

CHROMATIUS VS. JEROME: THE ORIGENIST CONTROVERSY RECONSIDERED

MICHAEL HANAGHAN 

*Institute for Religion and Critical Inquiry, Australian Catholic University,
Melbourne, Australia*

michael.hanaghan@acu.edu.au

Abstract

Chromatius, bishop of Aquileia, was closely acquainted with Jerome and Rufinus, the two main protagonists of the Origenist controversy in the Latin west. When hostilities between Jerome and Rufinus were renewed in 397 CE, Chromatius wrote to Jerome, urging him to be silent. Jerome demurred. In the years that followed, Chromatius continued as Rufinus' patron, first asking Rufinus to translate Eusebius' *Ecclesiastica Historia* and then requesting that Rufinus translate Origen's *Homilies on Joshua*. Scholars have viewed Chromatius' role in two ways, as either a pacific intermediary or subtly inclined towards Rufinus. This article argues that Chromatius was far more sympathetic to Rufinus. It examines first the relationship between Jerome and Chromatius prior to 397, then Jerome's use of Chromatius' name in his *Apology* and his epithets for Chromatius after Rufinus' translation of Origen's *Περὶ Ἀρχῶν* in 397, which markedly change, losing the honorifics typical for the address of a bishop. This is set against Chromatius' continued patronage of Rufinus, including his request in 403/404 for Rufinus to translate Origen's *Homilies on Joshua*, and Chromatius' use of Origenist ideas in his own work. Together, these arguments indicate that Jerome's relationship with Chromatius increasingly deteriorated as the Bishop of Aquileia's actions continued to favour Rufinus and his pro-Origenist position.

INTRODUCTION

In the 360s Chromatius, Rufinus, and Jerome were part of a monastic community in Aquileia;¹ both Jerome and Rufinus then

Thanks are due to Christa Gray for her comments on an earlier draft of this article, Stephen Carlson for our various discussions about Rufinus and Chromatius, and Leah O'Hearn for her help. I am grateful to Prof. Drs. Hans Bernsdorff, Hartmut Leppin, and Thomas Paulsen for the invitation to present some of this research in the Colloquium Classicum during my Humboldt Fellowship at Goethe-University, Frankfurt.

¹ Hier. *Chron. anno 374* (ed. R. Helm, GCS 47 [1956], p. 240): *Aquileienses clerici quasi chorus beatorum habentur*; Ruf. *Apol. adv. Hier.* 1.4 (ed. M. Simonetti, CCSL 20 [1961], p. 39).

departed for the east.² In 381 the Emperor Gratian convened the first council of Aquileia, which counted among its attendees Ambrose, the influential bishop of Milan, and Chromatius, then a mere presbyter.³ Chromatius' remarks are the only dialogue recorded in Ambrose's *acta* that were spoken by a presbyter in their own right (as opposed to the presbyters who were deputizing for a bishop).⁴ His language is forthright, as he accuses the Arrianist, Paladius of Ratiaria, of denying everything 'which the Catholic faith professes'.⁵ Chromatius clearly already enjoyed a position of some significance in the church as early as the 380s, prior to the beginning of his episcopacy. In late 388 Chromatius was elected the bishop of Aquileia, following the death of Valerian.⁶

When the monk Atarbius sought to have Origen and his work censored in 393, Rufinus and Jerome found themselves on opposite sides of the petition.⁷ A year later Jerome translated into Latin a letter from Epiphanius to John of Jerusalem (*Ep.* 51) in which Epiphanius accused John of being an Origenist. Criticism soon followed from unknown quarters leading Jerome to suspect that Rufinus was the instigator.⁸ In 397 Rufinus published his translation of Origen's *Περὶ Ἀρχῶν*. In a prefatory letter that Rufinus sent to Macarius (preserved as Jerome, *Ep.* 80), Rufinus claimed that Jerome's translation of two of Origen's homilies on the *Song of Songs* had inspired Rufinus (and others) to take an interest in Origen.⁹

² For this period see Elizabeth A. Clarke, *The Origenist Controversy* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1992), p. 20; Stefan Rebenich, *Jerome* (London: Routledge, 2002), p. 5; and Alan Booth, 'The Chronology of Jerome's Early Years', *Phoenix* 35 (1981), pp. 237–59, who offers a detailed assessment of the chronology of Jerome's and Rufinus' departures to the east.

³ *Acta Aquileiae* 1 dates the council to 3 September 381.

⁴ *Acta Aquileiae* 45, 51.

⁵ *Acta Aquileiae* 45 (ed. Michaela Zelzer, CSEL 82.3 [1982], pp. 354, 603–4): *Omnia negasti quae fides catholica profitetur*.

⁶ The date may be inferred from Paulinus, *Vit. Ambr.* 22.1, which notes that at some point after the death of Maximus (which took place in July 388), Ambrose was in Aquileia when Theodosius was in Milan. There Ambrose was informed of the emperor's response to the burning of the synagogue at Callinicum and wrote *Ep.* 71[40] to Theodosius admonishing him for his decision to force the local bishop to pay for the synagogue to be rebuilt. For a detailed description of these events see Neil McLynn, *Ambrose of Milan: Church and Court in a Christian Capital* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1994), pp. 299–300.

⁷ *Hier. Ruf.* 3.33 (ed. P. Lardet, CSEL 79 [1982], pp. 103–4). For discussion of this initial dispute see Francis X. Murphy, *Rufinus of Aquileia (355–411): His Life and Works* (Washington: Catholic University of America Press, 1945), pp. 68–70.

⁸ *Hier. Ep.* 57.2 (ed. I. Hilberg, CSEL 54 [1910], pp. 504–5).

⁹ *Hier. Ep.* 80.1 (ed. I. Hilberg, CSEL 55 [1912], p. 102).

Jerome's initial response to Rufinus, *Ep.* 81, written in 399, claimed that Rufinus' remarks in the letter to Macarius could only be understood as a stain on their friendship.¹⁰ The tone that Jerome adopts is consistent with the epistolary conceit of private communication, but at the end of the letter Jerome indicates his intent to publicize his response:

Frater meus Paulinianus necdum de patria reversus est et puto, quod eum Aquileiae apud sanctum papam Chromatium videris. . . . ceterisque amicis eadem significavimus: 'ne mordentes invicem consumamini ab invicem.'¹¹ iam tuae moderationis est et tuorum nullam occasionem impatientibus dare, ne non omnes mei similes invenias, qui possint figuratis laudibus delectari.¹²

My brother Paulinianus has not yet returned from his homeland and I think that you might have seen him at Aquileia at the house of the holy father Chromatius. . . . I have sent the same remarks to the rest of my friends: 'lest biting one another, you be consumed by one another.' It only remains for you and your friends to show your moderation in giving no offence to those who do not tolerate it. You will not find that everyone is like me; they cannot be pleased by fake praise.

