

Social Networks and the Origenist Controversy: The Case of Anastasius I of Rome, Jerome, and Paulinus of Nola

Geoffrey D. Dunn

Geoffrey D. Dunn is a Fellow of the Australian Humanities Academy and honorary research associate in the Department of Ancient and Modern Languages and Culture, University of Pretoria, South Africa, who lives in Brisbane, Australia.

Abstract

Attention to the complexities of social networks at the time of the first Origenist controversy at the end of the fourth century reveals that while both Jerome and Anastasius I, bishop of Rome, were anti-Origenist, they had differing attitudes towards Paulinus of Nola. Jerome was suspicious of him because of Origenist associates, while Anastasius seems to have held him in high regard. It is argued here that it is too simplistic to divide participants in this controversy into pro- and anti-Origenist camps and to expect that those within each camp all shared the same outlook and evaluation of others. Personal attitudes towards others usually are shaped by more than one issue, and different issues hold different significance for different people. In the case of Anastasius, it would appear that he was unaware of potential Origenist sympathies held by Paulinus, did not place the same importance on his network of contacts as Jerome did, and/or was more influenced by his social standing as a member of the elite than by suspicion about possible Origenist affinity.

One of the important insights from Elizabeth Clark's magisterial work on the Origenist controversy is that social networks, including those of kinship and patronage, with their relationships of loyalty and rivalry, influenced the attitudes and actions of many participants in the controversy.¹ Indeed, she had argued earlier that, since there was no single theological issue that characterized this controversy, these non-theological issues were all the more important.² This is not to deny that the various theological issues, like asceticism, marriage and sexuality, and divine anthropomorphism, were not important, as that article demonstrates, but to highlight that the social dimension was significant also. Interest in these networks in late antiquity, particularly revealed in episcopal letters but equally applicable in non-Christian circles, increasingly has become a focus for research in recent years.³

Anastasius I, bishop of Rome at the end of the fourth and beginning of the fifth centuries, makes several brief, but crucial, appearances in the pages of Clark's work.⁴ As bishop of the church of the largest city in the empire and of the only apostolic church in the West, where the two leading apostles, Peter and Paul, died and were buried, his opinion mattered. Without having to rehearse the question of the development of papal primacy in the early church, all can agree at the very least that the Roman bishop had a prestige and an influence unrivalled in the empire.⁵ Leaving aside his judicial role within the church regarding matters of discipline and behavior, mandated by an ever-increasing array of synodal canons,⁶ the position of the Roman bishop on matters of belief held great sway. Although not everyone would have agreed that his teaching was determinative or definitive, having the support of the Roman bishop was a weighty and consequential boost for those on the same side of the argument, and vice versa.

Anastasius corresponded with the principal antagonists in this phase of the Origenist controversy, Jerome and Rufinus, as well as other leading figures, like John of Jerusalem and Theophilus of Alexandria. It is well known that he reversed the position of his predecessor, Siricius (384–99),⁷ and condemned some of Origen's works, and this secures his place in the history of theology. Yet Anastasius is a neglected and overshadowed individual sandwiched between the more impressive figures of Siricius and Innocent I (402–17),⁸ much like Beethoven's fourth symphony (B-flat, Op. 60) goes largely unnoticed between his mighty third (Eroica, E-flat, Op. 55) and fifth (C minor, Op. 67) symphonies.

By placing Anastasius at the forefront of our consideration we can reexamine some aspects of the first Origenist controversy in order to appreciate the extent to which social networks shaped his theological position. It will be demonstrated that, while we are able to determine something of the social networks of "alliances and enmities," as Clark puts it,⁹ in which Anastasius operated, participants in this controversy cannot neatly be divided into two camps, at least with regard to who their allies and opponents were. While it is well known that both Anastasius and Jerome opposed Origenism, that Jerome was wary of Paulinus of Nola, and that Anastasius thought highly of Paulinus, scholarship has not addressed the question of why two anti-Origenists held divergent opinions about Paulinus. The answer is that different significance was placed on the varying factors that shaped the ways these two interacted with Paulinus. For Jerome it was Origenism that mattered most (combined with a resentment against Siricius), while for Anastasius this was the main issue in his relationship with Jerome but not in his relationship with Paulinus. The insight that alliances and rivalries were constructed from differently weighted issues adds richness to and confirms the valuable contribution Clark has made to early Christian scholarship as well as that offered by those who work on Jerome and Paulinus. We begin with the reference to Anastasius in *Epistula* 20 by Paulinus before exploring some of the complexities of the attitudes and relationships between these three.

ANASTASIUS IN PAULINUS OF NOLA'S CORRESPONDENCE

We find reference to Anastasius in one of the letters written by Paulinus of Nola to the bishop of his place of birth, Delphinus, metropolitan bishop of Bordeaux (ancient Burdigala in the province of Aquitania Secunda in the civil diocese of Septem Prouvinciae), while he was still a presbyter in Nola.¹⁰ In it Paulinus reveals that shortly (*breue*) after the ordination of Anastasius as pope of Rome (*papa urbis*), which I take to be 27 November 399,¹¹ the latter had written to the bishops of Campania.¹² Paulinus claims a close bond with Anastasius. No doubt that was true, but I would caution against taking Paulinus completely at face value. Despite Paulinus's claim that the letter was about him (*de nomine nostro*),¹³ it is more likely that this was a circular letter of communion in which newly elected bishops announced their solidarity with colleagues and dealt with other topical matters, which in this instance must have included some reference to Paulinus.¹⁴ According to Paulinus, the letter was an opportunity "to lavish on me his most devoted affection"¹⁵ and was "full of piety, devotion, and peace . . . so that he could reveal his own affection for me and set the precedent of his kindness before others."¹⁶

Why would Paulinus, a mere presbyter, be singled out, and why would Paulinus want to draw the attention of Delphinus to it? One can suggest three reasons, the last two of which would

indicate some pre-existing animosity involving Paulinus: 1) Anastasius had long been friends with Paulinus and was celebrating that friendship; 2) Siricius had denigrated Paulinus, which Anastasius sought to overturn; or 3) the Campanian bishops had denigrated Paulinus, which Anastasius intentionally or unintentionally was helping to overturn. A fourth possibility, one that does not accept what Paulinus said about Anastasius totally at face value, is that Paulinus was exaggerating the extent of the Roman bishop's commendation, whereby he was trying to convince Delphinus (and himself) that things were going well for him now that he was back in Campania not as governor but as presbyter. There is certainly evidence to support the second reason (and evidence within the letter itself leads us to reject the third), without diminishing the possibility of an element of the fourth being present. Whether there was a pre-existing acquaintance or friendship between Anastasius and Paulinus we cannot say based on the evidence that Paulinus presented to Delphinus.

As further evidence of their amiability, Paulinus reported that when he attended the liturgical celebration of Peter and Paul (29 June) in Rome in 400, he was fêted by Anastasius, or at least this is what he wanted Delphinus to believe.¹⁷ He noted that his attendance was a customary practice, and we have evidence for such practice in a letter to Sulpicius Severus from about 397, where he was busy with pilgrimages to the tomb sites and dealing with meetings.¹⁸ His reception by Rome's bishop that year seems to have been a first.

There must be some truth to the positive reception Paulinus experienced because some time later (*postea quoque interposito tempore*) the Roman bishop invited Paulinus to Rome to join in celebration for his *natalis*, the anniversary of his episcopal election, which I would take to be the first anniversary at the end of November 400.¹⁹ Paulinus was quick to add that such invitations were usually reserved for bishops, thereby highlighting to Delphinus just how appreciated and valued he was. Anastasius is said not to have felt any annoyance when Paulinus wrote back excusing himself, letting his letter be his attendance.²⁰ It would be interesting to know if Paulinus received subsequent invitations for the other anniversaries in November 401 and November 402, but evidence is lacking.

Why did Paulinus feel more welcomed by Anastasius than he had been by Siricius (evidence for which will be considered in the next section)? That they shared similar favorable views on asceticism was put forward nearly a century ago by Erich Caspar: "Anastasius I . . . stand dem asketischen Kreisen in Rom nicht mit der glerichen Abneigung [as had Siricius] und dem Hieronymus nicht mit derselben Voreingenommenheit gegenüber, wie sein Vorgänger."²¹ Even if we leave aside an alignment of views on asceticism,²² there are other reasons why Anastasius might have been more genial towards Paulinus. Anastasius could have considered himself as a new broom setting the church of Rome in a new direction after Siricius. He might also have been more pragmatic than Siricius in seeing the advantages in singling out Paulinus (if indeed he were singled out to the extent Paulinus represented it to Delphinus). Paulinus was a member of the empire's social elite, one of the few Christian aristocrats known to have embraced clerical life, as Michele Salzman points out.²³ Such aristocrats frequently retained a concern for their status and prestige,²⁴ and although Paulinus had divested himself of much of his wealth (even if the extent of that is unclear),²⁵ there can be little doubt that the church found tangible benefit from cultivating *amicitia* with such influential and well-connected individuals. Perhaps Anastasius valued such social possibilities and the *éclat* Paulinus brought more highly than had Siricius.

