the topographical imaginings of displacement to construct a defensible mapping of the Nicene orthodox legacy. In the following pages, the reader will discover how the literary imaginings of fleeing bishops provided a new understanding of why Tertullian's critique, with which this book opened, was eventually displaced by Athanasius's promotion of the bishop in flight.

92. See chapters 2 and 3.