Rufinus responded to Jerome's letter with an extended, polemical defence, his *Apologia contra Hieronymum*, written in 400, which Jerome responded to with his *Apologia contra Rufinum* in 402. While Jerome's letter was not the beginning of the acrimony between the two Christian thinkers, its tone was likely the instigation for the significant increase in their hostilities in the early 400s.¹³

Chromatius' role in the Origenist controversy has not been a central concern to scholars, even though both Rufinus and Jerome mention him in their respective apologies.¹⁴ When scholars have considered Chromatius' role, he is generally considered a friend to both men, who acted in an intermediary capacity in trying to stop both sides from further dispute. For example McEachnie offers the following assessment in his 2017 monograph:

¹⁰ Hier. *Ep.* 81.1 (CSEL 55, p. 107).

¹¹ Gal. 5:15.

¹² Hier. *Ep.* 81.2 (CSEL 55, p. 107, ll. 9–11, 13–16).

¹³ For the deterioration of Jerome and Rufinus' dispute and relationship, see Krastu Banev, *Theophilus of Alexandria and the First Origenist Controversy* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015), pp. 15–17.

¹⁴ At *Apol. adv. Hier.* 4, Rufinus places Chromatius as pivotal to the beginning of his Christian faith.

Chromatius intervened by asking both combatants to cease their venom. Rufinus agreed and sent a private letter to Jerome, but Jerome felt he could not remain silent, even though he recognised the wisdom of Chromatius' advice.¹⁵

There is no evidence that Chromatius ever asked Rufinus to stop his attacks against Jerome; that Rufinus did not respond to Jerome's *Apologia* is not evidence of Chromatius' intervention with the Aquileian monk.¹⁶ McEachnie's characterization of Chromatius' involvement relies on a plain reading of Jerome's remarks at *Apologia contra Rufinum* 3.2. These only confirm that Chromatius asked Jerome to keep quiet, and that Jerome's recognition of the wisdom of Chromatius' advice fell short of actually following it.¹⁷

A far more convincing position is adopted by Fürst:

Chromatius in Aquileja und Heliodorus in Altinum [waren] wichtige Bezugspersonen für Hieronymus; die Kontakte zu Chromatius blieben allerdings nicht konfliktfrei, weil dieser im Origenismusstreit eher der Partei des Rufinus zuneigte und einen vergeblichen Vermittlungsversuch zwischen diesem und Hieronymus unternahm.¹⁸

Chromatius of Aquileia and Heliodorus of Altinum were important reference persons for Jerome; his interactions with Chromatius were not however without conflict, because in the Origenist dispute Chromatius leaned more to the side of Rufinus and made a fruitless attempt to mediate between him and Jerome.

Fürst correctly identified that Chromatius' sympathies lay with Rufinus, but his depiction of Chromatius' involvement in the dispute shows the same inclination as McEachnie to characterize Chromatius

¹⁵ Robert McEachnie, *Chromatius of Aquileia and the Making of a Christian City* (London: Routledge, 2017), p. 53; Robert McEachnie, 'A History of Heresy Past: The Sermons of Chromatius of Aquileia', *Church History* 83 (2014), pp. 273–96, at 291, n. 56 refers to Jerome and Chromatius' 'close relationship'. See also J. N. D. Kelly, *Jerome: His Life, Writings, and Controversies* (London: Duckworth, 1975), p. 3: 'Chromatius . . . remain[ed] Jerome's lifelong friend.' Clarke, *The Origenist Controversy*, p. 31: '[Chromatius] retained cordial relations with Jerome.'

¹⁶ Kelly, *Jerome*, p. 256: 'Whether prompted by Chromatius, or his own good sense, Rufinus made no further response.' Cf. Rebenich, *Jerome*, p. 23: 'Rufinus did not reply. He did not need to. His backing was strong enough to withstand Jerome's attacks, whose inconsistent handling of the debate had enlarged the number of his enemies.'

¹⁷ Analysed in detail below.

¹⁸ Alfons Fürst, *Hieronymus, Askese und Wissenschaft in der Spätantike* (Freiburg: Herder, 2003), p. 75.

as an intermediary between the two disputing churchmen. This inclination results from one of Jerome's claims in his *Apology*, that Chromatius was one of the unnamed targets of Rufinus' criticisms that clergy were surreptitious users of Origen;¹⁹ but as Hitchcock, writing in 1948, first recognized, Jerome's claim that Rufinus' relationship with Chromatius soured over Rufinus' use of Origen has very limited evidentiary value, given Jerome's bias against Rufinus.²⁰

To try to gain insight into Chromatius' relationship with Jerome, and his relationship with Rufinus during this period, scholars have turned to specific details. Beatrice, for example, interpreted Chromatius' reluctance to use the beginning and end of the book of Jonah as a rebuke of Jerome's commentary and translation, which included taking the Hebrew *qiqeion* as *hedera* (ivy), which was too distant from the traditional rendering of the Greek *κολοκύντη* into Latin as *cucurbita* (gourd).²¹ Beatrice suggests that Chromatius' avoidance of these passages of Jonah (and this passage in particular) indicates that Chromatius agreed with Rufinus' outrage at Jerome's translation, but the conspiracy of thought may run even deeper.²² In his *Apology* against Jerome, Rufinus states:

Posteaquam senuit mundus et cuncta perurguentur ad finem, scribamus etiam in sepulchris veterum, ut sciant et ipsi qui hic aliter legerant, quia Ionas non habuit umbram cucurbitae sed hederæ; et iterum, cum voluerit legislator, nec hederæ sed alterius virgulti.²³

After the world has grown old and everything rushes to the end, let us write on the tombs of the ancients, so that they may know who had read the story differently, because Jonah did not have the shade of a gourd but an ivy plant and again, when our legislator wants it, it will not be that of ivy but of some other plant.

Rufinus' disdain for Jerome's apparently flippant disregard for the traditional translation *cucurbita* imagines the eventual correction of ancient tombs. In the Basilica of Santa Maria Assunta in

¹⁹ Hier. *Ruf.* 2.22, quoted and analysed in detail below.

²⁰ F. R. M. Hitchcock, 'Venerius, Bishop of Milan—II', *Hermathena* 71 (1948), pp. 19–35, at 26.

²¹ Pier Franco Beatrice, 'The Sign of Jonah: The Paschal Mystery and the Conversion of the Pagans according to Chromatius of Aquileia', in Pier Franco Beatrice and Alessio Persič (eds.), *Chromatius of Aquileia and his Age* (Turnhout: Brepols, 2011), pp. 19–66.

²² Beatrice, 'The Sign of Jonah', p. 41.

