# What Did Theodosius Know and Ambrose Conceal? Another Look at the Callinicum Episode (388 CE)

Much scholarly effort has been devoted to exploring the tensions between Christians and pagans as the former strove to establish their control over the public arena. Much less, however, has focused on the polemics and violence that newly empowered Christians directed toward other Christians, and toward Jews.[[1]](#endnote-1) These incidents must be taken together: understanding pagan–Christian and intra-Christian violence cannot be separated from analysis of brawls between Christians and Jews.[[2]](#endnote-2) Before 400 CE, anti-Jewish violence prevailed in neither half of the empire.[[3]](#endnote-3) Belligerent rhetoric was not matched by violent actions.[[4]](#endnote-4) We must also note the clear discrepancy between reports of violent Christian seizures or destruction of pagan or Jewish holy sites and the lack of an archaeological record of such episodes on the ground. Outbursts of violence between these religious rivals since Rome became Christian may have occurred, but these have left scant traces in the historical records—and, consequently, in modern scholarship. In actual fact, some such incidents did indeed have a major impact and a high profile in the public sphere, due not least to their later deployment by extremely influential public figures.

 In the annals of the study of *religious* *violence* in Late Antiquity, the destruction of the synagogue in Callinicum[[5]](#endnote-5) usually receives pride of place—though mostly for the wrong reasons. This episode represents for many scholars a significant inflection point in the history of religious violence in the Theodosian period.[[6]](#endnote-6)

 A clear view of Callinicum’s social impact may elude us, though certain inferences about its legal ramifications may be drawn. In this regard, the destruction of the synagogue at Callinicum by a Christian mob, mobilized by episcopal incitement, demands attention. How, then, are we to understand the Callinicum affair?[[7]](#endnote-7)

 Our sole (if indirect) witness to the event, which he linked over the course of two epistles to a report of an attack on a Valentinian church, is Ambrose of Milan.[[8]](#endnote-8) Ambrose became enmeshed in a chain reaction to these incidents, becoming—according to his account and his lengthy accompanying discussion—one of the two prominent protagonists historically linked to this episode. A further historical indication of the effects of the event may be the law promulgated by Theodosius I in 393, protecting synagogues from malicious acts.[[9]](#endnote-9) That this law was promulgated five years after the incident in Callinicum, however, militates at first sight against linking the two events, but, on further thought the time that elapsed between the Callinicum event and the promulgation of the law in 393 CE could also be attributed to the emperor’s effort to ward off possible public sentiments accusing him of siding with the Jews.

 Callinicum is also important for the insight it gives us into the contest for authority between *imperium* *et sacerdotium*. Scholars have tended to accept Ambrose’s account of his contest with Theodosius at face value, despite its invisibility in contemporary sources.[[10]](#endnote-10) This absence of contemporary reports suggests that the incident might have been quite minor, but that Ambrose retrospectively inflated its (and his own) importance to serve his own agenda. Ambrose’s epistles are, to repeat, our sole source of information for these two violent episode(s). Since they came down to us via his epistle collection, they are in fact products of a later, post-Theodosian, redaction by the bishop, even though their initial composition may have occurred closer to the events that they purport to describe.[[11]](#endnote-11) One is inclined to agree with Neil McLynn’s meticulous analysis, that the final account tendered by Ambrose was considerably enhanced with hindsight and rhetoric.[[12]](#endnote-12)

 Like McLynn, we also agree that Ambrose used the Callinicum affair as a pretext for the promotion of a more covert agenda: as well as the promotion of his own prestige and authority over internal ecclesiastical affairs, this concerned the regulation of the position of priests and the curial rank, and his general demand that priests be consulted on issues relating to *causa religiosa.* Yet, given McLynn’s conclusion that Ambrose wrote his initial complaint knowing that Theodosius rescinded the punitive orders in his initial rescript to the *comes Orientis*, we found ourselves intrigued by the sheer amount of space that the Callinicum incident occupied in that epistle, which in our reckoning goes beyond, though does not contradict, the idea that it served as a pretext.[[13]](#endnote-13) The space which Ambrose devoted to this episode in the course of his quite entangled “dialogue” with the emperor led us to think that there was more than meets the eye regarding the actual episode, and that, in fact, there a whole hidden layer which called for further probing.