So, what we have is a positive relationship between Anastasius and Paulinus throughout 400, if not beyond, even if slightly exaggerated by the latter, built most likely on a shared regard for asceticism and on the latter's social standing.

PAULINUS AND SIRICIUS: TENSION IN ROME OVER JOVINIAN AND ASCETICISM

To understand the relationship between Anastasius and Paulinus more completely we must back track and look at the relationship between Paulinus and Siricius, as well as understand that we must also come to terms with the attitudes towards asceticism shown by Siricius, Jerome, and Jovinian. Only after that can we turn to the relationship between Paulinus and Jerome, and then Anastasius and Jerome. It is within that broader picture that we can understand fully the relationship between Anastasius and Paulinus outlined above. All of this leads to an appreciation that the social networks were not constrained and cannot be categorised solely by the binary choice for or against Origenism. Fortunately, much of the research for this background has already been conducted. The reason, therefore, why Paulinus was keen to trumpet, if not exaggerate, his favorable reception by Anastasius was because it went some way to reverse the unfavorable reception he had received from Siricius summarized below and the blow to his self-esteem that must have resulted.

What is revealed also is that understanding the relationship as dyadic is incomplete and that a triadic analysis reveals a more accurate picture of these individuals as part of social networks and how differing values added to the complexity of the networks. While Anastasius and Jerome both opposed Origenism, and Jerome was indifferent to or suspicious of Paulinus, the relationship between Paulinus and Anastasius was cordial. In other words, factors other than Origenism alone shaped that last relationship. Further, in terms of balance theory in social network analysis, the two positive links and the one negative link (that between Jerome and Paulinus) ought to have led to cognitive dissonance.²⁶ We can offer a possible explanation at the end as to why Anastasius seems not to have experienced this, without attempting to pursue a developed sociological analysis of this network, which would be difficult given the limited information at our disposal. We can outline here what is established already in scholarship by way of background in the time before Anastasius.

After his presbyteral ordination probably in Barcelona at Christmas 394 and his adoption of an ascetic lifestyle, Paulinus returned to Campania, where he had been *consularis* years before.²⁷ On the way he stopped in Rome about the middle of 395. This was only a few months after Theodosius I had died and had been replaced in the West by the juvenile Honorius as emperor.²⁸ Nearly a year later, in a letter to his friend Sulpicius Severus, Paulinus reflected on his reception by the Roman clergy now that he was a presbyter rather than a senator.²⁹ He wrote scathingly of their jealousy (*zelotyporum . . . clericorum*), their flames of hatred (*odiorum flamma*), and their envy (*invidia*), which had been apparent during his visit and only his departure had seemed to calm. To varying degrees the Roman clergy regarded him as a stumbling block (*scandalizari*), some of whom, he went so far as to say, hated him (*oderunt pacem meam*) and would not have anything to do with him.³⁰ He informed Sulpicius Severus that even the pope of Rome (Siricius) haughtily refused to see him.³¹ Paulinus wanted to justify himself to Sulpicius Severus, so he pointed out how unwarranted such a treatment had been and how much it differed from his treatment from the local bishops in Campania. That he went on about it at such length surely indicates just how riled he had been.

It is with this in mind that we must understand what is happening in *Epistula 20* to Delphinus. We have no evidence that Delphinus had heard about how Paulinus was received in Rome, but there is every reason to believe that he had or that Paulinus feared that he had. Without acknowledging his initial setback in Rome in this letter, his enthusiasm in referring to the positive regard in which he was held by Anastasius must surely have been to prove (without admitting he had anything to prove) that he had done nothing wrong and that the hostility towards him had been totally unjustified. It would have suited his purposes to paint Anastasius in the most glowing of terms, since it reflected well on his own virtue and worthiness.

We do not know exactly why Siricius and the Roman clergy were so cool, even frosty, towards Paulinus, but suggestions have been made. Like Ambrose of Milan, Paulinus had been a senator and a provincial governor and was a member of the elite of Roman society, and both had been drafted into ordination, with Ambrose, at this point, having been made bishop rather than a mere presbyter. The social status and privilege of such individuals could easily trigger jealousy among fellow clergy from humbler backgrounds. Yet it seems that Siricius and Ambrose were on warm terms.³² So, even if there is truth to Dennis Trout's speculation that Siricius "was truly scandalized by the apparent irregularities of Paulinus's presbyteral ordination" it could not have been that alone that determined his reception, for it ought to have applied equally to Ambrose.³³ Both men had not observed the *cursus* that Siricius had written about in his letter to Himerius of Tarragona (ancient Tarraco in the province of Tarraconensis in the civil diocese of Hispaniae), and both men had also held civil office (*cingulum*), which ought to have made them ineligible.³⁴ In the case of Paulinus there was also the added fact that he had been ordained in one church and had moved to another.³⁵ So there must have been something else, if that last point was insufficient, that sparked the disdain Paulinus experienced. Ambrose was a bishop and had been for ten years before Siricius, he was bishop of the city that had been the imperial residence of Valentinian I and Justina, Gratian, and Valentinian II, and he had proved his worth in defending Nicene Christianity against the Arian version endorsed by Justina. Most likely he had done enough to earn the respect of the Roman clergy and was too important to denigrate, something that Paulinus, a mere presbyter, had yet to achieve. It could also simply be a matter of personality; perhaps Paulinus was possessed of an annoying disposition. Indeed, the tone of *Epistula 20* to Delphinus leaves the impression of someone fawning and craving approval as well as somewhat egotistical and self-justifying, which is what one would expect from someone who experiences a degree of cognitive dissonance. Compensatory behavior by someone with self-esteem issues could be part of the reason why Paulinus experienced antagonism from the Roman clergy.

We need not rely entirely upon psychological supposition. Trout suggests that it is possible that Paulinus's ascetical lifestyle antagonised Siricius.³⁶ There certainly was conflict in Rome during the 380s and 390s about the practice of asceticism (particularly the sex and marriage aspects of it, as well as its financial aspect), as the dispute between Jerome and Jovinian indicates. That Jerome zealously advocated for asceticism is well known from his correspondence with elite women in Rome.³⁷ That Jovinian was an opponent of the special status that asceticism delivered to its practitioners (as well as other theological issues like the perpetual virginity of Mary) is evinced by Jerome's *Adversus Iovinianum* of 393. Jovinian was not alone, as we know from Ambrosiaster's moderate attitude towards asceticism and his

support of marriage.³⁸ While the controversy dates to after Jerome had left Rome, it no doubt reflected tensions within the church there, only part of which revolved around asceticism. Indeed, Ambrosiaster informs us of the tensions in Rome between deacons and presbyters,³⁹ which leads one to the suspicion that there was a complex interplay between personalities and issues in understanding the clerical rivalries in Rome at the end of the fourth century, and which showed no signs of abating into the fifth.⁴⁰

It should be noted that criticism of Paulinus for having embraced asceticism was not restricted to some elements of the Roman clergy. As Ambrose opined in his letter to Sabinus, those from his *ordo* would be less than sympathetic that one of their own turned his back on his obligations to his wider family by selling property in order to engage in almsgiving.⁴¹ Perhaps this aristocratic attitude was a reaction to the anti-pagan ridicule (exemplified by Ambrose in his letter when he points out that those who would criticize Paulinus themselves engaged in the risible rites of Isis) we find in such texts as *Carmen contra paganos*.⁴² While one could perhaps expect such a reaction from one's social peers, to have a similar negative reaction from one's religious peers, who were probably parroting what they heard from those to whom they desired to attach themselves like clients to patrons,⁴³ was no doubt a bitter disappointment and source of confusion to Paulinus, given that the call to asceticism seemed to be a major teaching of Jesus.

Siricius too had been critical of Jovinian, condemning him in synod in 390, primarily because of the threats of his teaching to the bishop's position on clerical celibacy, the finding of which was endorsed by Milan.⁴⁴ Yet this did not make Siricius and Jerome allies, nor did it make Siricius and Paulinus allies as we have seen, and it did not make Jerome and Paulinus allies either. A triad of three negative links is balanced, yet for someone like Paulinus, given his social status and his expectation to be integrated into the upper echelons of ecclesiastical power, while adopting an ascetical lifestyle, such rejection was perplexing and intolerable. As Kelly pointed out, Siricius belonged to the clerical establishment despised by Jerome and he was no great supporter of asceticism beyond his insistence on celibacy for married clergy.⁴⁵ As David Hunter observes, "Although Siricius, Ambrose, and Jerome concurred in their rejection of Jovinian, the three men had rather different perspectives on asceticism and the role it should play in defining authority in the Church."⁴⁶ What Siricius knew from Himerius about the licentious nature of certain professed ascetics (*monachorum quosdam atque monacharum*) living scandalously in Spain could have seen him doubt Paulinus's motives in moving to Campania, according to Trout.⁴⁷ Perhaps even the fruitless efforts by Paulinus to cultivate friendship with Jerome through reaching out to Jerome's friends in Rome such as Pammachius and Marcella annoyed Siricius and the local clergy.⁴⁸

In triadic, or more complex, relationships (and adding Ambrose and Ambrosiaster into the mix would indeed make this even more complex)⁴⁹ that form a network, the enemy of my enemy is not necessarily my friend, particularly when there is more than one issue at stake. Thus, Siricius and Jerome could be allies with regard to Jovinian but opponents with regard to asceticism more generally.⁵⁰ Paulinus and Siricius could be opponents with regard to asceticism, and Paulinus and Jerome could be allies with regard to asceticism, but this did not make them friends, as we shall now consider.