²³ Ruf. *Apol. adv. Hier.* 2.35 (CCSL 20, p. 114).

Aquileia a third-century mosaic floor remains intact in the nave. Among the various biblical scenes that it depicts is an image of Jonah clearly taking shade under a gourd vine (Fig. 1 below).²⁴ Jerome's translation, if accepted, would invalidate this depiction. This suggests that Rufinus may have had exceedingly local concerns in mind, including the validity of this mosaic in Chromatius' church in Aquileia, when he chose that specific example to illustrate his rejection of Jerome's translation of the book of Jonah.

The evidence to suggest that Chromatius remained on friendly terms with both antagonists is weak.²⁵ It has three parts: Jerome's



FIG. 1. A depiction of Jonah at rest on the fourth-century mosaic floor of the Basilica of Aquileia.

²⁴ I am grateful to Andrea Bellavite, the Director of the Basilica of Aquileia, and Mattia Vecchi for permission to use my photograph of the Jonah mosaic in this article. I am also grateful to Professor Lorenzo Cavelli for his help and advice.

²⁵ McEachnie, *Chromatius of Aquileia*, p. 43: 'He [Jerome] referred to Chromatius throughout his life, even in times when they should have butted heads, with a deference that he gives to practically no-one else.' McEachnie notes that Jerome referred to Chromatius as blessed in his early correspondence but does not interpret Jerome's subsequent abandonment of these epithets for Chromatius, for which see below. For similar claims regarding Jerome and Chromatius' friendship, see W. Friend, 'Joseph Lemarié, Henri Tardif: *Chromace d'Aquilée, Sermons, Tome i (Sermons 1-17A)*', *Classical Review* 21 (1971), pp. 454-5, at 455. Katharina Bracht, 'The Appropriation of the Book of Jonah in 4th Century Christianity by Theodore of Mopsuestia and Jerome of Stridon', in Jörg Rüpke et al. (eds.), *Lived Religion in the Ancient Mediterranean World* (Berlin and Boston: De Gruyter, 2000), pp. 531-52, at 543 comes closer to the mark with her description of Chromatius' relationship with Jerome as that between 'professional colleagues'.

claim in his *Apology* that Chromatius wrote to him, asking him to keep silent; Jerome's dedication of two translations to Chromatius, the books of Solomon and Tobit; and Chromatius' request to Rufinus to translate Eusebius' *Historia Ecclesiastica* (which has been interpreted as a Chromatian ruse aimed at distracting Rufinus from his quarrel with Jerome).²⁶ This article reinterprets this evidence, and so offers a reassessment of Chromatius' relationship to Jerome, first by examining Jerome's references to Chromatius in his *Apology against Rufinus* and the dedicatory letters that preface his translations of the books of Solomon and Tobit. It then extends the claim that Chromatius remained on friendly terms with Rufinus by considering Chromatius' request for Rufinus' translation of Eusebius' *Historia Ecclesiastica*, and Rufinus' response, alongside Chromatius' request for Rufinus to translate Origen's homilies on Joshua. It argues that Chromatius' request for Rufinus to translate Origen's homilies aligns Chromatius with Rufinus in the wake of Jerome's criticism of Origen (and Rufinus).

I. CHROMATIUS' RELATIONSHIP WITH JEROME BEFORE 397

Jerome and Chromatius were clearly once on quite friendly terms. Chromatius was one of the addressees of Jerome's *Ep.* 7 (c.375) along with Jovinus and Eusebius.²⁷ In that letter Jerome repeatedly refers to his affection and love for his three correspondents.²⁸ Jerome's next letter, addressed to Niceas, the sub-deacon of Aquileia, uses the epithet *beatus* to refer to Chromatius.²⁹ Similarly, in Jerome's famous letter of consolation, addressed to Heliodorus, Chromatius is referred to as *beatus papa*,³⁰ while in Jerome's letter to Rufinus, *Ep.* 81, Chromatius is *sanctus papa*.³¹

²⁶ C. P. Hammond, 'The Last Ten Years of Rufinus' Life and the Date of his Move South from Aquileia', *JTS*, ns 28 (1977), pp. 372–429, at 392.

²⁷ Ferdinand Cavallera, *Saint Jérôme. Sa vie et son oeuvre, première partie* (Paris: Champion, 1922), vol. 2, p. 154.

²⁸ E.g. Hier. *Ep.* 7.6.3 (CSEL 54, p. 31, ll. 3–5): *epistulae brevitatis compellit tacere, desiderium vestri cogit loqui. praeproperus sermo; confusa turbatur oratio; amor ordinem nescit*; 'the brevity of a letter compels me to be quiet, my affection for you urges me to speak. My talk is in haste, my speech confused and ill-arranged; but love does not know order.'

²⁹ Hier. *Ep.* 8.2 (CSEL 54, p. 32, l. 9); Cavallera *Saint Jérôme*, vol. 2, p. 154.

³⁰ Hier. *Ep.* 60.19 (CSEL 54, p. 574, l. 17).

³¹ See above, at n. 12. This is the same epithet that Jerome uses to characterize Chromatius' request for him to keep silent at Hier. *Ruf.* 3.2 (see below), where the use of this epithet is part of Jerome's attempt to split Chromatius from Rufinus, by praising the former and criticizing the latter.

A similarly positive tone toward Chromatius may be found in Jerome's prefaces dedicated to Chromatius prior to 398. The preface to his commentary on Habakkuk (393)³² drew attention to Chromatius' pre-eminent learning: *Chromati episcoporum doctissime* ('Chromatius, most learned of bishops'),³³ language that also features in Jerome's preface to his translation of the *Paralipomena* (396):³⁴ *mi C[h]romati, episcoporum sanctissime atque doctissime* ('my Chromatius, most holy and most learned of bishops').³⁵ The unusual (at least in Jerome's correspondence) combination of two superlatives, which respectively draw attention to Chromatius' holiness and knowledge, indicates the respect that Jerome has for Chromatius, while the possessive adjective *mi* is consistent with the affection of a personal relationship.³⁶ Jerome also uses this personal possessive to address Chromatius later in his commentary on Habakkuk: *mi Cromati, papa uenerabilis* ('my Chromatius, venerable father').³⁷ The same noun and adjective combination features in his preface to his commentary on Jonah (396): *Chromati papa uenerabilis* ('Chromatius, venerable father').³⁸

Jerome clearly courted Chromatius in the period prior to the breakdown of Jerome's relationship to Rufinus in 397. Together these glowing references and epithets provide an important contrast for Jerome's change in tone towards Chromatius in the years that followed.