 Hence, we wish to argue that, lurking behind all the Callinicum “pretext,” there is a layer of concealed issues, well known to both Ambrose and to the emperor, but which the bishop went out of his way to suppress in the interests of his own impact on his public readership and on posterity. Given the fact that Ambrose’s epistles divulge only the very bare facts of the incident(s)—Callinicum being mentioned only once and in passing in the course of the letter to the emperor (14), and the conflation of the two incidents with the Jews and the Valentinians—it is not surprising that most of the scholarly discussions were and still are focused on his rhetoric. Moreover, the *communis opinio* has it that the Jews mentioned by Ambrose in his other writings were not real living Jews, and thus those figuring in his letters served as tools in a rhetorical, polemical drama.[[14]](#endnote-14) We, on the contrary, suspect that Ambrose’s vitriolic attack on “the Jews” does reflect present realities, more than has been assumed thus far.[[15]](#endnote-15) As will become apparent in the course of our paper, the circumstances surrounding the Callinicum incident flashed out the tension between Ambrose and Emperor Theodosius which was fueled by conflicting agendas concerning public order advocated by both, the potentate and prelate.

 The full force of Ambrose’s epistle to Theodosius becomes apparent once its structure is exposed. The letter ought to be divided into two separate and near-equal units: 1–17 (the injustice visited upon the church) and 18–33 (the impiety of the Jews and their supporters). The first part was clearly penned and formulated by a legal mind befitting Ambrose’s earlier educational formation and career.[[16]](#endnote-16) In this context, Ambrose demands from the emperor *libertas—*freedom, in its political form as a desirable virtue in an emperor who refrains, as an *optimus princeps*, from abusing his unlimited power and allows his subjects to speak openly.[[17]](#endnote-17) In this context, biblical exempla of prophetic rebukes to kings also came in handy: Ambrose walked a path well trodden by other fellow bishops such as Hilary of Poitiers, and by contemporary orators such as Libanius.[[18]](#endnote-18)

 Indeed, in our view, Ambrose’s convoluted line of argument and his excessive use of rhetorical devices such as *antistasis*,[[19]](#endnote-19) as well as other methods typical of an accomplished rhetorician and former pagan official, contributed a great deal to creating a facade which was meant to blur the real characteristics of the event in the far Roman East in the service of much greater issues. Thus, the textual juncture we wish to explore is the axis between “fact and fiction” which Ambrose so relentlessly tried either to distort or to conceal from his readers.

 A good place to begin our exploration of Ambrose’s rhetorical deceits is his claim that the recent violent precedent was actually set by the Jews in the days of Julian, when they putatively burned down a set of basilicas in different locations in the eastern part of the Roman state. “The Church was not avenged, but the synagogue will be?” (*Ecclesia non vindicata est*, *vindicabitur synagoga?*). While Ambrose claims that justice must be carried out here according to the *ius gentium*, the set of violent incidents in the days of the Emperor Julian involving the Jews is fraudulent and presented in a distorted manner.[[20]](#endnote-20)