PAULINUS, SIRICIUS, AND JEROME ON ORIGENISM

Dennis Trout has analysed the perception of the involvement by Paulinus in the first Origenist controversy and situates him in the network of early Christian figures who took sides (or were placed into sides) over Origen, who would later be condemned (or the influence of some of his teachings—such as the pre-existence of souls, the incorporeality of God, universal salvation, and subordinationism—in the writings of others was condemned) in 553 at the Second Council of Constantinople.⁵¹ Trout's interest is to explain the lack of a blossoming relationship between Paulinus and Jerome because of the former's suspected Origenism. The evidence for that is found in the tone of Jerome's *Epistula* 58 of 395 and involved, as far as Jerome was concerned as interpreted by Trout, the choice of Vigilantius as letter-bearer for Paulinus, the latter's connection (a family one it seems) with Melania the Younger and her family and the association therefore with Rufinus,⁵² and Jerome's doubts over scriptural interpretations offered by Paulinus.⁵³ Thus, even though both Jerome and Paulinus had fallen foul of Siricius because of asceticism, this did not draw the two of them together as they were held apart over Origenism, and Origenism was the decisive factor as far as Jerome was concerned. Trout's interest is with the independence exercised by Paulinus in these Christian networks.⁵⁴ Mine is with the independence exercised by Anastasius. Yet when Jerome wrote to Paulinus in *Epistula* 85 in 400, a letter Trout describes as terse, he invited Paulinus to read Origen for the answer to one of the questions he had posed, a point that leads Clark to observe that Jerome's attacks on Origenism might have been less than fully theological.⁵⁵

As we have seen, there is no evidence that Jerome had been critical of Siricius for his lack of action against Origenism, except to say that Siricius had been deluded and gullible in the face of Origenist propaganda.⁵⁶ Siricius had not felt the need to take action against Origen's supporters in Rome or elsewhere.⁵⁷ With his *Apologia* of 400, Rufinus further convinced Christians in Rome of Jerome's extremism,⁵⁸ while Jerome's own *Apologia* against Rufinus from a couple of years later draws attention to the fact that the fate of Origenism in Rome had changed with the succession of Anastasius after Siricius.⁵⁹

Having outlined the negative link between Paulinus and Jerome on the basis of Origenism, we can now return to Anastasius to examine the link between him and Jerome on Origenism, before exploring what impact that had on the positive link between Anastasius and Paulinus presented above.

ANASTASIUS AND JEROME ON ORIGENISM

We know that Anastasius took an anti-Origenist stance in 400, when, in response to pressure from Christians in Rome, including Jerome's supporters such as Marcella and Principia,⁶⁰ a letter from Theophilus of Alexandria,⁶¹ and one from Jerome,⁶² he called a synod of bishops in Rome and wrote about the decision taken to condemn Origen as a heretic in a letter to Simplician of Milan,⁶³ in another to Simplician's replacement, Venerius, in the latter half of 400,⁶⁴ and in a reply⁶⁵ to a non-extant letter from John of Jerusalem who had sought to exonerate Rufinus.⁶⁶ There may have been even more letters from Anastasius after the synod.⁶⁷ Thus, he aligned himself with Jerome's position. Jerome would retain a positive regard for Anastasius years after the Roman bishop's death, as Jerome's letters to Principia and to the young Demetrius from 414 indicate.⁶⁸

In his letter to Simplician (*Grandem sollicitudinem*), Anastasius made use of the popular scriptural images of the shepherd guarding the flock (Isa 40.11; Ezek 34.15; Ps 23; Luke 15.4–7; John 10.1–18; Acts 20.28–29; Heb 13.17; 1 Pet 5.2–3), the sentry in the tower (Isa 52.8; 62.6; Ezek 3.17; Hab 2.1), and the ship's master (Acts 27.11; Jas 3.4), which he applied to Theophilus of Alexandria and, by extension, to himself and the church of Rome, which, like Peter, strengthened the whole church. What had been condemned (at the Roman synod, although this is not specified) was the reading of Origen, a position he expected the bishops of northern Italy to imitate, after reading his letter, in deference to divine teaching. At the end of the letter, Anastasius seems to indicate that what he knows about Origen's work was pointed out to him by the presbyter Eusebius of Cremona, who was the bearer of the letter to Simplician. His blanket rejection of other unspecified passages of Origen that manifest the same blasphemy seem to be an admission that he had not read much Origen at all.

Apologia ad Anastasium from Rufinus seems not to have been written because the synod presided over by Anastasius had condemned him, but rather as a pre-emptive defense now that his orthodoxy had been slighted and called into question.⁶⁹ In response to this, Anastasius indicated in his effusive letter (*Probatae quidem*) to John of Jerusalem that he left up to God the judgement of Rufinus concerning the extent to which he agreed with what he translated or whether the works should even have been translated, although Anastasius firmly believed that works that disturb the peace of the church should not be distributed.⁷⁰ Anastasius lacked the personal indignation, pique, and vituperation that Jerome expressed about his former friend. His passion was not as enflamed as Jerome's by Rufinus or even by Origen. He was prepared to condemn the latter's writings, but he was far from obsessed with the issue. Indeed, he admitted to John that until this was brought to his attention, Origen was of no interest to him; he did not know who he was or what he had written.⁷¹ Clark is somewhat skeptical about the claims by Anastasius,⁷² and if it is true that Anastasius was exaggerating his ignorance, then it would highlight even further the perfunctory nature of his reaction to Origenism. Now that he had been made aware of Origen (and the contribution by Rufinus), we are left with the impression that Anastasius felt he had acted sufficiently and that this was not going to be a topic of enduring significance. He did not wish to know what Rufinus was doing or where he was since he was not close enough physically to Anastasius to be of concern.⁷³

Of some interest to us is the fact that Anastasius was responding to an inquiry by John, who, after all, had a history of antagonism against Jerome, as evidenced by the 397 *Contra Iohannem* and the 416 attacks on Jerome's monasteries in Bethlehem.⁷⁴ As far as Jerome was concerned, John supported Origenism, but this did not stop Anastasius from being friendly and courteous with him and did not cause him to investigate such supposed sympathies. This, we shall see, is similar to how Anastasius treated Paulinus, again despite Jerome's opinion of the presbyter of Nola.

ANASTASIUS I AND PAULINUS, AGAIN

In examining part of the network of relationships at the time of the first Origenist controversy at the start of the fifth century, we have observed the friendly attitude between Anastasius and Paulinus, largely due, I think, to the latter's social status, and doubtlessly helped by a shared advocacy of asceticism. We have also observed the friendly attitude that existed

between Anastasius and Jerome, built upon the same shared advocacy of asceticism and anti-Origenism (in contrast with the attitudes between Siricius and Jerome), even if Anastasius's anti-Origenism was less passionate than Jerome's. We have also observed a less than warm relationship between Paulinus and Jerome because of the latter's suspicions of the former's support for Rufinus and Origenism, and because Paulinus was connected with the Roman aristocrats like Melania, with whom Jerome was not positively connected.

When we broaden our perspective from a simple dyadic understanding and look instead at triadic relationships, a question arises: if both Anastasius and Jerome were opposed to Origenism, why did they have such different attitudes towards Paulinus of Nola?

Dennis Trout noted the dyadic elements (the negative one between Jerome and Paulinus and the friendly one between Anastasius and Paulinus) and commented more broadly on the network of correspondents created by Paulinus, but he did not ask why Anastasius and Jerome did not hold similar regard for Paulinus, since that was not the direction of his research.⁷⁵ Indeed, he turned his attention to the possibility, which soon withered, that Paulinus could have acted as a mediator between Jerome and Rufinus.⁷⁶ Clark is less inclined to see a complete break between Jerome and Paulinus and so does consider Paulinus as a link between the warring camps.⁷⁷ Yet, Paulinus was not the link between the two.

The mismatch between Anastasius and Jerome with regard to Paulinus shows that these social networks were complex realities and that all people in one camp on the issue of Origenism did not regard everyone else in the opposing camp in exactly the same way. A person's positive or negative regard for another person was not based upon a single issue but upon an aggregation of issues, some of which were more significant to one person than the other in making an assessment about a third. What were some of those issues?