II. CHROMATIUS' REQUEST FOR SILENCE

In his *Apology against Rufinus*, Jerome claimed that Chromatius wrote to him, asking him to keep his silence:

testem inuoco Iesum conscientiae meae, qui et has litteras et tuam epistulam iudicaturus est, me ad commonitionem sancti papae Chromatii uoluisse reticere, et finem facere simultatum, et uincere in bono malum. Sed quia minaris interitum, nisi tacuero, respondere compellor, ne videar tacendo crimen agnoscere, et lenitatem meam, malae conscientiae signum interpreteris.³⁹

³² Cavallera, *Saint Jérôme*, vol. 2, p. 110.

³³ Hier. *Abac.* praef. (PL 25, col. 1273A).

³⁴ Cavallera, *Saint Jérôme*, vol. 2, p. 110.

³⁵ Hier. *Praef. in lib. Paralip.* (PL 28, col. 1323B).

³⁶ For discussion of the intimacy of *mi* and its use for high-ranking individuals, see Eleanor Dickey, *Latin Forms of Address, From Plautus to Apuleius* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007), pp. 215–23.

³⁷ Hier. *Abac.* lib. 2, praef. (PL 25, col. 1307A).

³⁸ Hier. *Jon.* praef. (PL 25, col. 1119B).

³⁹ Hier. *Ruf.* 3.2 (CCSL 79, p. 75).

I call upon Jesus as a witness upon my conscience, who will judge both this letter and your epistle, that at the instigation of the holy father Chromatius I wanted to keep silent, and end our dissensions, and to overcome evil with good. But, now that you threaten me with destruction, I am compelled to reply; otherwise, my silence will be taken as an acknowledgment of the crime, and you will interpret my moderation as the sign of an evil conscience.

Jerome's public naming of Chromatius as the source of a request that he then refused must surely have irked the bishop of Aquileia, especially given Chromatius' growing episcopal authority. The conceit is readily apparent; Jerome could easily have refused Chromatius' request, without publicly indicating that he had done so.

In the second book of his *Apology*, Jerome names Chromatius as the target of Rufinus' claim that Christians secretly used Origen without acknowledging that use:

Qui sunt isti, qui in Ecclesia disputare latius solent, qui libros scribere, qui totum de Origene loquuntur et scribunt, qui, dum sua nolunt furta cognosci, et ingrati sunt in magistrum, idcirco simplices ab illius lectione deterrent? Nominatim debes discere et ipso homines denotare. Ergo beati episcopi Anastasius et Theophilus et Venerius et Chromatius, et omnis tam Orientis quam Occidentis catholicorum synodus, qui . . . illum haereticum denuntiant populis, fures librorum illius iudicandi sunt? . . . Non tibi sufficit passiva contra omnes detractatio, nisi specialiter contra beatum et insignem Ecclesiae sacerdotem stili tui lanceam diriges?⁴⁰

Who are these men who are wont to dispute at such great length in the churches, and to write books, and whose discourses and writings are taken wholly from Origen; these men who are afraid of their literary thefts becoming known, and show ingratitude towards their master, and who therefore deter men of simple mind from reading him? You ought to mention them by name, and designate the men themselves. Are the reverend bishops Anastasius and Theophilus, Venerius and Chromatius, and the whole council of the Catholics both in the East and in the West, who . . . denounce him as a heretic, to be esteemed to be plagiarists of his books? . . . Is it not enough for you to disparage them all in general, but you must specially aim the spear of your pen against a reverend and eminent priest of the church?

Jerome names four clergy as potential targets for Rufinus' claims, which he then expands to include the entire council of Catholics.

⁴⁰ Hier., *Ruf.* 2.22 (CCSL 79, pp. 57–8).

Jerome clearly meant these examples to be absurd. The idea that Anastasius or Theophilus, both of whom publicly opposed Origen and his thought, might be the target of Rufinus' claims that there are surreptitious users of Origen is easily recognized as *reductio ad absurdum*, but in Chromatius, Jerome may have inadvertently hit his mark. Several of Chromatius' homilies and his tractate on Matthew include Origenist claims.⁴¹ While it remains unclear whether these were from direct knowledge or allusion to Ambrose's use of Origen, and when these were composed and then delivered,⁴² the indisputable fact remains that Chromatius requested Rufinus to translate Origen's *Homilies on Joshua* in 403/4, a couple of years after Jerome listed Chromatius as an absurd example of Rufinus' criticisms of covert Origenist use.

Scholars have largely overlooked the political ramifications of Jerome's use of Chromatius' name in his *Apology*, because Chromatius, it seems, continued to patronize Jerome's translations, to which we now turn.

III. JEROME'S PREFATORY LETTER TO THE BOOKS OF SOLOMON

In 398, either in the summer or autumn of that year, Jerome dedicated his translation of the books of Solomon (Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, and the Song of Songs) to Chromatius and Heliodorus:

Chromati et Heliodoro episcopis Hieronymus.

Iungat epistola quos iungit sacerdotium: imo charta non dividat, quos Christi necit amor.⁴³

Jerome to the bishops Chromatius and Heliodorus.

Let a letter join those whom the priesthood has joined: indeed let no document divide those whom the love of Christ entwines.

⁴¹ E.g. Chromatius, *Tract. Mat.* 51A, 3; 54.3, for discussion of which see Beatrice, 'The Sign of Jonah', pp. 27–8, 42, 54. Joseph Lemarié (SC 154 [1969]) suggests some further broad parallels between Chromatius and Origen, e.g. Chromatius, *Serm.* 2.5, 3.5, 3.8, 4.1, but none of these is specific enough to show clear or exceptional use of Origenist thought or language by Chromatius.

⁴² It remains speculative, albeit possible, that Venerius could have felt obliged to defend the select use of Origenist thought, given his close relationship to Ambrose. For discussion of Jerome's attack on Ambrose and its involvement of Origenist thought, see Richard A. Layton, 'Plagiarism and Lay Patronage of Ascetic Scholarship: Jerome, Ambrose and Rufinus', *Journal of Early Christian Studies* 10 (2002), pp. 489–522. Ruf. *Apol. adv. Hier.* 2.28 (CCSL 20, p. 103) defended Ambrose against some of Jerome's charges.

⁴³ Hier. *Praef. in lib. Sal.* (PL 28, col. 1241A).