 What about more concrete issues regarding the Callinicum incident, such as the time and place? The former is certainly a rather minor detail, and most scholars who have addressed the issue of the exchanges between Ambrose and Theodosius I have defined only the probable chronological boundaries in which the open exchange between the bishop and the emperor might have taken place. This was to be determined by an assessment of the time of arrival of the news from the east. Many scholars ignored the need to determine a rather more precise date, remaining content with dating the event(s) vaguely to 388 CE.[[21]](#endnote-21) Others have come up with various other dates. Those vary between the immediate aftermath of Maximus’s defeat to sometime during the subsequent months, that is between the end of August 388 and possibly extending to the end of November of the same year, the month in which Chromatius, Bishop of Aquileia, was most probably consecrated in the presence of Ambrose, following the death of Valerian on 26 November.[[22]](#endnote-22) A more precise dating aims to place the composition of the letter by Ambrose during the latter part of the month of November and during December of 388.[[23]](#endnote-23) Given the accepted assumption that Ambrose wrote his letter when he knew that the emperor had already rescinded his initial order that the *comes Orientis* punish Callinicum’s bishop by demanding that he rebuild the synagogue from his own pocket, and that he punish the monks involved in the clash with the Valentinians, the actual event(s) must have taken place some weeks earlier.[[24]](#endnote-24) For, according to recent new assessments which model Roman connectivity in the spheres of political and military movements, as well as information networks, and based on a thorough assessment of the available routes, costs, and speed of movement during winter or summer, the information traveling from Callinicum to Aquileia or Milan (where the emperor resided during the late summer and early autumn), would have taken five or more weeks via courier,[[25]](#endnote-25) and in the case at hand slightly more still, when we allow for some sort of local investigation.[[26]](#endnote-26) Moreover, and just for the record, if we allow for up to another full five-plus additional weeks, following Theodosius’s second order to the *comes Orientis* andprior to Ambrose’s penning his letter in its initial version, then the event(s) in Callinicum and near Antioch (involving the Valentinians) were by that point somewhat “distant” incidents. Certainly, contrary to what Ambrose might have wished to convey by the heated and tense tone of his attack on the emperor, and given the real time that had lapsed between the inception of the event and its later phases, the whole matter was already destined to be recast into its polemical, rhetorical form.

 There was, however, yet more to it. The geographical distance from Milan played into the hands of Ambrose, and while writing to the emperor he capitalized on it. “If you are moved to anger by the burning of even the most worthless buildings—for what else could there be in such an *obscure fortified settlement*(*in tam ignobili castro*)—do you not remember, emperor, how many mansions of prefects have been burned in Rome, without anyone exacting punishment?”[[27]](#endnote-27) This harping on the contrast between center and periphery definitely sounded impressive. As a small garrison town (*castra*) on the edge of the Roman frontier, a distant and peripheral point in the Roman *orbis terrarum*, Callinicum was placed in sharp contrast to Rome as the epicenter of that very same universe.

 But was Callinicum indeed so unimportant? It seems not. The bishop’s subtle rhetorical presentation obscures the weakness of his point. Although Ambrose might not have been well informed, even when granted his good contacts within imperial circles, his claim concerning the obscurity of the Osrhoene garrison town was a gross underestimation in light of the reality that was known all too well by the emperor, who was above all an accomplished general. Nicephorium/Callinicum—better known from the Abbasid period as a-Raqqa and situated on the river Balīkh, a small tributary of the Euphrates (*in vicinia Euphratis*, *Nicephorion*)—was most probably founded in the Seleucid era (under Seleukos Nikator (301–281 BCE). It served in the days of Emperor Julian on his final expedition against the Persians as a reliable stronghold in very close proximity to the Sassanian–Roman border.[[28]](#endnote-28) But Callinicum, alongside two other eastern towns, also served as an important trade center between Persia and Rome, so much so that by 408/409 CE the Roman emperors Honorius and Theodosius II promulgated the following law:

 Merchants subject both to our empire as well as to the king of the Persians should not hold period markets (*nundinae*) beyond those places in which it was agreed upon by us at the time of the treaty (298 CE) with the aforementioned nation. Lest the secrets of a foreign kingdom be found out (*ne alieni regni*, *quod non convenit*, *scrutentur arcana*). Therefore no one hereafter subject to our empire should dare to set out beyond Nisibis, Callinicum, and Artaxatafor the sake of buying and selling merchandise (*species*), nor should he think of exchanging merchandise with a Persian except in the cities mentioned (*Nullus igitur posthac imperio nostro subjectus ultra Nisibin Callinicum et Artaxata emendi sive vendendi species*).[[29]](#endnote-29)

The legislation of 408 CE referred to an initial treaty from Diocletian’s days that concerned only the town of Nisibis but, as seen here, was extended to include Callinicum as well. Moreover, the law cited above, albeit promulgated twenty years after the episode discussed here, no doubt attests to Callinicum’s well-established mercantile prestige and status, coupled with its regional military importance.[[30]](#endnote-30) Callinicum, in brief, was no obscure backwater, but an important nerve center along the boundary spine between Persia and Rome.