For one thing, Anastasius's expressed opposition to Origenism came a little while after the friendly overtures to Paulinus. Perhaps, one could argue, those overtures were withdrawn when the Roman bishop became aware of his suspected Origenist sympathies. If that were true, Paulinus did not record it, which would not be surprising. No one else mentioned it either. Yet we do not have to conclude that Anastasius ever changed his mind about Paulinus.

For another thing, the evidence from Anastasius about Origenism came from sources who might not have known Jerome's reservations about Paulinus. Further, even in what Anastasius learned from Jerome himself (in the non-extant letter mentioned in *Ep.* 88), the latter might not have said anything about Paulinus because he might not have known that Anastasius and Paulinus were on friendly terms and that the Roman bishop, therefore, needed to be warned about Paulinus's suspected sympathies. As far as Jerome was concerned, Anastasius only needed to be warned about Origen and Rufinus. By the time Anastasius invited Paulinus to join the celebrations of his *natalis* in Rome late in 400, he had been involved in the Origenist controversy for several months. Others in Jerome's circle who also knew Paulinus, such as Eusebius of Cremona and Pammachius, held him in some regard.⁷⁸ Whatever doubts Jerome had about Paulinus he seems to have kept to himself or taken them up only with Paulinus directly.

Perhaps if Anastasius knew of any sympathy Paulinus held for Origen, as Jerome suspected Paulinus had, he was in a better position in Rome to ascertain more detail and evaluate the evidence since he knew Paulinus personally and could make his own assessment. He must have rejected such an assertion if he had heard it. One imagines that Anastasius was aware of who the contacts and relatives of Paulinus were, including Rufinus. A careful reading of the letter from Anastasius to John of Jerusalem shows that, while he was prepared to condemn Origen, Anastasius was less definitive against Rufinus. It would not be surprising that Anastasius did not react against Paulinus simply on the basis of the latter's friendship with Rufinus, even if someone had warned him about Paulinus, because Rufinus was not as significant in the controversy for Anastasius as he was for Jerome.

Of course, apart from what Paulinus tells us of the Roman bishop's feelings towards him, we have nothing from Anastasius himself that tells us that he even knew of Paulinus, let alone felt positively about him. That Anastasius singled him out as a presbyter suggests that it was the social status and political connections of Paulinus that were important. The entrée Paulinus provided into the world of Christian aristocracy must have been more than enough to outweigh any suspicion of Origenism. As the bishop of a city such as Rome, Anastasius likely needed to treat the aristocracy much more sensitively than the irascible presbyter Jerome needed to in far-off Palestine.

CONCLUSION

The first Origenist controversy saw the allegiances and alliances within the Roman church reshaped to some extent as Siricius died and was replaced by Anastasius I. But Origenism was not the only issue that divided the local clergy and the tremendously important Christian aristocrats. Questions about the value of asceticism also provided room for disagreement, as well as all personal rivalries and frustrated ambitions. After his presbyteral ordination, Paulinus of Nola held a position on asceticism that did not find favor with Siricius and many of the local Roman clergy. This changed under Anastasius I.

I conclude that, when Anastasius became interested in the issue of Origenism after its significance was drawn to his attention by Jerome and his supporters, Anastasius found suggestions of Paulinus's sympathies with Origenism (although I am not convinced that he had even heard those suggestions) too weak to overcome the cachet and prestige that Paulinus's social standing brought to the churches of Italy.

Social network theory helps us appreciate that even though people might have been divided over the issue of Origenism, this was not the only issue by which people were deemed allies or opponents. When we look at Anastasius I, Paulinus of Nola, and Jerome, we find that all three were proponents of asceticism. We find that Origenism was the issue that united Jerome and Anastasius and the issue that divided Jerome and Paulinus. Yet it was not an issue that divided Anastasius and Paulinus. It appears that social status rather than Origenism was more influential in shaping Anastasius's opinion about the presbyter in Nola.

Footnotes

1. Elizabeth A. Clark, *The Origenist Controversy: The Cultural Construction of an Early Christian Debate* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1992). On Origenism see also Rowan D. Williams, "Origen: Between Orthodoxy and Heresy," in *Origeniana Septima: Origenes in den Auseinandersetzungen des 4. Jahrhunderts*, ed. W. A. Bienert and U. Kühneweg, *Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologiarum Lovaniensium* 137 (Leuven: Peeters, 1999), 3–14; Demetrios S. Katos, *Palladius of Helenopolis: The Origenist Advocate*, *Oxford Early Christian Studies* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011); Krastu Banev, *Theophilus of Alexandria and the First Origenist Controversy: Rhetoric and Power*, *Oxford Early Christian Studies* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015); and Miyako Demura, "Origen after the Origenist Controversy," in *Christians Shaping Identity from the Roman Empire to Byzantium: Studies Inspired by Pauline Allen*, ed. Geoffrey D. Dunn and Wendy Mayer, *Supplements to Vigiliae Christianae* 132 (Leiden: Brill, 2015), 117–39.
2. Elizabeth A. Clark, "New Perspectives on the Origenist Controversy: Human Embodiment and Ascetic Strategies," *CH* 59 (1990): 145–62; and Elizabeth A. Clark, "Elite Networks and Heresy Accusations: Towards a Social Description of the Origenist Controversy," *Semeia* 56 (1990): 79–97.
3. Adam M. Schor, *Theodoret's People: Social Networks and Religious Conflict in Late Roman Syria*, *The Transformation of the Classical Heritage* 48 (Los Angeles: University of California Press, 2011); Carmen Angela Cvetković and Peter Gemeinhardt, eds., *Episcopal Networks in Late Antiquity: Connecting and Communicating across Boundaries*, *AKG* 137 (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2019); and Adam M. Schor, "Abstract Social Network Modelling and the Rise of Singular Bishops: Textual Guidance from Three Urban Roman Settings," in *Leadership and Community in Late Antiquity: Essays in Honour of Raymond Van Dam*, ed. Young Richard Kim and A. E. T. McLaughlin, *Cultural Encounters in Late Antiquity and the Middle Ages* 26 (Turnhout: Brepols, 2020), 15–45.
4. See Alessandra Pollastri, "Anastasio I, santo," in *Enciclopedia dei Papi*, vol. 1, *Pietro, santo–Anastasio Bibliotecario antipapa*, ed. Massimo Bray (Rome: Istituto della Enciclopedia Italiana, 2000), 381–84.
5. For divergent views on the emergence of papal primacy, see, e.g., John Chapman, *Studies on the Early Papacy* (New York: Benzinger, 1928); Robert B. Eno, *The Rise of the Papacy*, *Theology and Life*, vol. 32 (Wilmington, DE: Michael Glazier, 1990); Michele Maccarrone, ed., *Il primate del vescovo di Roma nel primo millennio. Ricerche e testimonianza, Atti del symposium storico-teologico, Roma, 9-13 Ottobre 1989* (Vatican City: Libreria Editrice Vaticana, 1991); *Il primate del successore di Pietro, Atti del simposio teologico, Roma, dicembre 1996*, *Collana Atti e Documenti* 8 (Vatican City: Libreria Editrice Vaticana, 1998); Stephen K. Ray, *Upon This Rock: St. Peter and the Primacy of Rome in Scripture and the Early Church* (San Francisco, CA: Ignatius Press, 1999); George E. Demacopoulos, *The Invention of Peter: Apostolic Discourse and Papal Authority in Late Antiquity* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2013); Geoffrey D. Dunn, ed., *The Bishop of Rome in Late Antiquity* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2015); and John Chryssavgis, ed., *Primacy in the Church: The Office of Primate and the Authority of Councils*, 2 vols. (Yonkers, NY: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 2016).
6. See Geoffrey D. Dunn, "The Development of Rome as Metropolitan of Suburbicarian Italy: Innocent I's *Letter to the Bruttians*," *Aug* 51 (2011): 161–90.
7. See Elena Cavalcanti, "Siricio, santo," in Bray, *Enciclopedia dei Papi*, 1:375–81.
8. See Malcolm R. Green, "Pope Innocent I: The Church of Rome in the Early Fifth Century," (DPhil diss., Oxford University, 1974); and Alessandra Pollastri, "Innocenzo I, santo," in Bray, *Enciclopedia die Papi*, 1:385–91.
9. Clark, *The Origenist Controversy*, 9.