The epithets used at the beginning of the preface are strictly formal, noting merely Chromatius' episcopal rank, not as in the earlier prefaces, his holiness, blessedness, or pre-eminent learning.⁴⁴ The opening line of the body of the preface deploys the epistolary trope that a letter may bring together those who are physically distant.⁴⁵ Jerome's opening comment comes close to the first words of his letter sent to Chromatius, Eusebius, and Jovinus, written some 20 years earlier: *non debet charta dividere, quos amor mutuus copulavit* ('a document should not divide those whom mutual love has linked').⁴⁶ The remarks are similar, but the phrase *amor Christi* is clearly not as personal as *amor mutuus*. Jerome could well have claimed a shared love of Christ with any clergy or even with any Christian, but mutual affection indicates a personal relationship, full of respect and love. The differences are subtle, but letters were read very closely by Jerome and other Christian authors in late antiquity. As Ebbeler has shown, Jerome and Augustine's correspondence was full of carefully formed barbs.⁴⁷ For example, Jerome's use of the word *liber* to refer to Augustine's book of letters, rather than the standard *libellum*, a diminutive that gestures at the generic expectation that a letter should be brief, builds on his criticism that Augustine's letters were too long. Chromatius, as an addressee of both letters, would certainly have recognized the removal of positive epithets, and likely detected the intratextual allusion to Jerome's *Ep.* 7, especially as both phrases are at the very beginning of the respective letters. Jerome does not use comparable language elsewhere in his extant letters, which suggests that he had in mind the *incipit* to his earlier letter to Chromatius and the others, when he wrote the beginning of his dedicatory letter to his translations of the books of Solomon. Other readers may also have

⁴⁴ See above, section I.

⁴⁵ Janet G. Altman, *Epistolarity: Approaches to a Form* (Ohio: Ohio State University Press, 1982), pp. 13–31 analyses this epistolary trope in detail.

⁴⁶ Hier. *Ep.* 7.1 (CSEL 54, p. 26, ll. 3–4). For discussion of Jerome's letter collections, see A. Cain, 'The Letter Collections of Jerome of Stridon', in Cristiana Sogno et al. (eds.), *Late Antique Letter Collections: A Critical Introduction and Reference Guide* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2017), pp. 221–38, at 222 ff.

⁴⁷ Jennifer Ebbeler, 'Tradition, Innovation and Epistolary Mores', in Philip Rousseau and Jutta Raitzel (eds.), *A Companion to Late Antiquity* (Chichester and Malden: Wiley Blackwell, 2009), pp. 270–84, at 277. See also Jennifer Ebbeler, *Disciplining Christians: Correction and Community in Augustine's Letters* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012), pp. 102–3.

dedicated the change in phrase, especially as *Ep.* 7 was almost certainly included in Jerome's *Liber Epistolarum ad diversos*.⁴⁸

In his *Apology against Rufinus*, Jerome recalls the dedicatory prefaces of two of his works. The first is his preface to the *Paralipomena*. Jerome quotes directly from the text:

In libro Temporum, id est Paralipomenon, qui hebraice dicitur 'dabre iamim', hac ad sanctum papam Chromatium praefatiuncula usus sum: 'Si Septuaginta interpretum pura et ut ab eis in graecum uersa est editio permaneret, superflue, mi Chromati, episcoporum sanctissime atque doctissime, impelleres ut hebraea volumina latino sermone transferrem.'⁴⁹

In *Chronicles*, that is *Paralipomenon*, which in Hebrew is called *dabre iamim*, I used this prefatory note for the holy father Chromatius: 'If the version of the Seventy translators is pure and has remained as it was rendered by them into Greek, you would be urging me on superfluously, my Chromatius, most holy and most learned of bishops, that I translate the Hebrew scrolls into Latin words.'

His positive language towards Chromatius is a direct quotation from his earlier work,⁵⁰ and so cannot be taken to represent his attitude towards Chromatius when he wrote the *Apology against Rufinus*.

The second preface to be quoted is to his translation of the books of Solomon:

Salomonis etiam libros . . . in latinum verteram, ex hebraico transferens et dedicans sanctis episcopis Chromatio et Heliodoro, haec in praefatiunculae meae fine subieci: 'si cui Septuaginta interpretum magis editio placet, habet eam a nobis olim emendatam.'⁵¹

Indeed the books of Solomon . . . I had turned into Latin, transferring them from the Hebrew and dedicating them to the holy bishops

⁴⁸ Cain, 'The Letter Collections of Jerome of Stridon', p. 224: 'he [Jerome] assembled them [*Ep.* 2–13, 15–17] for a readership that extended beyond their original recipients: not in isolation from one another but rather as members of the same body, as intertwined pieces of a unified literary work that, despite the miscellaneity of their addressees and the diversity of their content, work in concert with one another toward the common goal of idealized self-presentation.' The collation and distribution of these letters in a single book also make them a prime intertextual target for Jerome's later work, including his epistolary prefaces.

⁴⁹ Hier. *Ruf.* 2.27 (CCSL 79, p. 64).

⁵⁰ See above, at n. 35.

⁵¹ Hier. *Ruf.* 2.31 (CCSL 79, p. 69).

Chromatius and Heliodorus. I added these words at the end of my preface: 'If the edition of the Septuagint interpreters is preferred by anyone, he has the copy that I have already edited.'

The direct quotation from that preface suggests that Jerome had a copy of the preface to his books of Solomon open in front of him as he wrote these words. This raises two possibilities: either Jerome's original version of his preface to the books of Solomon addressed Chromatius and Heliodorus as *sanctis episcopis* or Jerome subsequently claimed that it did when he wrote his *Apology against Rufinus* in 402.

The first possibility is remote. The manuscript tradition for Jerome's prologue to the books of Solomon does not support Jerome's claim in his *Apology*. The two oldest manuscripts attest to the dedicatory line including only *episcopis* without any positive epithets. The first, Staatsbibliothek Bamberg Msc.Class.3, dated to the first third of the ninth century, has at the top of folio 1v: *CHROMATIO ET HELIODORO EPISCOPIS HIERONIMUS*.⁵² The second, BNF Latin 9380, related to the revision of Jerome's vulgate conducted by Theodolf, the bishop of Orléans and Abbot of Fleury c.800, reads (170r): *HIERONIMUS CHROMATIO ET HELIODORO EPISCOPIS DEDITIONE AD LIQUIDUM EX HEBRAEO TRANSLATA*.⁵³ Several later manuscripts remove the dedicatory line completely.⁵⁴ Jerome's original dedicatory line might have been removed at some point prior to the two oldest manuscripts being copied, but if this removal did take place, the scribes did not subsequently reinsert the epithet based on Jerome's comments in his *Apology*. Indeed, even when copyists noticed the textual connection, as in Basel B III 30, they resisted emending the dedicatory letter Jerome sent to Chromatius and Heliodorus to align it with Jerome's claim in his *Apology*.

The strong possibility therefore remains that Jerome did not include positive epithets for Chromatius and Heliodorus in his

⁵² Staatsbibliothek Bamberg, Msc.Class.3, 1v (<<https://zendsbb.digitale-sammlungen.de/db/0000/sbb00000077/images/index.html>>).