 In order to understand the importance of Callinicum alongside the other two cities mentioned in the law, one has to note the wider picture of the trade and security concerns in the region. Unlike other sections of the Roman–Persian border (mainly along the Euphrates), which consisted of fortified posts (such as Dura-Europos in the third century and others), the region in northeast Syria better known as Mesopotamia and Osrhoene was defended by a concentration of well-defined posts governing the open plains of the Syrian steppe to the east and southeast of Beroea. This situation presented an even more difficult challenge to both superpowers, Rome and Persia, requiring special efforts in monitoring movements of groups and individuals in this area.[[31]](#endnote-31) Accordingly, following the defeat of Julian in the summer of 363, Nisibis was ceded to the Persians, and Callinicum was the only one of the three mentioned centers of trade to remain within Roman borders, thus, as later proved to be the case, meriting its pivotal status.[[32]](#endnote-32) Overall, it should be emphasized that the entire area surrounding Callinicum underwent a major development during late Roman rule, proof of its strategic position close to the Roman front with Persia and along the trade routes which reached their apex in the fifth and sixth centuries. This state of affairs was known all too well to Theodosius I. Ambrose’s slighting remark about Callinicum’s obscurity registers as somewhere between unfounded and ridiculous.[[33]](#endnote-33)

 Let us now turn our attention to the other explicit motive behind this frontier legislation, which was aimed not only at regulating economic activity, but also at curbing the free flow of information liable to be passed on in such bustling commercial meeting points in this frontier zone. These places provided opportunity for information, sometimes sensitive, to be easily passed between parties from either side of the border. The effort to check this potential flow of information without impairing the mercantile activity that drew merchants to it from as far afield as the western regions of the empire was most probably easier to effect by the presence of an army garrison.[[34]](#endnote-34) If we add to this mix insinuations concerning the potential or actual treachery of the Jews (discussed below in more detail), the violent act against the Jewish community might have become a cause for concern.

 Where were the Jews in all this? What was their role and place in the context described above? It is quite difficult to determine the makeup of the local Jewish community, let alone its size, but we may assume that members of that community had their share in the local mercantile activity.[[35]](#endnote-35)

 In this social, political, and military context, a few questions remain open. Nowhere in his letter to the emperor does Ambrose hint at what might have triggered the local Christians’ violent attack on Callinicum’s synagogue. Was there any provocation on the part of the Jews besides the distant, unrelated precedent of violent anti-Christian outbursts led by Jews in the days of Julian, conjured up by Ambrose to justify his demands upon the emperor? Clearly, from his own tacit admission, Ambrose was not privy to the details of the incident; or, conversely, he opted to conceal whatever did not suit his agenda. If we are to follow the guidelines suggested by Johannes Hahn, religious issues alone cannot provide a viable explanation for these outbursts, since conflicts with violent outcomes were invariably mingled with other issues.[[36]](#endnote-36) What then triggered the Callinicum event? Could we, for the sake of argument, given the nature of the town’s probable social makeup as a trade center, contemplate the possibility that competition with the local Jewish merchants only intensified standing religious grudges and resentments? When and how such grievances might turn into extreme intolerance and later violence in the local context is not easy to answer.[[37]](#endnote-37)

 On further thought, however, we might after all be in some sort of position to clear up some of the fog shrouding the Callinicum event. If another incident involving the destruction of a synagogue in another remote location in the same region close to the Sassanian territory is something to go by in the way of filling in the gaps, we would like to draw attention to an anecdote found in the Vita of Sergius by John of Ephesus. According to the tradition, Sergius led his disciples into an ongoing conflict ca. 520 CE with the Jewish community of Kalesh, a small village in the territory of Amida. It is our contention that this story, recently analyzed by Fergus Millar, could shed some light on the pieces missing from the enigmatic puzzle that is the Callinicum incident, and more so on the shared atmosphere in which these strained extra-communal relations developed. A short extract from the Vita will suffice. The narrative begins with Sergius’s wishes to begin a life as a recluse:

 But, before doing this, because there were *many Jews* in that village and they went about with great freedom (*prhsyʾ=parrhesia*), he carried on a continuous contest (ܬܟܬܘܫܐ ܐܡܝܢܐ) against them, and every day he used to contend against them as with slayers of God … and he used to upbraid Christians who had dealings with them (=the Jews) in the way of taking and giving. And one day he led about twenty of their (Simeon’s and his) disciples by night, and took fire, and went and burnt their great synagogue-house (house of Shabbat), with their book (ܣܦܪ݀ܝܗܘܢ), their trumpets (ܘܫܝܦܘܪ݀ܝܗܘܢ) and all their furniture (ܘܟܘܠܗܿܬܫܡܫܬܗܘܢ).[[38]](#endnote-38) But these men when they saw that all their hope had been cut off through the burning of their books and all of their furniture, lamented bitterly, and because they were settled in the territory of the church of Amida (ܘܡܛܘܠܠ ܕܒܬܘܬܒܘܬܐ ܕܥܕܬܐ ܕܐܡܿܕ ܝܿܬܒܝܢ ܗܘܘ) and used to pay many contributions to the members of the church … *all the members of the church became their supporters*, threatening the blessed Sergius … But the zealous man, when these men [=the Jews] had gone into the church of the city to prefer an accusation, while the fire was still in their synagogue, collected all his master’s disciples with him and *all the others from the village*,and took water and went and put out the fire; and they cleared all the soil; and they collected stones and within three days built a small martyr’s chapel in that place.[[39]](#endnote-39)

Ignoring the gap in time between the two incidents, and allowing for omissions and different priorities of presentation by John of Ephesus writing in Constantinople a generation or so after the actual events, there might yet be some important similarities with the Callinicum episode.[[40]](#endnote-40) Bearing in mind the differences between Kalesh (a small remote village in the northeastern edge of the Roman Empire close to the Tigris river) and Callinicum (which maintained its centrality during the sixth century), some unique similarities indicate a common ground between the two incidents, for it is our contention that the basic social conditions remained the same.[[41]](#endnote-41)

 Let us begin by addressing the clear dissimilarities between the two incidents in these nearby locations, most prominently concerning the manner in which the two incidents evolved. Thus, while in Callinicum the Roman authorities took some formal action, no doubt following some investigation into the matter, the authorities were nowhere to be seen in the course of the ongoing violent encounter between the band of zealot recluses and the Jews of Kalesh. Conversely, while in the course of the Callinicum episode, there was no report of any public or grassroots action in support of the local Jews, in Kalesh, we do observe an open protest by local Christians in support of their Jewish neighbors.[[42]](#endnote-42)