10. Paulinus of Nola, *Ep.* 20 (CSEL 29:142–49). On Paulinus of Nola, see the article by Janine Desmulliez in Charles Pietri and Luce Pietri, ed., *Prosopographie Chrétienne du Bas-Empire* [= *PCBE*], vol. 2, *Prosopographie du l'Italie chrétienne (313-604)* (Rome: École française de Rome, 1999), 1630-54 (Paulinus 1); and J. R. Martindale, *The Prosopography of the Later Roman Empire* [= *PLRE*], vol. 2, *A.D. 395-527* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1980), 848-49 (Paulinus 16). On Delphinus, see Louis Duchesne, *Fastes épiscopaux de l'ancienne Gaule*, vol. 2, *L'Aquitaine et les Lyonnaises*, 2nd ed. (Paris: Albert Fontemoing, 1910), 60; and Luce Pietri and Marc Heijmans, *PCBE*, vol. 4, *La Gaule Chrétienne (314-614)* (Paris: Association des amis du Centre d'histoire et civilisation de Byzance, 2013), 1:552–55. On the role of the cult of the saints, especially Felix, as promoted by Paulinus see Maria M. Kiely, "The Interior Courtyard: The Heart of Cimitile/Nola," *J ECS* 12 (2004): 443–79.
11. Prosper, *Epitome Chronicon* 1212 (ed. Theodor Mommsen, *Chronicorum minorum saec. IV. V. VI. VII.*, vol. 1, MGH.AA 9 [Berlin: Weidmann, 1892], 464) dated the election of Anastasius to 398. Calculations by the French editors of the *Liber pontificalis* arrive at a date of 399. See Theodor Mommsen, ed., *Libri pontificalis, pars prior*, MGH.GPR 1 (Berlin: Weidmann, 1898), xlvi, lix, and 87; Louis Duchesne and Cyril Vogel, eds., *Le Liber pontificalis. Texte, introduction et commentaire*, vol. 1, 2nd ed. (Paris: E. de Boccard, 1955), ccl [printed as cxl]–ccli, cclxi, 87, and 218; and Herman Geertman, *Hic fecit basilicam. Studi sul Liber Pontificalis e gli edifice ecclesiastici di Roma da Silvestro a Silverio* (Leuven: Peeters, 2004), 198. Dennis E. Trout, *Paulinus of Nola: Life, Letters, and Poems*, *The Transformation of the Classical Heritage* 27 (Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1999), 115 dates the death of Siricius to 26 November 399, while on 224 he states that Anastasius became bishop in November 398. I take the latter as incorrect. On the *Liber pontificalis*, see recently, Rosamond McKitterick, *Rome and the Invention of the Papacy: The Liber pontificalis* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2020).
12. Anastasius I, *Ep.* 1. See Philippe Jaffé, *Regesta Pontificum Romanorum ab condita ecclesia ad annum post Christum natum MCXCVIII*, ed. S. Lowenfeld, F. Kaltenbrunner, and P. Ewald, vol. 1, *A S. Petro ad a. MCXLIII*, 2nd ed., rev. Wilhelm Wattenbach (Leipzig: Veit, 1885) [= JK], no. 273; and Philippe Jaffé, *Regesta Pontificum Romanorum ab condita ecclesia ad annum post Christum MCXCVIII*, vol. 1, *A S. Petro usque ad a. DCIV*, 3rd ed., rev. Marcus Schütz (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck et Ruprecht, 2016) [= J³], no. 644. For the renumbering of the letters of Anastasius, see the appendix below.
13. Paulinus of Nola, *Ep.* 20.2 (CSEL 29:144).
14. On letters of communion, see Geoffrey D. Dunn, "Innocent I and Anysius of Thessalonica," *Byz* 77 (2007): 124–48. Perhaps the non-extant *Ep.* 2 from Anastasius I to Anysius, metropolitan of Thessaloniki (ancient Thessalonica in the province of Macedonia in the civil diocese of Macedonia), mentioned by Innocent I, *Ep.* 1 (*Cum Dominus noster*) (PL 20:465 = Pierre Coustant, ed., *Epistolae Romanorum Pontificum et quae ad eos scriptae sunt a S. Clemente I usque ad Innocentium III*, vol. 1 [Paris: L.-D. Delatour, 1721], col. 740 = Hermann-Josef Sieben, trans., *Die ältesten Papstbriefe. Vetustissimae epistulae Romanorum Pontificum*, *Fontes Christiani* 58/2 [Freiburg: Herder, 2014], 368-70) = *Coll. Thess. Ep.* 4 (Karel Silva-Tarouca, ed., *Epistularum Romanorum Pontificum ad vicarios per Illyricum aliosque episcopos. Collectio Thessalonicensis ad fidem codicis Vat. Lat. 5751*, *Textus et documenta. Series theologica* 23 [Rome: Pontificia Universitas Gregoriana, 1937], 20) = JK 285 = J³ 663, was similarly a letter of communion.
15. Paulinus of Nola, *Ep.* 20.2 (CSEL 29:144): . . . *ingerere nobis piissima affectione properavit*; trans. P. G. Walsh, *Letters of Paulinus of Nola*, vol. 1, *Letters 1–22*, *Ancient Christian Writers* 35 (New York: Newman Press, 1966).
16. Paulinus of Nola, *Ep.* 20.2 (CSEL 29:144): . . . *plenas et religionis et pietatis et pacis . . . quibus et suum declaret affectum et aliis benignitatis suae praeberet exemplum*.
17. Paulinus of Nola, *Ep.* 20.2 (CSEL 29:145): . . . *tam blande quam honorifice excepit*. Trout, *Paulinus of Nola*, 115n56, observes from *Ep.* 45.1 (CSEL 29:379), a letter to Augustine, that by

- about 406 this practice changed, such that he now visited Rome after Easter to venerate the saints and martyrs at their tombs. One may presume that under Innocent I this was the appropriate time for suffragan bishops of Italy to meet in synod with their metropolitan as an alternative to (or even an addition to) a synod in conjunction with the annual episcopal anniversary, although it is not mentioned. From about 409 or 410, when he became a bishop, this timing would be expected, but that it changed several years before that episcopal ordination is interesting. On when Paulinus became bishop, see Trout, *Paulinus of Nola*, 120; Giovanni Santaniello, *Vita di Paolino di Bordeaux vescovo di Nola (352/353 ca.-431)*, Strenae Nolanae 12 (Naples: Libreria Editrice Redenzione, 2015), 403. Whether Paulinus had forsaken his earlier practice of being in Rome at the end of June is not specified.
18. Paulinus of Nola, *Ep.* 17.1–2 (CSEL 29:125–26). On the date, see Trout, *Paulinus of Nola*, 240; and Walsh, *Letters of St. Paulinus of Nola*, 1:247n1, who is more inclined to date it to 398 or possibly 399.
 19. Paulinus of Nola, *Ep.* 20.2 (CSEL 29:145) = Anastasius I, *Ep.* 8 = JK 274 = J³ 645.
 20. [Anastasius I], *Ep.* 9. Even though I believe Anastasius was bishop until December 402 rather than December 401, I agree with Walsh, *Letters of St. Paulinus of Nola*, 1:252n1 that *Ep.* 20 was written between November 400 and June 401 because it was after the first *natalis* of Anastasius and there is no mention of a second visit for the feast of Peter and Paul during the visit by Paulinus. One may presume it was closer to November 400 if Paulinus wasted no time in communicating the good news to Delphinus.
 21. Erich Caspar, *Geschichte des Papsttums von den Anfängen bis zum Höhe der Weltherrschaft*, vol. 1, *Römische Kirche und Imperium Romanum* (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1930), 285.
 22. For the views held by Paulinus on sexual asceticism, see Peter Brown, *The Body and Society: Men, Women, and Sexual Renunciation in Early Christianity*, Lectures on the History of Religion 13 (New York: Columbia University Press, 1988), 385 and 409, who mentions Paulinus, but does not consider Anastasius.
 23. Michele Renee Salzman, *The Making of a Christian Aristocracy: Social and Religious Change in the Western Roman Empire* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2002), 311n119. Also important is Michele R. Salzman, "Competing Claims to 'Nobilitas' in the Western Empire of the Fourth and Fifth Centuries," *J ECS* 9 (2001): 359–85.
 24. Salzman, *The Making of a Christian Aristocracy*, 123, 213.
 25. Trout, *Paulinus of Nola*, 133–59.
 26. See e.g., Dorwin Cartwright and Frank Harary, "Structural Balance: A Generalization of Heider's Theory," *Psychological Review* 63 (1956): 277–93; Leon Festinger, *A Theory of Cognitive Dissonance* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1957); Fritz Heider, *The Psychology of Interpersonal Relations* (London: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 1958); M. Granovetter, "The Strength of Weak Ties," *American Journal of Sociology* 78 (1973): 1360–80; Stanley Wasserman and Katherine Faust, *Social Networks Analysis: Methods and Applications* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994); W. De Nooy, "Fields and Networks: Correspondence Analysis and Social Network Analysis in the Framework of Field Theory," *Poetics* 31 (2003): 305–27; Linton C. Freeman, *The Development of Social Network Analysis: A Study in the Sociology of Science* (Vancouver: Empirical Press, 2004); Avidit Acharya, Matthew Blackwell, and Maya Sen, "Explaining Preference from Behavior: A Cognitive Dissonance Approach," *Journal of Politics* 80 (2018): 400–11; Julia Brennecke, "Dissonant Ties in Intraorganizational Networks: Why Individuals Seek Problem-Solving Assistance from Difficult Colleagues," *Academy of Management Journal* 63 (2019): 743–78.
 27. Trout, *Paulinus of Nola*, 94.
 28. See Meaghan A. McEvoy, *Child Emperor Rule in the Late Roman West, ad 367–455*, Oxford Classical Monographs (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013), 135–220.