⁵³ BNF Latin 9380, 170r (<<https://gallica.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/btv1b8452776m>>). Not all the editions derived from Theodolf's vulgate, such as the British Library's MS 24142, include the letter. To these manuscript witnesses one might also add Cassiodorus *Inst.* 1.32, which uses the epithet *sanctus* to qualify Jerome, but does not include any epithets for Chromatius and Heliodorus: *epistula sancti Hieronymi ad Chromatium et Heliodorum*. No extant letter of Jerome has Chromatius and Heliodorus as addressees, other than dedicatory letters, but it remains unclear which of these Cassiodorus had in mind.

⁵⁴ E.g. Berlin Ms. theol. lat. fol. 65, 89v: *incipit p[ro]logus in libros Salomonis. iungat epistola* (<<http://resolver.staatsbibliothek-berlin.de/SBB00007FFD00020180>>).

preface to the books of Solomon, and then tried to pass off this elision as an oversight by claiming that the work was dedicated to the holy bishops (*sanctis episcopis*) in his *Apology*. Rufinus, and others, may well have noticed. In his preface to his translation of Origen's *Homilies on Joshua*, written in 402, Rufinus uses an unusual formula in his epithet for Chromatius:

Idcirco namque Beselehel ille repletus esse dicitur omni sapientia a Deo, ut intelligens singula haec quibus usibus apta sint, nihil ex offerentium devotione repudiet. Quia ergo et tu, o mihi semper venerabilis pater Chromati, iniungis, et praecipis nobis, ut . . . conferamus Oratiunculus XXVI in Jesum Nave, quas ex tempore in Ecclesia peroravit Adamantius senex[.]⁵⁵

In fact, the well-known Bezalel is said to have been filled by God with all wisdom so that, understanding for what uses individual things are suited, he rejected none of the sacrificial offerings. O Chromatius, you are always a venerable father to me, you request and order . . . me to translate the twenty-six homilies on Joshua, which Origen as an old man completely delivered extemporaneously in the church.

The epithet *semper venerabilis* is not a standard form.⁵⁶ Rufinus uses the related word *venerandus* in his epithet for Chromatius in the preface to his *Historia Ecclesiastica*, which was probably written a couple of years after his translation of Origen's homilies on Joshua. The only other uses of *venerabilis* to describe Chromatius are found in Jerome's commentaries on Habakkuk and Jonah, mentioned briefly above, where Jerome addresses the bishop as *Chromati papa venerabilis*. Rufinus' remark in his prologue to his translation of Origen's homilies on Joshua, that Chromatius will always be *venerabilis* to him, is particularly apt if Rufinus realized that Jerome had removed his positive epithets for Chromatius in his preface to the books of Solomon, and wanted to remind Chromatius that their relationship would always be respectful. This interpretation is supported by Rufinus' use of the first-person dative pronoun *mihi*, highlighted by his immediate shift to the authorial plural *nobis*, which adds a personal level of intimacy to Rufinus' epithet for Chromatius that subtly implies that Chromatius is no longer

⁵⁵ Ruf. *Prologus in Homelias Origenis super Jesum Nave* (ed. W. Baerhens, GCS 30 [1921], p. 286, ll. 8–14).

⁵⁶ Prior to Rufinus there is only a single attestation, Lucan, *Bellum Civile* 8.316.

venerabilis to everyone, that is, to Jerome. In his preface to his translation of Origen's homilies on Joshua, Rufinus targets Jerome in other ways, repeating the assertion that he (Rufinus) should not be credited as the author of Origen's words that he had translated—despite Jerome's repeated call that *his* alterations to Origen's text were beyond the scope of a translator. At the same time, Rufinus continues with his respectful tone towards Chromatius, who is credited with the ability to discern which of Origen's remarks are worthy.⁵⁷

The other letters that Jerome sent to bishops do not show a marked change in the epithets used. Jerome's correspondence with Theophilus, the bishop of Alexandria, is a useful point of comparison. Six of Jerome's letters to Theophilus are extant: *Ep.* 63, 82, 86, 88, 99, and 114. *Ep.* 82, for example, sent to Theophilus, in the CSEL edition includes the address *ad Theophilum*. The manuscript tradition offers two longer and more respectful variants. Berolinensis *lat.* 17, dating to the ninth century (and therefore among the oldest), has *ad theophilum papam*, while Ambrosianus H. 59, a thirteenth-century manuscript, but representing a distinct tradition, has *ad theophilum papam contra quendam episcopum. Domino vere sancto et beatissimo pap[a]e theophilo Hieronymus in xpo salutem*.⁵⁸ It is most likely that the stemmata that list only *ad Theophilum* simply cut out the additional material as if it were superfluous, and so Jerome's epithets to Theophilus, the powerful bishop of Alexandria, in those letters were in fact *papa*, *domino vere sanctus*, and *beatissimus*. Jerome's other epithets for Theophilus are equally positive. Thus, *Ep.* 86 is addressed: *beatissimo papae Theophilo Hieronymus*, so too *Ep.* 88 and *Ep.* 99, the latter with the addition of *episcopo*.⁵⁹ Unlike Jerome's dedicatory letters to Chromatius, his correspondence with Theophilus shows no indication that there was any change in their relationship.

⁵⁷ Ruf. *Prologus in Homelias Origenis super Jesum Nave* (GCS 30, p. 287, ll. 11–14).

⁵⁸ Hier. *Ep.* 82 (CSEL 55, p. 107).

⁵⁹ Hier. *Ep.* 86, 88, 99 (CSEL 55, pp. 138, 141, 211). The enduring strength of their relationship is also attested by Theophilus' epithets for Jerome in the letters that he addressed to the presbyter that are extant in Jerome's correspondence. Hier. *Ep.* 87 (CSEL 55, p. 140) begins *dilectissimo et amatissimo fratri Hieronymo*; Hier. *Ep.* 89 (CSEL 55, p. 142) adds *presbytero*; Hier. *Ep.* 113 (CSEL 55, p. 393), attested in two manuscripts, is fragmentary. This may account for why it does not preserve the address and epithets that Theophilus used for Jerome.

If we return to Jerome's dedicatory letter to the books of Solomon, other aspects suggest a deterioration in Jerome's relationship to his patrons. He claims that Chromatius and Heliodorus have made multiple demands on him, refers to the diverse numbers who make similar requests, and claims that he has worked to meet their demands at the expense of his health:

Itaque longa aegrotatione fractus, ne penitus hoc anno reticerem et apud vos mutus essem, tridui opus nomini vestro consecravi[.]⁶⁰

And so, even though I have been shattered by a long illness, so that I am not completely silent this year and mute among you, I have dedicated the three works to your name.