 The possible similarities are quite suggestive. In the first place, in searching for a probable cause for the Callinicum Christian onslaught, one could perhaps extrapolate that the “defiant” (according to Sergius) self-confidence (the *parrhesia* behavior) of the Kalesh Jews reflected a trait attributed to the Jews in some of the early fifth-century incidents which took place in the Syrian orbit, as well as mentioned in some imperial laws.[[43]](#endnote-43) In this way, local commercial competition between the communities in Callinicum might similarly have triggered feelings of animosity and, compounded with common Christian hatred *adversus Iudaeos*, thus spiraled into violence. A very similar atmosphere might have been triggered by “some wrong done to God, or by an insult to the Church,” which Ambrose suggested had led to the Callinicum bishop’s instigation of his attack.[[44]](#endnote-44) The later claim by Paulinus, Ambrose’s biographer, that the Jews “reviled some Christian monks” (*propterea quod Judaei vel Valentiniani insultarent monachis Christianis*)[[45]](#endnote-45) seems more of an afterthought, particularly since it is linked to the incident with the Valentinians who, as we know from Ambrose himself, blocked a procession of monks on the festival of the Maccabean Martyrs. In this context, we encounter what seems to us to be yet another one of Ambrose’s exaggerations in the service of his agenda, describing the procession in memory of the Maccabees as an “ancient custom.”[[46]](#endnote-46) The core of the matter was not the actual veracity of such a provocation, but the pretext used by alleged negative sentiments encountered by the local Christians. This is what is meant by vitriolic utterances reaching the public arena. An additional point of similarity between the two incidents, in Kalesh and in Callinicum, lies in the similar sense of a zealous mission which drove Sergius and his comrades to engage in a sustained attack on the Kalesh Jewish synagogue, burning down the edifice and everything it housed (furniture, books/Law Scrolls and Trumpets/Shofar). This zealotry can be envisaged in the Callinicum attack too. In his epistle to Theodosius, Ambrose refers to property of the Jews being reclaimed, to which Ambrose responds that the possessions of the Jews were consumed by the fire: “What could a synagogue in a remote fortified settlement … possess, when all there is in the place is inconsiderable, and nothing of value and little in quantity? Of what then could the **fire** have robbed the treacherous Jews?”There might nevertheless have been some plundering here too.[[47]](#endnote-47) One thing, though, should be stressed: it is time to put to rest the unfounded assertion made in several modern scholarly studies that the Callinicum synagogue was converted into a church.[[48]](#endnote-48) For in none of the contemporary sources on the Callinicum affair, that is Ambrose’s epistles as well as the account by Paulinus, Ambrose’s biographer, is there any mention of this particular outcome. All Ambrose refers to is the burning of the synagogue by an agitated mob, never its displacement and conversion into a church.

 Moreover, Ambrose entreats Theodosius not to grant the Jews a triumph of any sort, in other words the rebuilding of the burnt-down synagogue and the return of its burnt or plundered “offerings” (*donaria*,whatever was meant by this). Fulfilling that demand would have meant in the eyes of Ambrose a glorious victory for the Jews, whereas the visible ruins of the synagogue would have symbolized the Christians’ subjugation of the Jews, if not their humiliation. A converted synagogue would not have conveyed the notion of Christianity’s supremacy, like the actual remains of the burnt-down synagogue would. Indeed, the circumstances leading to the converted synagogue would in time have vanished from local collective memory.[[49]](#endnote-49) Finally, accepting the current *communis opinio* discarding the veracity of the confiscation and conversion of the “Hasmonean” synagogue in Antioch, discussed above, the notion of converting synagogues to Christian places of worship became a phenomenon, albeit perhaps a not very widespread one, not before the second decade of the fifth century.[[50]](#endnote-50) Ambrose’s belligerent attitude,[[51]](#endnote-51) enhanced by a strong sense of camaraderie with his Callinicum counterpart and perhaps fueled by his own admiring envy of the latter’s action, sets the tone, which could be further explained by another look at the distant Kalesh incident. Like in Sergius’s later “hate crime” in Kalesh, marked by its concerted and sustained effort to rid the public arena of Jewish presence, Ambrose’s more significant goal was to cleanse the public domain of the presence of Jews and heretics. This would explain his opening remarks, which portray the situation of Callinicum’s bishop, thanks to the emperor’s initial ruling, as a choice between becoming a martyror anapostate.[[52]](#endnote-52) Ambrose contended that he himself wished to be in a similar position, facing martyrdom: “You (emperor) have a culprit who is on the spot, one who admits the charge. I declare that I burnt the synagogue, or at any rate that I instructed them that there should be no building where Christ was denied.”What was Ambrose referring to here? In light of what follows, the meaning of his statement becomes even more complicated: “If I am faced with the further question of why I have not burnt the synagogue here (Milan? or Aquileia?), [I reply that] since it had already caught fire by an act of God, my participation was not required.” These extremely vague statements are a matter for speculation.[[53]](#endnote-53) It is difficult to envisage, even for the sake of argument, Ambrose bragging about his own involvement in the destruction of the Callinicum synagogue. However, his own admission of involvement in one way or another, whether instigating, assisting, or condoning such actions closer to home, Milan, or Aquileia, should not be dismissed lightly. The latter possibility seems to carry more weight, although it remains quite vague.[[54]](#endnote-54) It still remains quite probable to see in all this an extension of Ambrose’s vicious rhetoric in an effort to gain public support.