29. On Sulpicius Severus, see G. K. van Andel, *The Christian Concept of History in the Chronicle of Sulpicius Severus* (Amsterdam: Adolf M. Hakkert, 1976); Clare Stancliffe, *St. Martin and his Hagiographer: History and Miracle in Sulpicius Severus*, Oxford Historical Monographs (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1983); Richard J. Goodrich, "Vir Maxime Catholicus: Sulpicius Severus' Use and Abuse of Jerome in *Dialogi*," *JEH* 58 (2007): 189–210; *PCBE* 4:1744–52 (Severus 1); *PLRE* 2:1006–7 (Severus 20); and Richard J. Goodrich, trans., *Sulpicius Severus: Complete Works*, Ancient Christian Writers 70 (New York: Newman Press, 2015).
30. Paulinus of Nola, *Ep.* 5.13 (CSEL 29:33).
31. Paulinus of Nola, *Ep.* 5.14 (CSEL 29:33): . . . *urbici papae superba discretione* . . .
32. Neil B. McLynn, *Ambrose of Milan: Church and Court in a Christian Capital*, The Transformation of the Christian Heritage 22 (Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1994), 278.
33. Trout, *Paulinus of Nola*, 114.
34. Siricius, *Ep.* 1 (*Directa*) (PL 13:1131–47 = Coustant, *Epistolae Romanorum Pontificum*, 1:623–38 = Sieben, *Die ältesten Papstbriefe*, 302–26) = JK 255 = J³ 605. See Christian Hornung, *Directa ad decessorem: Ein kirchenhistorisch-philologische Kommentar zur ersten Dekretale des Siricius von Rom*, Jahrbuch für Antike und Christentum, Erg.-Bd. Kleine Reihe 8 (Münster: Aschendorff, 2011); Klaus Zechiel-Eckes, *Die erste Dekretale. Der Brief Papst Siricius' an Bischof Himerius von Tarragona vom Jahr 385 (JK 255)*, Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Studien und Texte 55 (Hannover: Hahnsche Buchhandlung, 2013); Christian Hornung, "Siricius and the Rise of the Papacy," in Dunn, *The Bishop of Rome*, 57–72; Alberto Ferreiro, "Pope Siricius and Himerius of Tarragona (385): Provincial Papal Intervention in the Fourth Century," in Dunn, *The Bishop of Rome*, 73–85. On the *cursus*, see Geoffrey D. Dunn, "The Clerical *cursus honorum* in the Late Antique Roman Church," *Scrinium* 9 (2013): 132–45. On the ineligibility created by the *cingulum*, see Geoffrey D. Dunn, "Canonical Legislation on the Ordination of Bishops: Innocent I's Letter to Victricius of Rouen," in *Episcopal Elections in Late Antiquity*, ed. Johan Leemans, Peter Van Nuffelen, Shawn W. J. Keough, and Carla Nicolaye, AKG 119 (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2011), 145–66, at 159–62.
35. Trout, *Paulinus of Nola*, 114 also mentions his migratory habits. Council of Nicaea (325), canons 15 and 16 (CCCOGD 1:27–28) ought to have been relevant to Paulinus. Most scholarly attention is on the translation of bishops, rather than presbyters, and it is complicated because of tolerated exceptions partly based on whether the movement was initiated by the individual concerned or by others. See Mary E. Sommar, "Pragmatic Application of Proto-Canon Law: Episcopal Translation," in *Confrontation in Late Antiquity: Imperial Presentation and Regional Adaptation*, ed. Linda Jones Hall (Cambridge: Orchard Academic, 2003), 89–101; Geoffrey D. Dunn, "The Letter of Innocent I to Florentinus of Tivoli," *Journal of the Australian Early Medieval Association* 6 (2010): 9–23; and Geoffrey D. Dunn, "Boniface I and the Illyrian Churches on the Translation of Perigenes to Corinth: The Evidence and Problems of *Beatus apostolus* (JK 350)," *Sacris Erudiri* 53 (2014): 132–46.
36. Trout, *Paulinus of Nola*, 114.
37. . See J. N. D. Kelly, *Jerome: His Life, Writings, and Controversies* (London: Gerald Duckworth, 1975), 181–86; Andrew Cain, *The Letters of Jerome: Asceticism, Biblical Exegesis, and the Construction of Christian Authority in Late Antiquity*, Oxford Early Christian Studies (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009); and Andrew Cain, *Jerome and the Monastic Clergy: A Commentary on Letter 52 to Nepotian, with an Introduction, Text, and Translation*, Supplements to Vigiliae Christianae 119 (Leiden: Brill, 2013).
38. David G. Hunter, "Resistance to the Virginal Ideal in Late Fourth-Century Rome: The Case of Jovinian," *TS* 48 (1987): 45–64; Sophie Lund-Rockliffe, *Ambrosiaster's Political Theology*, Oxford Early Christian Studies (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007); David G. Hunter, *Marriage, Celibacy, and Heresy in Ancient Christianity: The Jovinianist Controversy*, Oxford Early Christian Studies (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007), 230–34; David G. Hunter, "The Significance of Ambrosiaster," *J ECS* 17 (2009): 1–26, at 16–17; Peter Brown, *Through the Eye*

- of a Needle: Wealth, the Fall of Rome, and the Making of Christianity in the West, 350–550 ad* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2012), 282–88; and Valentina Marchetto, "The Patristic Reception and Interpretation of John 17:21. A Case Study: Jovinian vs. Jerome," in *Christian Discourse in Late Antiquity: Hermeneutical, Institutional and Textual Perspectives*, ed. Anna Usacheva and Anders-Christian Jacobsen (Leiden: Ferdinand Schoningh, 2020), 31–52. On Ambrosiaster as a presbyter, see David G. Hunter, "On the Sin of Adam and Eve: A Little-known Defense of Marriage and Childbearing by Ambrosiaster," *HTR* 82 (1989): 283–99.
39. Ambrosiaster, *Quaestiones ueteris et noui testamenti* 101 (CSEL 50:193–98); and Jerome, *Ep.* 146 (CSEL 56/1:308–12). See Charles Pietri, *Roma Christiana. Recherches sur l'Eglise de Rome, son organisation, sa politique, son idéologie de Miltiade à Sixte III (311–440)*, Bibliothèque des Écoles française d'Athènes et de Rome 224 (Rome: École française de Rome, 1976), 714–18; and David G. Hunter, "Rivalry between Presbyters and Deacons in the Roman Church," *VC* 71 (2017): 494–510.
 40. See Geoffrey D. Dunn, "Zosimus and Ravenna: Conflict in the Roman Church in the Early Fifth Century," *REAug* 62 (2016): 1–20.
 41. Ambrose, *Ep.* 6.27.1–2 (CSEL 82/1:180–81). See Alan Cameron, *The Last Pagans of Rome* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011), 181–82; and Brown, *Through the Eye of a Needle*, 208–40.
 42. See Cameron, *The Last Pagans of Rome*, 273–319; and Dennis E. Trout, "Napkin Art: *Carmina contra paganos* and the Difference Satire Made in Fourth-Century Rome," in *Pagans and Christians in Late Antiquity: Conflict, Competition, and Coexistence in the Fourth Century*, ed. Michele Renee Salzman, Marianne Saghy, and Rita Lizzi Testa (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2016), 213–31.
 43. See Brown, *Through the Eye of a Needle*, 250–58.
 44. Siricius, *Ep.* 7 (*Optarem semper*) (PL 13:1168–72 = Coustant, *Epistolae Romanorum Pontificum*, 1:663–68 = Sieben, *Die ältesten Papstbriefe*, 344–48) = JK 260 = J³ 613. Kelly, *Jerome*, 182 dated the Roman synod to 393.
 45. Kelly, *Jerome*, 107–15, especially 112, 214. See Brown, *Body and Society*, 358–59; Stefan Heid, *Celibacy in the Early Church: The Beginnings of a Discipline of Obligatory Continence for Clerics in East and West*, trans. Michael J. Miller (San Francisco, CA: Ignatius Press, 1997), 240–62; Hunter, *Marriage, Celibacy, and Heresy*, 208–19; Andrew Cain, "Rethinking Jerome's Portraits of Holy Women," in *Jerome of Stridon: His Life, Writings and Legacy*, ed. Andrew Cain and Josef Lössl (Farnham: Ashgate, 2009), 47–57, at 56; Philip Rousseau, *Ascetics, Authority, and the Church in the Age of Jerome and Cassian*, 2nd ed. (Notre Dame, IN: Notre Dame University Press, 2010), 129; and Geoffrey D. Dunn, "Clerical Marriage in the Letters of Late-Antique Roman Bishops," in *Men and Women in the Early Christian Centuries*, ed. Wendy Mayer and Ian J. Elmer, *Early Christian Studies* 18 (Strathfield: St. Pauls, 2014), 293–313.
 46. Hunter, *Marriage, Celibacy, and Heresy*, 207.
 47. Siricius, *Ep.* 1.6.7 (PL 13:1137). See Trout, *Paulinus of Nola*, 114.
 48. Trout, *Paulinus of Nola*, 114–15.
 49. On the complexity of the attitudes of Jerome and Ambrose toward each other, see Richard A. Layton, "Plagiarism and Lay Patronage of Ascetic Scholarship: Jerome, Ambrose, and Rufinus," *J ECS* 10 (2002): 489–522.
 50. I use the term "ally" and "opponent" loosely simply to indicate whether two individuals shared or did not share a point of view. See Hunter, *Marriage, Celibacy, and Heresy*, 239–42.
 51. On this council, see Leo Donald Davis, *The First Seven Ecumenical Councils (325–787): Their History and Theology*, Theology and Life Series 21 (Wilmington, DE: Michael Glazier, 1983), 207–57; Aloys Grillmeier with Theresia Hainthaler, *Christ in Christian Tradition*, vol. 2, *From the Council of Chalcedon (451) to Gregory the Great (604)*, part 2, *The Church of Constantinople in the Sixth Century*, trans. John Cawte and Pauline Allen (London: Mowbray,