Jerome's claim is not that the illness has broken, but that he has been broken by the illness. His addressees come across as demanding taskmasters, insisting that Jerome meet his commitments despite his illness. Still, Chromatius and Heliodorus, Jerome tells us, provided him with the logistical and financial means to complete the work. This claim advertises their support for him, and so acts as a reminder, in the midst of the Origenist controversy (398), to Chromatius, Heliodorus, and others, that they had directly supported his endeavours.

IV. JEROME'S PREFATORY LETTER TO TOBIT

Initial efforts by Skemp claimed a date range for Jerome's Tobit of 391–405.⁶¹ Shanzer offered an important addition to Skemp's claim, noting that Jerome's commentary on Job 2.9 imitates Tobit 2.22, but Jerome's language does not follow the words that he uses in his translation of Tobit.⁶² This suggests that Jerome's translation of Tobit was written after his commentary on Job. Gamberoni, and following him Kelly, advocated a date around 405, claiming that the preface assumes that Jerome's translation of

⁶⁰ Hier. *Praef. in lib. Sal.* (PL 28, col. 1241A).

⁶¹ Vincent T. M. Skemp, *The Vulgate of Tobit Compared with Other Ancient Witnesses* (Atlanta: SBL, 2000), pp. 16–17. See also Vincent T. M. Skemp, 'Jerome's Tobit: A Reluctant Contribution to the Genre Rewritten Bible', *Revue Benedictine* 112 (2002), pp. 5–35.

⁶² Danuta M. Shanzer, 'Jerome, Tobit, Alms, and the *Vita Aeterna*', in Andrew Cain and Josef Lössl (eds.), *Jerome of Stridon: The Monk, The Scholar, and his Reception in Late Antiquity and Beyond* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2009), pp. 87–103, at 89, n. 14.

the Septuagint was already well known.⁶³ The dedicatory letter is addressed to Chromatius and Heliodorus:

Chromatio et heliodoro episcopis hieronymus in domino salutem.
mirari non desino exactionis uestrae instantiam. . . . feci satis desiderio
uestro, non tamen meo studio. arguunt enim nos hebraeorum studia, et
inputant nobis, contra suum canonem latinis auribus ista transferre. sed
melius esse iudicans pharisaeorum displicere iudicio et episcoporum ius-
sionibus deseruire[.]⁶⁴

To the bishops Chromatius and Heliodorus Jerome sends greeting in the Lord.

I do not stop marvelling at the insatiability of your demands. . . . I have done enough for your desire, but not enough for interest. For the study of the Hebrew books accuses me, and judges me, for translating these words for Latin ears against their canon, but I judged it better to displease the judgement of Pharisees than to abandon the orders of bishops[.]

As in the preface to the books of Solomon, Jerome does not include any positive qualifier for the epithet *episcopis*. His tone towards Chromatius and Heliodorus deserves careful consideration. Jerome labels their request as an *exactio*, a word which has negative associations, derived from its use for the recollection of debts or the imposition of taxation.⁶⁵ This negativity is compounded by the tone of *instantia* which conveys a degree of force and urgency. Jerome uses forensic language (*arguunt*, *inputant*, *iudicio*) to draw attention to his reputational risk in translating the book of Tobit, given its non-canonical status. This both protects Jerome from this criticism, and impugns Chromatius and Heliodorus as the ones who deserve any blame for the translation—Jerome was just following episcopal orders, despite his reluctance and general lack of enthusiasm for the project.

The preface concludes with Jerome outlining the curious method that he used to complete the translation, using a bilingual Chaldean and Hebrew speaker to render Tobit's Chaldean into Hebrew, which Jerome then translated into Latin. Jerome claims that the

⁶³ Johann Gamberoni, *Die Auslegung des Buches Tobias in der griechisch-lateinischen Kirche der Antike und der Christenheit des Westens bis 1600* (Munich: Kösel-Verlag, 1969), p. 74. Kelly, *Jerome*, p. 284; see also Cavallera, *Saint Jérôme*, vol. 2, p. xxviii, n. 71.

⁶⁴ Hier. *Prologus Tobiae* (PL 29, cols. 23A–25A).

⁶⁵ TLL. s.v. Edmon L. Gallagher, 'Why did Jerome Translate Tobit and Judith?', *Harvard Theological Review* 108 (2015), pp. 356–75, at 358.

whole process took a single day.⁶⁶ Such claims should generally be considered critically, as speed of composition is a trope aimed at highlighting the skill of the author;⁶⁷ Jerome certainly was aware of this, as he criticized Rufinus for his claim that he composed his *Apology* in two days.⁶⁸ The extreme brevity in this case is consistent with the reluctant attitude towards the task Jerome expresses earlier in the prologue, where he claims to have done just enough to please the bishops (*feci satis desiderio uestro*). The tone of this dedicatory letter is in stark contrast to Jerome's exchanges with Chromatius prior to 398, examined in section I, and is in keeping with Jerome's cold tone in the preface to the books of Solomon.

In this light Jerome's explicit reminders of Tobit's non-canonical status take on a new hue. In the preface to the commentary on Jonah there is a brief mention: *Liber quoque Tobiae, licet non habeatur in Canone, tamen quia ursupatur ab ecclesiasticis viris* ('Also the book of Tobit, admittedly not thought of as being in the Canon, but nevertheless it is still used by churchmen').⁶⁹ The verb *ursupo* has the capacity to convey illicit use.⁷⁰ In the preface to the books of Solomon, Jerome provides further explanation as to how Tobit may be used:

sicut ergo Judith, et Tobi, et Machabaeorum libros legit quidem Ecclesia, sed inter canonicas Scripturas non recipit: sic et haec duo volumina legat ad aedificationem plebis, non ad auctoritatem ecclesiasticorum dogmatum confirmandam.⁷¹

And so the church does actually read the books of Judith, and Tobit, and Maccabees, but does not count them among canonical scripture, so let it read these two volumes for the edification of the people, not the confirmation of church dogmas.

By and large, scholars have accepted Jerome's claims regarding Chromatius' motivations in requesting that he translate Tobit.⁷²

⁶⁶ Hier. *Prologus Tobiae* (PL 29, col. 26A).

⁶⁷ Victoria Pagán, 'The Power of the Epistolary Preface from Statius to Pliny', *Classical Quarterly* 60 (2010), pp. 194–201, at 196.

⁶⁸ Hier. *Ruf.* 3.6 (CCSL 79, p. 79).

⁶⁹ Hier. *Ion.* praef. (PL 25, col. 1119A).

⁷⁰ Lewis and Short II.B.2 s.v. 'to assume or appropriate unlawfully'.

⁷¹ Hier. *Praef. in lib. Sal.* (PL 28, col. 1242A–43A). The reference of *duo volumina* is to Ecclesiasticus and the Wisdom of Solomon.