 It is time to turn our gaze to the second protagonist in this unfolding textual or real drama: The emperor, as portrayed by Ambrose. Ambrose implicitly censures the emperor for “seemingly exceeding territorial boundaries” by ruling from the far west on an issue that was supposedly then under the jurisdiction of his son Arcadius, resident in Constantinople.[[55]](#endnote-55) But what, in the first place, was Ambrose’s own standing in this ecclesiastical incident thousands of miles from his own diocese? Was Ambrose induced, even in good faith, to pose his incisive question in light of the novel administrative changes that were slowly taking place? For in those very same years the administrative demarcation line between East and West was being drawn up with Theodosius’s own profound involvement. In fact, the layout of the eastern provinces and the dividing lines between East and West were establishedprior to the emperor’s death in 395.[[56]](#endnote-56) Circumstances on the ground, however, were such that Theodosius’s presence in the west in those very years (387–391) was crucial for the well-being of the empire. Thus Ambrose’s claim would have aroused ire and contempt within imperial circles. Theodosius’s presence in Italy (especially in Milan) was to protect and mentor the child Emperor Valentinian II, who was urged by Ambrose himself to request Theodosius’s guidance in handling the earlier crisis of the Altar of Victory in Rome (384). Come 387, following Magnus Maximus’s invasion of Italy, Theodosius took command of an army and moved into Italy in order to check Maximus’s aspirations and activities, by setting up headquarters in Milan in 388 and rallying support from leading pagan dignitaries such as Symmachus.[[57]](#endnote-57) In doing so, Theodosius also sought the high opinion and loyalty of the troops, whose fealty was often swayed by shows of effective military might.[[58]](#endnote-58)

 There remains yet another enigmatic component in the unfolding Callinicum episode. It concerns the rather swift response of Theodosius to the complaint and query sent to him by the *comes Orientis* as to how to deal with the culprits involved in torching the synagogue, an action that was followed by a no less swift rescinding of that very same order. Was the move by the emperor to fine the bishop and punish his accomplices carried out solely on the grounds of upholding public order (*ratio disciplinae/disciplinae publicae*)? The earliest law protecting synagogues was enacted only in 393 (CTh XVI 8. 7, 29 September). Back in 388, the only legal definition under which Theodosius might have taken action against the rioters in Callinicum was indeed the *ratio disciplinae*.[[59]](#endnote-59) Were there other reasons involved?[[60]](#endnote-60) We would like to postulate that Theodosius was actually also acting according to the spirit of the ideal monarch, as presented to him by earlier and contemporary rhetoricians such as Themistius, who entreated Theodosius as early as January 381 not only to guard his subjects and defend them against their enemies, but also to establish an atmosphere of social harmony.[[61]](#endnote-61)

 We would like to draw attention to an additional possible consideration that might have been involved here regarding the Jews, beyond the mundane issue of “public order.” The proposed element might also be part of the fermenting local atmosphere toward the Jews. Given the sensitive location of Callinicum, described above in detail, especially concerning the possible free flow of sensitive information carried by merchants from either side of the Roman–Persian border (as indicated in the Roman law), monitoring and checking this potential situation was of utmost importance. In that context, we would like to highlight some prevalent rumors concerning the shaky loyalty of the Jews in border towns or zones, particularly in times of political distress. This imputed trait of the Jews was founded on and propagated by their negative presentation as betrayers of Jesus in the New Testament gospels. However, on the Roman–Persian front, it was already by the fifth century being fed by official imperial sentiments and later “vindicated” by anecdotal material.[[62]](#endnote-62)

 Thus, for instance, the *Chronicle of Pseudo-Joshua the Stylite* describes the Persian siege of Tella which took place during of the Roman–Persian war of 502/3. The chronicler describes the local Jews as digging a tunnel underneath the synagogue tower situated near the city wall to assist the Persians’ penetrating the city. The plot, once exposed, led to a major massacre of the city’s Jews.[[63]](#endnote-63)