- 1995), 438–62; and Richard Price, trans., *The Acts of the Council of Constantinople of 553*, rev. ed., Translated Texts for Historians 51 (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2012).
52. See Pietri, *Roma Christiana*, 906; Elizabeth A. Clark, trans., *The Life of Melania the Younger: Introduction, Translation, and Commentary*, Studies in Women and Religion 14 (New York: Edwin Mellen Press, 1984); *PCBE* 2:1480–83 (Melania 1); A. H. M. Jones, J. R. Martindale, and J. Morris, *PLRE*, vol. 1, A.D. 260–395 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1971), 593 (Melania 2); and Geoffrey D. Dunn, "The Poverty of Melania the Younger and Pinianus," *Aug* 54 (2014): 93–115. On Rufinus, see *PCBE* 2:1925–40 (Rufinus 3). On Paulinus and Rufinus, see Paulinus of Nola, *Ep.* 28.5 (CSEL 29:245–46); and Clark, *The Origenist Controversy*, 34. On Rufinus and Jerome, particularly on the issue of translating Origen, see Catherine M. Chin, "Rufinus of Aquileia and Alexandrian Afterlives: Translation as Origenism," *J ECS* 18 (2010): 617–47.
53. Jerome, *Ep.* 58 (CSEL 54:527–41). Trout, *Paulinus of Nola*, 97–101 and 219–27. Clark, *The Origenist Controversy*, 36 draws more attention to differences over asceticism between Vigilantius and Jerome than does Trout.
54. Trout, *Paulinus of Nola*, 219.
55. Jerome, *Ep.* 85 (CSEL 55:135–38). Trout, *Paulinus of Nola*, 100; and Clark, *The Origenist Controversy*, 35.
56. Jerome, *Ep.* 127.9 (CSEL 56/1:152). On this letter, see Stefan Rebenich, *Jerome, The Early Church Fathers* (London: Routledge, 2002), 119–21; and Cain, *The Letters of Jerome*, 93–97.
57. Pietri, *Roma Christiana*, 906 says that Siricius was not interested in "cette querelle de moines"; Kelly, *Jerome*, 246; and Trout, *Paulinus of Nola*, 224.
58. Rufinus, *Apol. ad Anas.* (CCL 20:25–28) = [Anastasius I], *Ep.* 9. There is a reference to this being sent to Anastasius in Jerome, *Apol.* 2.1 (SC 303:100). I would date Anastasius's reception of the appeal from Rufinus to after the synod in Rome. See Clark, *The Origenist Controversy*, 171–72.
59. Jerome, *Apol.* 3.21 (CCL 79:92). For recent reconsideration of Jerome's *Apol.*, see Maijastina Kahlos, "Rhetorical Strategies in Jerome's Polemical Works," in *Polemik in der frühchristlichen Literatur. Texte und Kontexte*, ed. O. Wischmeyer and L. Scornaienchi, Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft 170 (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2010), 621–49; and Nicole Clay, "Jerome on the Attack: Constructing a Polemical Persona," (PhD diss., Edinburgh University, 2015), 162–74.
60. Jerome, *Ep.* 127.10 (CSEL 56/1:153). On Marcella, see *PCBE* 2:1357–62 (Marcella 1); and *PLRE* 1:542–43 (Marcella 2). On Principia, see *PCBE* 2:1825; and *PLRE* 2:904 (Principia 2).
61. See Jerome, *Ep.* 88 (CSEL 55:141) and *Apol.* 1.10 (SC 303:28) = [Anastasius I], *Ep.* 3.
62. See Jerome, *Ep.* 88 (CSEL 55:141) = [Anastasius I], *Ep.* 4.
63. [Jerome], *Ep.* 95 (CSEL 55:157–58) = Anastasius I, *Ep.* 6 (*Grandem sollicitudinem*) (PL 20:73–76 = Sieben, *Die ältesten Papstbriefe*, 352–54) = JK 276 = J³ 647. On Simplician, see *PCBE* 2:2075–79 (Simplicianus 1). Jerome, *Apol.* 1.10 and 3.23–24 (SC 303:28 and 276–78) could be including this letter among those sent by Anastasius against Origen, although I believe a non-extant letter issuing the condemnation (Anastasius I, *Ep.* 5) was sent to Theophilus, but not Jerome, who, in writing to Pammachius and Marcellus early in 402 (*Ep.* 97.4 [CSEL 55.184]), says he has only heard rumor (*sermone uulgatum*) that Anastasius condemned Origenism and in *Apol.* 3.20 (SC 303.266) says that a copy was not sent to him. Jerome, *Apol.* 3.21 (SC 303:268) is aware of the synod's decision, probably through a copy of the letter to Simplician. It is to be noted that Jerome, *Ep.* 81.2 (CSEL 55:107) had also approached Simplician, but to no avail, as his *Apol.* 2.22 (SC 303:162) suggests by its omission of Simplician's name, according to Pietri, *Roma Christiana*, 906n4.
64. Anastasius I, *Ep.* 8 (*Dat mihi plurimum*) (J. van den Gheyn, "La lettre du Pape Anastase I^{er} a S. Venerius évêque de Milan sur la condamnation d'Origène," *Revue d'histoire et de la littérature religieuses* 4 [1899]: 1–12 = Sieben, *Die ältesten Papstbriefe*, 356–58) = JK 281 = J³ 658. On