⁷² See e.g. Gallagher, 'Why did Jerome Translate Tobit and Judith?'; Shanzer 'Jerome, Tobit, Alms, and the *Vita Aeterna*', p. 89; Jose Lucas Brum Teixeira, "'Magis sensum e sensu quam ex verbo verbum'" (Hier. In Prol. Jud.): Jerome's Translation Art in the Vulgate of 'Tobit', *Revista de Cultura Teológica* 97 (2020), pp. 22–35, at 26.

This warrants reassessment. In a homily Chromatius quotes from Tobit 4.23: *Pauperem quidem, fili, gerimus vitam; sed omnia bona habes si Deum timueris.*⁷³ The language varies from Jerome's vulgate for the same line in four ways. Firstly, the noun *fili* is placed after *Pauperem quidem*, instead of before, and is not qualified by the possessive adjective *mi*; the verbs *habes* and *timueris* are in the second person singular, rather than first person plural; the adjective *omnia* is used instead of Jerome's *multa*; and the word order of *gerimus vitam* and *Deum timu** is reversed. These changes are extensive, for what is a reasonably simple line. Even if some allowance is made for the changing of the person of the verbs to fit Chromatius' homiletic mode, together these changes indicate that when Chromatius wrote his fifth homily, he did not have access to Jerome's translation of Tobit or he refused to use it. Indeed, Chromatius' use of the line from Tobit is the only extant biblical quotation in his homilies from a non-canonical source. In *serm.* 19 Chromatius expresses an overwhelming preference for the gospels. He may have welcomed a new translation of Tobit, he may even have asked Jerome for it, but this falls short of confirming that Chromatius was pleased to be linked to a non-canonical work that could not confirm ecclesiastical dogmas.

V. JEROME, CHROMATIUS, AND RUFINUS (397–407)

Jerome's relationship with Chromatius post 397 can now be reconsidered. The mere fact that Jerome dedicated his translation of the books of Solomon and Tobit to Chromatius cannot be relied upon to indicate a good relationship given Jerome's tone towards the bishop of Aquileia. Chromatius' intervention in the dispute, specifically the letter that he wrote to Jerome asking him to be silent, must also be dismissed as evidence of a strong relationship between presbyter and bishop, or even as an indication of Chromatius' friendly intent towards Jerome. Not only did Jerome refuse to comply with Chromatius' request, but he also publicized this refusal, highlighting the limitations of the bishop's influence over him.

The evidence pointing towards a deterioration in their relationship is far more compelling. First, we have Jerome's omission of positive epithets from his addresses to Chromatius, beginning in 398 and continuing to *c.*405. Then there is the tone of Jerome's

⁷³ Chromatius, *Serm.* 5.5 (ed. J. Lemarié, SC 154, p. 172, ll. 83–4).

dedicatory letters; the first complains that Chromatius' requests are endless, even during Jerome's sickness. The second similarly stresses Chromatius' constant demands. The claim that an author is writing in response to a request is a prefatory trope, but Jerome's claims go far beyond this trope.⁷⁴ Then, there are Jerome's reference to Chromatius in his *Apology against Rufinus*, in which Jerome names Chromatius as a possible secretive borrower of Origenist claims, and refuses to acquiesce in Chromatius' urging that he not respond to Rufinus. Lastly, we have Chromatius' enduring relationship with Jerome's opponent, Rufinus, to which we now turn.

In 400 Anastasius, the bishop of Rome, convened a council which condemned Origen as unfaithful to the Catholic Church.⁷⁵ Some, including Jerome, urged Anastasius to excommunicate Rufinus for his translations of Origen, but he eventually decided against taking that course of action following correspondence with both Rufinus and Venerius, the bishop of Milan, who interceded on Rufinus' behalf.⁷⁶ Anastasius died c.401–2. A year or two later Chromatius asked Rufinus to translate Origen's homilies on Joshua, which he completed in 403/404. If Chromatius had made this request when Anastasius was still alive, he may have sown further discord between the anti-Origenist movement and Rufinus. Anastasius, however, was not the only critic of Origen and Rufinus; Chromatius must have known that asking Rufinus to translate further Origenist works after the council of 400 would be an affront to those who had condemned the Christian philosopher and his Aquilean translator, including Jerome. This provides important context for why Jerome did not include positive epithets for Chromatius in his dedicatory letter which accompanied his translation of Tobit in 405. By asking Rufinus to translate Origenist works, following the ecclesiastical strife of the late 390s and early 400s, Chromatius had effectively taken sides against Jerome.

EPILOGUE: CHROMATIUS RECONSIDERED (397–407)

In the 1960s the discovery that Chromatius had authored a collection of sermons prompted renewed scholarly interest in

⁷⁴ See e.g. Tore Janson, *Latin Prose Prefaces: Studies in Literary Conventions* (Stockholm: Almqvist and Wiksell, 1964), p. 48.

⁷⁵ Banev, *Theophilus of Alexandria*, p. 41 notes that this ban was supported by imperial legislation.

⁷⁶ For analysis of Anastasius I and Jerome see Geoffrey D. Dunn, 'Anastasius I and Innocent I: Reconsidering the Evidence of Jerome', *Vigiliae Christianae* 61 (2007), pp. 30–41.

the bishop of Aquileia. This article shows that Jerome's relationship with Chromatius deteriorated after the renewal of hostilities between Jerome and Rufinus, and so sheds new light on Chromatius' leadership in the final years of his episcopacy and the growing importance of his see of Aquileia. In 397, one of Chromatius' key supporters, Ambrose, the powerful bishop of Milan, died. This left Chromatius somewhat exposed when his close friend, Rufinus, came under criticism for translating Origen's *Περὶ Ἀρχῶν*, including from Pope Anastasius I. After Anastasius I died c.401–2, Chromatius asked Rufinus to translate two works, Eusebius' *Historia Ecclesiastica* and Origen's *Homilies on Joshua*. Both requests were linked to the Origenist controversy. By asking Rufinus to translate Eusebius' history, Chromatius provided Rufinus with the scope to present Eusebius as less Arian, which was important given Jerome's criticism of Eusebius' sympathies for Origen, and even to present Origen himself in a more favourable manner.⁷⁷ The request for Rufinus to translate Origen broadcasted that Chromatius had no issue with Origenist thought and was not bound by the pressure that Jerome and others had tried to exert. That there were no ramifications for Chromatius in making this request—other than Jerome's cool tone toward him—indicates that Chromatius had not overplayed his hand. In fact, in the final years of his life, Chromatius came to assume a key position of leadership in the ecclesiastical circles of Northern Italy.

⁷⁷ Clarke, *The Origenist Controversy*, p. 181. Michael P. Hanaghan and Stephen Carlson, 'Rufinus's Version of Eusebius's Origen and the Politics of Martyrdom', *Journal of Early Christian Studies* 31 (forthcoming 2023).