 Although such rumors, to the best of our knowledge, were still absent from the fourth-century landscape, we still wish to argue that the following anecdotes, albeit coming from over a century later, might yet be relevant. For these insinuations concerning the Jews did not enter the public arena *ex nihilo*; they represented the climax of a slow and steady erosion of the image of the Jews, going back among others to Ambrose’s own vitriol against them. Thus, in the course of his epistle to his sister Marcellina, he hammers home this notion about the Jews, time and again harping on the absence of genuine love among the Jews, who lack *fides* and who are essentially treacherous.[[64]](#endnote-64)

 Given the unique situation in conflict zones and with Jewish-Babylonian communities across the border, feelings of that kind might have been running high among local Romans and Christians. The Roman provinces of Osrhoene and Mesopotamia were quite extensively inhabited at least from the time of the Callinicum episode, and most probably earlier on too, by Jews culturally adapted to their environment.[[65]](#endnote-65) So much so, that it has been claimed that they interacted with and influenced the local brand of Syrian Christianity.[[66]](#endnote-66) Theodosius, we thus claim, was most probably well aware of this potential situation. Hence, apart from securing public order, he acted upon a further belief that it would be in the service of the empire to pacify the local Jewish community or even “preempt” dissident Jewish feelings in the aftermath of the violent attack. This consideration would have been strategically important given the only very recent (387) treaty between Theodosius and Shapor III over Armenia, made following a diplomatic initiative, and all while encountering trouble on the western front.[[67]](#endnote-67)

 Summing up our conjectures, the encounter between the monarch and the bishop, sharing the same Nicene faith, yields the following picture. While the emperor succeeded toward the end of summer 388 in triumphing over his arch competitor Maximus, he received the disturbing news from the eastern edge of the empire. Aware of the possible repercussions for that sensitive region and guided by the necessity to be seen to exercise the rule of public order, he found himself at loggerheads with a bishop who was pursuing an entirely different agenda, one governed by strong animosity against all those external to his Nicene camp and intent on cleansing the public arena from present and potential enemies. At that given moment, these protagonists represented two separate worlds, in which Callinicum with its own local rival ethnic and sectarian feuds fell prey to an alien struggle.[[68]](#endnote-68)

 Finally, as a coda to our discussion, we would like to turn our gaze to Ambrose’s “home front” in Milan, which most probably was more important to him than the events in the east, in Callinicum, as already rightly claimed by McLynn.[[69]](#endnote-69) However, this did not just concern the struggle for the privileges of Christian clerics in regards to curial rank, and possibly other matters, all of which were indeed explicit enough in the letter to Theodosius. We argue that within the highly charged encounter between Ambrose and Theodosius lay issues concerning public order as seen by the ecclesiastical circles aspiring to secure for themselves a greater civic role as leaders of the urban community.[[70]](#endnote-70) The latter served Ambrose as a convenient pretext for focusing public attention on the recent (17 June 386) local gains in power and authority. These were enhanced to a great extent, in Ambrose’s Milan, by the *inventio* (“discovery”) and later *translatio* of the remains of two martyrs, Protasius and Gervasius, to his own recently constructed and consecrated basilica. Hence, Ambrose’s great emphasis in his epistle on martyrdom (contrasted with apostasy). Ambrose, as claimed by Lucy Grig, was all too familiar with the cachet of martyrs’ remains and their high value as political currency. At that point and time following the demise of Maximus, the supporter of heretics, favorite of pagans, and protector of the Jews, the Callinicum contretemps was up for grabs, and it served Ambrose’s agenda of cleansing the public space from his competition. Thus, for the sake of self-promotion he claimed that he himself was prepared to be martyred by the emperor on this altar of religious principle.[[71]](#endnote-71) It would seem that the Callinicum episode might have served as a public statement in a more wide-ranging, local affirmation of power within Milan’s communal power struggle between Arian Goths, Ambrosian, Nicaeans, and imperial authority.
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