- Venerius, see *PCBE* 2:2263–64 (Venerius 1). Jerome, *Apol.* 1.10 and 3.23–24 (SC 303:28 and 276–78), could also be including this letter among those sent by Anastasius against Origen.
65. Anastasius I, *Ep.* 13 (*Probatae quidem*) (PL 20:68-73 = Coustant, *Epistolae Romanorum Pontificum*, 1:723-30 = Sieben, *Die ältesten Papstbriefe*, 360-64) = [Marius Mercator], first appendix to first part (PL 48:231–40 [Migne's 1846 printing of Jean Garnier's 1673 edition, in which the entire contents of the *Collectio Palatina* were attributed to Marius Mercator]) = Edward Schwartz, ed., *Acta Conciliorum Oecumenicorum [= ACO]*, vol. 1, *Concilium Vniversale Ephesenum*, vol. 5, part 1, *Collectio Palatina sive qui fertur Marius Mercator* (Berlin: De Gruyter, 1924), 3–4 = JK 282 = J³ 650. There is reference to this letter in Jerome, *Apol.* 1.10, 2.14, and 3.20–21 (SC 303:28, 134–36, and 266–70). I would identify JK 282/J³ 650 and JK 284/J³ 660 as being the same letter. According to Jerome, *Apol.* 3.21 and 38 (SC 303:268–70 and 310–12), Rufinus questioned the authenticity of the letter from Anastasius to John of Jerusalem, claiming that it was a forgery by Jerome himself. Following Kelly, *Jerome*, 247–49, I would date this correspondence between John and Anastasius to 401, after the correspondence between Anastasius and Paulinus and after *Apol. ad Anas.* had been sent to Anastasius by Rufinus. This letter, along with the works of Marius Mercator, was included by the Scythian monastic compiler of the *Collectio Palatina* about a century later, preserved in the first half of a manuscript from the first half of the ninth century once thought to be from Verona (the second half is Augustine's *De Genesi ad litteram*). It might have found its way to the abbey in Lorsch (or, more likely, was copied there), before being transferred to Heidelberg in the mid-sixteenth century by Otto Heinrich (d. 1559), the elector Palatine, who formed the Bibliotheca Palatina, from where they were donated to Pope Gregory XV (1621–23) by Maximilian I (d. 1651), the elector of Bavaria, of the Wittelsbach family, who plundered them during the Thirty Years' War. See William Bark, "The Doctrinal Interests of Marius Mercator," *CH* 12 (1943): 210–16; William Bark, "John Maxentius and the *Collectio Palatina*," *HTR* 36 (1943): 93–107; Walter Dunphy, "Marius Mercator on Rufinus the Syrian: Was Schwartz Mistaken?" *Aug* 32 (1992): 279–88; Walter Dunphy, "Rufinus the Syrian: Myth and Reality," *Augustiniana* 59 (2009): 79–157; and Walter Dunphy's unpublished paper, "Marius Mercator's Writings and the *Collectio Palatina* (Pal. lat. 234)—A Strange Survival." In the last paper Dunphy asks why the letter of Anastasius was included and reaches no firm conclusion, partly because of debate about whether Rufinus of Aquileia and Rufinus the Syrian are one and the same person. Although the letter now stands as the first item of the *Collectio Palatina*, there could well have been prior folios (even as much as a quire in the first half) before the two halves of the manuscript were bound together without them.
66. [Anastasius I], *Ep.* 12 = J³ 648.
67. Jerome, *Apol.* 3.21 (SC 303:270): *Esto, praeteritio anni ego epistulam finxerim. Recentia ad Orientem scripta quis misit, in quibus papa Anastasius tantis te orant floribus ut, cum ea legeris, magis te uelle defendere quam nos incipias accusare?* Was Jerome saying that he thought Rufinus forged letters from Anastasius exonerating him or, more likely, are the "flowery epithets" a sarcastic reference to the condemnation of Rufinus found in the other letters of Anastasius already mentioned, such that Rufinus could no longer continue to assert that the letter from Anastasius under question was a forgery?
68. Jerome, *Epp.* 127.10 (CSEL 56/1:153) and 130.16 (CSEL 56:196). On Demetrias, see *PCBE* 2:544–47; *PLRE* 2:351–52; A. S. Jacobs, "Writing Demetrias: Ascetic Logic in Ancient Christianity," *CH* 69 (2000): 719–48; and Cain, *The Letters of Jerome*, 160-66. On Anastasius in the latter, see Geoffrey D. Dunn, "Anastasius I and Innocent I: Reconsidering the Evidence of Jerome," *VC* 61 (2007): 30–41. On the letter to Principia about Marcella, see Cain, *The Letters of Jerome*, 93.
69. Kelly, *Jerome*, 248.

70. Anastasius I, *Ep.* 13 (ACO 1.5.1:3): . . . *conscientiae suae diuinam habet arbitram maiestatem* . . . One of the main issues in Rufinus's *Apol. ad Anas.* was that translators should not be held responsible for what authors wrote.
71. Anastasius I, *Ep.* 13 (ACO 1.5.1:3): *Origenes autem . . . ante, quis fuerit et in quae processerit uerba, nostrum propositum nesciit* . . .
72. Clark, *The Origenist Controversy*, 30.
73. Anastasius, *Ep.* 13 (ACO 1.5.1:4): *Illud tamen tenere te cupio ita haberi a nostris partibus alienum, ut quid agat, ubi sit, nescire cupiamus* . . .
74. See Jerome, *C. Ioh.* (CCL 79A); and Jerome, *Epp.* 51, 82, and 86 (CSEL 54:395-412; CSEL 55:107–19 and 138–39); Clark, *The Origenist Controversy*, 32; and Geoffrey D. Dunn, "Innocent I and the Attacks on the Bethlehem Monasteries," *Journal of the Australian Early Medieval Association* 2 (2006): 69–83, including argument about redating the incident from 417 to 416.
75. Trout, *Paulinus of Nola*, 199–209.
76. Trout, *Paulinus of Nola*, 225.
77. Clark, *The Origenist Controversy*, 42.
78. Jerome, *Ep.* 53.11 (CSEL 54:464) records Eusebius praising Paulinus for his asceticism; and Clark, *The Origenist Controversy*, 34.
79. Coustant, *Epistolae Romanorum Pontificum*, 1:713–38.
80. Jacques-Paul Migne, ed., *Quinti saeculi scriptorium ecclesiasticorum qui ad S. Hieronymum usque floruerunt*, PL 20 (Paris: J.-P. Migne, 1845), cols. 51–80.
81. Sieben, *Die ältesten Papstbriefe*, 351–65.
82. See note 12 above.

APPENDIX

Pierre Coustant's 1721 edition of early papal letters included only two for Anastasius I and reference to non-extant letters under twelve headings.⁷⁹ Jacques-Paul Migne's 1845 edition, based largely on Coustant, contained two letters (one of which was not in Coustant), sixteen headings for missing letters, and two letters attributed to Anastasius.⁸⁰ In Hermann-Josef Sieben's 2014 German translation, there are three letters of Anastasius.⁸¹ In none of these three volumes does any letter of Anastasius receive the same number. It is appropriate to have stable numbers for his letters and to incorporate definitively known non-extant letters into the numbering. The second (1885) and third (2016) editions of *Regesta Pontificum Romanorum* do offer a JK or a J3 number for non-extant letters sent by Roman bishops but not for non-extant letters sent to them.⁸² Including the known non-extant letters, both to and from the Roman bishop, goes some way in providing a more accurate picture of the extent of epistolary corpora.

Epistulae 14 and 18, from the pseudo-Isidorian collection, are regarded as forgeries.

No.	PL no.	PL 20 cols.	JK no.	J ³ no	Cooustant no.	Cooustant cols.	Sieben	Sender	Recipient	Reference	Incipit	Date
1			273	644				Anastasius	Bishops of Campania	PAUL., <i>Ep.</i> 20.2 (CSEL 29:144)		late 399/ early 400
2			275	646				Anastasius	Anysius of Thessaloniki	INN I, <i>Ep.</i> 1 = <i>Coll. Thess. Ep.</i> 4		late 399/ early 400
3								Theophilus	Anastasius	HIER., <i>Ep.</i> 88 (CSEL 55. 141); HIER., <i>Apol. c. Ruf.</i> 1.10 (SC 303:28)		early to mid-400
4								Jerome	Anastasius	HIER., <i>Ep.</i> 88 (CSEL 55.141)		early to mid-400
5								Anastasius	Church of Rome, Theophilus	ANAS., <i>Ep.</i> 6		early to mid-400
6	2	73–76	276	647			1	Anastasius	Simplician	HIER., <i>Ep.</i> 95 (CSEL 55:157-8)	<i>Grandem sollicitudinem</i>	mid-400
7								Simplician	Anastasius	ANAS., <i>Ep.</i> 8		mid-400
8			281	658			2	Anastasius	Venerius	GHEYN	<i>Dat mihi plurimum</i>	late 400
9					1	715–20		Rufinus	Anastasius	RUF., <i>Apol. ad Anas.</i> (CCL 20:25–28); HIER., <i>Apol. c. Ruf.</i> 2.1 (SC 303:100)	<i>Audiui quosdam</i>	late 400

10		274	645			Anastasius	Paulinus of Nola	PAUL., <i>Ep.</i> 20.2 (CSEL 29:144)		July to November 400	
11						Paulinus of Nola	Anastasius	PAUL., <i>Ep.</i> 20.2 (CSEL 29:144)		late 400/early 401	
12			648			John of Jerusalem	Anastasius	ACO 1.5.1		early 401	
13	1	68–73	282/4	650/660	723–30	3	Anastasius	John of Jerusalem	ACO 1.5.1.3–4; HIER., <i>Apol. c. Ruf.</i> 2.14; 3.20–21 (SC 303: 134–36, 266–70)	<i>Probatae quidem</i>	7 June 401
14	2*	78–80	278	649			Anastasius	Nerianus		<i>Multa mihi in</i>	7 June 401
15				652			African bishops	Anastasius	<i>Reg. eccl. Carthag. excerpta</i> 56 (CCL 149: 194)		prior to 17 June 401
16				653			Anastasius	African bishops	<i>Reg. eccl. Carthag. excerpta</i> 65 (CCL 149:198)		between 17 June and 13 September 401

No.	PL no.	PL 20 cols.	JK no.	J ³ no	Cooustant no.	Cooustant cols.	Sieben	Sender	Recipient	Reference	Incipit	Date
17			283	659				African bishops	Anastasius	<i>Reg. eccl. Carthag. excerpta</i> 68 (CCL 149:200)		13 September 401
18	1*	65-78	277	651				Anastasius	Bishops of Germania and Burgundia		<i>Exigit dilectio uestra</i>	7 October 401
19				654				Anastasius		<i>Lib. pont.</i> 41.1		
20								Anastasius		<i>Lib. pont.</i> 41.2		
21				655				Anastasius		GRAT., p2, c16, q1, c55	<i>Statuimus ut si</i>	
22				656				Anastasius		GRAT., p2, c16, q1, c56	<i>In sacris canonibus</i>	